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This article discusses the rationale for and the background to a new genealogical study of Australian adolescence, citizenship and schooling. The project takes as its focus the middle decades of the twentieth century (1930s-1970s), a time of significant expansion and transformation in secondary and post-compulsory schooling in Australia, set against a backdrop of widespread cultural and economic change in Australian social life (Campbell and Sherington, 2006a; Macintyre 2009). Over this period, the norms of adolescence and the social expectations of schooling for young people changed radically, placing new demands on the work of schools in shaping youth values and identities and their potential role as future citizens (Marginson, 1993; Savage, 2007). The study informing this article is investigating educational programs and discourses that address how best to educate adolescents and prepare them for future citizenship. It does so through taking a close look at changes in curriculum provision and the establishment of student support services, such as adolescent and child guidance. Documentary and archival research is combined with oral histories to explore institutional and informal memories of schooling and educational change alongside scholarly, professional and popular ideas about the purposes of secondary schooling, including debates about the personal and civic values young people should embody. In the larger study, these matters are investigated specifically in the decades of the 1930s, 1950s and 1970s, with a view to developing some comparative and generational perspectives, to see how ideas and memories about schooling and the normative construction of adolescence and the youth citizen do or do not change over this period of time.[i]

An important dimension of the study has been the exploration of such issues from a transnational perspective. This has involved moving our attention beyond national developments (Curthoys and Lake, 2005) to consider, for example, links between key figures in Australian education and educators in the United States, Britain and the former colonies and dominions, and the ways in which ideas as well as people ‘travelled’. Transnational ideas concerning child-centred and progressive pedagogy from the 1930s onwards, developmental, social psychology and adolescent and youth studies from the 1950s, and the ‘new’ sociology of education and social inequalities and feminism in the 1970s, have had considerable impact on curriculum development and on guidance programs in Australia. Indeed, Australia has a longstanding engagement in international dialogues, and research on this topic provides a counterpoint to arguably more common views of Australia as either largely anglophilic or intellectually isolated, or only a relatively recent player on the international stage. Our work suggests that Australian education in the 1930s was more cosmopolitan and embedded in international exchange than is usually remembered in the present. Additionally, some current debates about globalisation, in overstating its singularity, also underestimate the impact of earlier manifestations of the transnational ‘flow of ideas’. Arising from this observation too is the relationship between philanthropy and public policy. It was not only abstract ideas that were travelling: international philanthropy, such as the Carnegie Corporation, and the
projects and study visits it funded, had practical effects on Australian public life. Some research exists on the institutional relationships between Carnegie and Australian education, especially ACER (White 1997; Connell 1980) but there remains limited research on the extent and nature of the influence of international philanthropy upon the translation of ideas, practices and policy models in Australian education (but see Campbell and Sherington 2006b).

One immediate impetus to this historical study was the depth of contemporary anxieties about social values, student wellbeing and the role of schools in shaping future citizens. By the mid 2000s, public and educational debates had become swamped by attention to the ideological aspects of these topics. Our questions, informed by Foucauldian approaches, are more concerned with understanding the ‘history of the present’ (Baker and Heyning, 2004; O’Farrell, 2005; Baker, 2009; Popkewitz, 2010). To begin this genealogical work, we are examining the circulation of discourses concerning school values, the ‘good student’ and the ‘problem student’, as expressed in the fields of school curriculum and school counselling. By bringing together these two fields, our aim is to open up some new avenues for researching the education of the adolescent and to add to historical and contemporary understandings about the role of schools in shaping student values and wellbeing.

Building on this, two main lines of analysis are developed in the following discussion. First, these two domains – curriculum and counselling – are typically thought of as distinct parts of schooling, but as we argue below, they are closely linked in the task of citizenship formation, and a more relational analysis of their aims, practices and associated concepts regarding the education of young people is helpful for grasping the different dimensions of the role of schooling in citizen formation. Second, we suggest that transnational flows of people and ideas were integral to understandings about and initiatives directed to the education of the adolescent, particularly during the interwar period in Australia. A longer story can be told of the travelling ideas about adolescence and transnational movements of educational reform across the mid-twentieth century. For the purposes of this article, however, and to illustrate our argument about the value of looking at curriculum and counselling side-by-side, we focus most here on influential exchanges in the 1930s – a decade that witnessed significant changes flowing from the spread of both child-centred progressivism and psychological knowledge into educational practices. And we consider the impact of international philanthropic funding, in particular the Carnegie Corporation of New York, in facilitating and promoting a range of internationalising practices and transnational exchanges in Australian education during this period. Examples are drawn from the fields of citizenship education and of counselling and guidance to indicate the extent and nature of these transnational movements and their ‘travelling concepts’ (Popkewitz, 2000; Hultqvist, 2004). We argue for a stronger appreciation of these dynamics, not only in building histories of adolescence in Australia, but in contemporary memory and constructions of Australia’s educational history more broadly. In summary, our study is attempting to understand the history of adolescence in some new ways. On the one hand, we are trying to look afresh at the history of youth citizen formation by concurrently examining educational and curriculum reforms and the development of guidance and counselling, and on the
other, we are aiming to look beyond the borders and pre-occupations of national histories of education, and consider the ways in which local events and debates are connected to wider international networks and developments.

**Youth values and schooling for citizenship**

Our approach to developing new ways of thinking historically about adolescence, citizenship and schooling draws on Foucauldian genealogy. This mode of inquiry seeks to make problematic and expose the contingency of apparently fundamental and continuous categories of political and social life and seeks to examine relations between, and discontinuities among, discourses and events and operations of power (Foucault, 1984). The associated concepts of ‘problematisation’ and ‘history of the present’ (O’Farrell, 2005, pp.65-73) are most relevant to the discussion here. Foucault describes his interest in the ‘history of thought’ as involving ‘the analysis of the way an unproblematic field of experience or set of practices which were accepted without question…becomes a problem, raises discussion and debate, incites new reactions, and induces a crisis in the previously silent behaviour, habits, practices and, institutions’ (Foucault, 2001, p.74, cited in O’Farrell, 2005, p.70). Somers (2008, p.173) argues that Foucauldian approaches help us to ‘analyze how we think and why we seem obliged to think in certain ways’ and emphasise the ‘historicity of thinking and reasoning practices’.

A commonly claimed central purpose of formal schooling is the education of students for future citizenship and the development of their social skills and values. The type of values young people should embody and the role of schools in shaping those values are topics that command considerable public and policy attention. How schools actually perform such work and what these social values might be are, of course, much-contested questions, and the points of contention vary over time and place. Recent public debate about the teaching of Australian history in schools, for example, underlined the close connections between curriculum and wider cultural and political anxieties (Taylor, 2000; Clendinnen, 2006). Associated public discussions in Australia regarding national identity, immigration and citizenship have similarly often invoked the vexed issue of the role of school curriculum in fostering a sense of individual and collective national identity and the type of social values schools were, or were not, encouraging in young people (Macintyre and Clark, 2003; McLean, 2008).

The development of a national framework and school programs for Values Education (DEST, 2005; Lovett and Toomey, 2006) has been one notable response to such dilemmas. A focus on values and citizenship has also characterised various Australian state curriculum frameworks. For example, the *Victorian Essential Learning Standards* identified ‘Interpersonal development’, ‘Personal learning’, and ‘Civics and Citizenship’ as core domains of learning for all students in years P-10 (VCAA, 2007). In similar vein, the *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* (MCEECDYA, 2008) advocated that all young people become ‘confident and creative individuals’ and ‘active and informed citizens’. These principles have underpinned the development of a
national curriculum, the *Australian Curriculum* (ACARA, 2012), which, for example, identifies ‘ethical behaviour’ as one of seven general capabilities to be integrated across the curriculum and discipline areas. Concurrently, there are similarly widespread discussions about youth wellbeing, from anxieties about obesity and substance abuse to the impact of online worlds and digital culture. Concerns about the emotional and psychological wellbeing of young people and their capacity to negotiate complex social worlds also form part of the backdrop to current discourses on schooling and citizen formation. A key aim, then, of the larger study on which this article draws, is to understand some of the antecedents to such contemporary concerns about youth identities and values, and the kind of educational discourses and policy responses these matters have generated in earlier times. We are also attempting to map some of the transnational dimensions and effects of these developments.

In various ways, the curriculum areas named Civics, or Citizenship, or Moral and Values Education have long sought to articulate the norms of good student and good citizen, and the types of knowledge and values seen as necessary for young people and future adults (Down, 2004; McLean, 2008; Wright, 2008). Citizenship education encompasses formal curriculum areas devoted to the study of civic life, as well as education for citizenship (Marginson, 1993; Kennedy, 1997). However, even subjects dedicated to the study of civics are not usually confined to learning the principles of government (Gilbert, 1992; Hogan, 1995). From its beginnings in the late 19th century, civics education in Australia has attended to the cultivation of ‘character as well as capacity’ (Meredith and Thomas, 1999, p.2). Citizenship also involves forms of identity and social interaction: ‘it is about the kind of people we become, and the kind of people we encourage or allow our children to become’ (Cullen, 1997, p.2). For example, one goal of the Australian comprehensive secondary school in the 1960s was ‘to provide a common curriculum core to all Australian youth’, reflecting a ‘firm sense of what was required to produce Australian citizens’ (Campbell and Sherington, 2006a, p.159). Type of school, formal and informal curriculum, pedagogical practices, and support services all contribute to the shaping of student identities and their making as future citizens (Popkewitz, 2006).

The content and form of this identity and knowledge work has varied over time, as have the curriculum areas deemed most responsible or appropriate for citizenship formation. That is, in addition to curriculum areas designated as Values or Civics Education, other subject areas have either been associated with or attributed special responsibilities for values and the shaping of future citizens. Certainly, education for citizenship is widely seen as the work of schooling in general (Biesta *et al.*, 2009), but the functions and aims of particular subject areas have changed over time, and curriculum knowledge and the values deemed important to this task have been articulated and mediated differently in different historical periods, via for example, curriculum policy, text books and so forth. In the present, for example, we can see history curriculum as having special responsibilities for citizen formation. In the 1930s, Alice Hoy’s widely used and reprinted textbook firmly placed civics within the domain of the history curriculum (Hoy, 1931/1938; Hoy, 1934). In
the 1980s and 1990s, citizenship education was more likely to be identified as a specific component in a social studies curriculum (Civics Expert Group, 1994; Down, 2004) and in the 1960s and 70s the spread of the ‘new English’ (Green and Cormack, 2008) held English curriculum to have special responsibilities for cultivating the ‘whole person’ and fostering the self-reflective formation of social and personal values (Author A). Students’ dispositions and values are, however, shaped by more than the formal organisation of school curriculum; other informal and formal knowledges come into play, including professional and popular understandings of students’ identities and their emotional and psychological wellbeing.

A flourishing field of Australian and international youth studies scholarship has examined the diverse influences on youth values and identity formation today, frequently exploring the impact of and interactions between schooling and youth cultures (Tsolidis, 2006; Nayak and Kehily, 2008; Author A). Accompanying this, an equally substantial body of work on youth citizenship has explored the different dimensions of what constitutes both education for citizenship and citizenship itself. Citizenship is ‘multiple and various’: it can be ‘an identity, a set of rights, privileges and duties; an elevated and exclusionary political status; a set of practices that can unify – or divide – the members of a political community; and an ideal of political agency’ (Friedman, 2005, p.3). Citizenship is widely understood as ‘having three essential and complementary dimensions: it is a status, a feeling and a practice’ (Osler and Starkey, 2005, p.11). Alongside the concerns of social citizenship with inequalities and rights, contemporary social scientists are increasingly interested in knowing ‘what it feels like to be a citizen’ and ‘the emotional aspects of belonging and not-belonging within the civic community’ (Arnot, 2009, p.7).

Across the range of work on youth citizenship, there is growing interest, indeed an almost overwhelming focus on global citizenship and the relation between globalisation and local youth cultures (Author A; Dolby and Rizvi, 2008; Dillabough and Kennelly, 2009). Such scholarship has generated important insights and contributed to an expansion of conceptions of citizenship and of the role of education in fostering youth citizenship. Yet, it tends to be predominantly focused on contemporary issues and experiences; exploring, for example, how youth cultures are mediated and performed in the contemporary era and in complex interactions with transnational and global phenomena. While this work has been valuable in enriching the field of youth studies, it is less commonly interested in the historical dimensions to these interactions. Inadvertently perhaps, it thus risks creating a sense that issues arising from processes of globalisation – the flow of ideas, mobility of people and knowledge, and the place of local youth identities and cultures in wider international and internationalising contents – are phenomena principally of the present or at most of the very recent past.

The purpose of making these observations is not to enter into an extended debate about whether we are now witnessing an intensification of these processes of globalisation. Rather, they are an impetus to advance two related arguments: first, that debates about the education of the adolescent
in mid-twentieth century Australia extended beyond the national border and that international exchange and the movement of ideas and expert knowledge across nations and networks was central to how these problems were defined and addressed; second and more specifically, that transnational perspectives offer a valuable lens onto the history of adolescence and education for citizenship. Building on this, we argue broadly for the value of bringing more historically-informed approaches to the field of youth studies research. Of relevance to this task is a relatively small but important and growing body of cultural histories of youth (Lesko, 2001) and historical studies of adolescence and schooling in Australia (Johnson, 1993; Campbell, 1995; Cormack, 2007). For example, Cormack’s (2007) genealogy of adolescence and the English curriculum in early 20th century South Australia; Johnson’s (1993) study of gendered constructions of the adolescent which shows the influence of psychological knowledge in 1950s Australian education; or Proctor’s (2009) study of high school cultures and practices of student classification and identification in early twentieth century Australia. Nevertheless, despite some important historical work, and a robust tradition of contemporary youth studies, the cultural and transnational history of adolescence and Australian education nevertheless remains strikingly under-researched.

**Psy-knowledges and the future citizen**

We have suggested that bringing into view issues of the governance of student mental health and emotional wellbeing adds a vital dimension to the historical study of adolescence and youth citizenship. Student ‘wellbeing’ is itself a relatively recent term, in many ways an invented concept that reflects the changing influence of psychological knowledges and therapeutic approaches to education. This claim is part of a larger argument about therapeutic culture and its multiple effects on education, which, again, warrants elaboration but we can only signal here (Ecclestone and Hayes, 2008). There is much evidence to show that the idea of student wellbeing has become the subject of increasing attention, giving rise in recent years to an expansion of student support and counselling services (Author B). The policy and program focus on wellbeing and attendant discourses represents, we argue, a convergence of social and psychological concerns. In current educational policy discourses, student wellbeing is closely aligned with the language of risk and resilience – promoting programs that assist students to cope with difficulties, to minimise and manage risky situations and risky conduct. Wellbeing also has an affiliation with discourses of personal adjustment and social cohesion and is explicitly linked to the aims of values education (Pring, 2010) and with the many tasks of citizenship formation. These intersecting discourses obviously have complicated and multi-layered histories. An important part of that history, we suggest, lies in the development of school-based strategies – especially guidance and counselling services – aimed at managing, preventing, diagnosing and measuring problems of ‘adjustment’ of and mental health and emotional wellbeing.

Tracing educational concerns with managing the mental health and wellbeing of young reveals the important role that psychology has played in educational developments since the early decades of the twentieth century. The proliferation of psychological knowledge during the twentieth century
(Rose, 1999; Damousi, 2005) profoundly shaped ideas and practices in education (Author B). Psychology provided the means for identifying and managing students who were judged as outside developmental norms, or who appeared to have ‘problems’ or otherwise did not conform to prevailing ideals of the ‘good student’, which in turn placed them at risk of not becoming good citizens (McCallum, 1990). Theories of cognitive and personality development infused curriculum programs, notions of individual difference underwrote mental testing, and concerns about adjustment and maladjustment gave impetus to the establishment of various forms of guidance and counselling. The appointment of psychologists in state education departments in the 1920s (Turtle, 1990), the founding of child guidance clinics (Cook, 1944) and the introduction of comprehensive schemes of vocational guidance during the 1930s (Giles, 1937) were significant developments in the spread of psychological strategies and the governing of student identities.

During the formative years of the 1930s, student guidance services across the Australian states were limited both in scope and focus, but were well-established in some states by the 1950s. As a senior official in the NSW education department noted, the school counselling service, ‘instituted originally as a means of giving guidance at the transitional stage, and of preparing for vocational guidance, has become a service of general practitioners in educational, vocational and all kinds of psychological guidance’ (Verco, 1958, p.26). During this period, social psychology was an influential framework for interpreting the dramas and characteristics of adolescence (Erikson, 1950; Connell et al., 1957; Johnson, 1993). It shaped the direction and concerns of the guidance movement and had a powerful impact upon educational ideas and curriculum practices more generally, evident in educational reforms underpinned by notions of, for example, the peer group, adolescent adjustment and the sex-role (Author A). By the 1970s, however, a stronger interest in counselling emerged and school guidance services adopted a more therapeutic approach in dealing with educational problems (Author B). This shift to managing the emotional health and wellbeing of all individuals – not only the troubled adolescents – paralleled broader socio-cultural change, manifested in, for example, a heightened interest in self-reflexivity and the project of the self (Giddens, 1991; Elliott, 2007), and also found expression in pedagogical strategies such as values clarification (Author A).

These changing emphases in student guidance and counselling have significant consequences for understandings of the adolescent. The expansion of these services pointed to changing roles for schools as they took on ever more responsibility for diagnosing and managing the emotional and psychological needs of students. How these responsibilities were understood and put into practice has affected school and student cultures more generally, not only those students who were the focus of interventions. The history of these services is therefore important in understanding the history of adolescence. Further, changing emphases shed light on the shifting norms of the ‘good student’ by elaborating the characteristics of such a student and by delineating and serving the needs of those who deviated from these norms. Yet, surprisingly, although there are extensive histories of the various forms of guidance and counselling in the US (Horn, 1989) and the UK (Sampson, 1980),
comparable Australian accounts remain limited. Some important Australian historical studies do exist, notably in the area of vocational guidance (Holbrook, 1989; Dixon, 2002), but a history is yet to written on the diverse forms of student management and support that developed from the international child guidance and vocational guidance movements during the interwar years, evolving into an extensive system of student guidance and counselling during the second half of the twentieth century.

As with the history of curriculum, the development of guidance and counselling services in Australian schools was caught up in wider, transnational intellectual and political currents, particularly the traffic in ideas and personnel between the US, the UK and other Commonwealth countries (Cunningham, 1938; White, 1997). Campbell and Sherington (2006, p.49), for example, note the influence upon the development of Australian comprehensive schools of British and North American discussions about ‘the future of the education of the “adolescent”’. Yet, as Holbrook (1989) observes, while the influence of the UK and Europe on Australian education is relatively well-established, accounts of the influence of the US have been considerably less common – although there is evidence of this situation changing, in part arising from the turn to transnational enquiry in educational and historical studies.

A transnational view

Transnational histories, Curthoys and Lake (2005, pp.6-7) suggest, can take many forms but overall this approach suggests that ‘historical understanding often requires us to move beyond a national framework of analysis, to explore connections between people, societies and events usually thought of as distinct and separate’. Transnational perspectives rest on a critique of histories that privilege the nation state as the primary unit analysis or comparison and share a focus on relations and connections. More than two decades ago, the historian Ian Tyrrell (1991, p.1033) argued that ‘there had been a failure of comparative history to transcend the boundaries of nationalist historiography’. Moreover, there was a tendency, he claimed, for local or regional histories to become replicas of ‘national histories writ small’ (Tyrell, 1991, p.1036). To correct this, Tyrrell (1991, p.1042) proposed that historians needed to develop new approaches of a ‘global kind, especially those that give proper place to local and regional peculiarities’. The way forward, as he saw it, is to revive regional approaches within a global focus, and to be attentive to historical specificity and variety. Transnational histories, Tyrrell suggests, would look across the levels of nation, region, and locality, without seeing the local as an inevitable miniature of the national; and we would add, not construct the national as a miniature of the global.

Ballantyne (2005, p. 32) has similarly called for a form of transnational history that ‘pays close attention to “bundles of relationships”…and is sensitive to the complex interplays between different layers of the analysis: the local, the regional, the inter-regional, the national, the continental and the global’. These are most ambitious aims and it is arguable that any one study could not take proper and equal account of all these multiple dimensions. The point, however, seems to be to adopt and
mark out an intellectual orientation and mode of enquiry that looks beyond static boundaries and towards the instability and flows of multiple, multilayered and dynamic connections. Within historical studies of education a number of complementary directions in transnational history are apparent, including the study of transnational or collaborating national organisations (e.g. Fitzgerald, 2010), the reception and impact of transnational educational ideas and practices in particular state, regional or local or national settings (e.g. Whitehead and Peppard, 2006), and historiographical and theoretical discussions on interpretive approaches and concepts (Novoa and Yariv-Mashal, 2003; Hultqvist, 2004). Catherine Burke (2010) has argued that attending to the movement and exchange of educational ideas and practices presents rich opportunities for historians of education to develop what she calls ‘located hermeneutics’ that are imbued with an understanding of the translation and transformation of knowledge flows beyond national or local borders. We now turn to consider examples of transnational exchange during the 1930s that were significant in linking Australian educators to international networks of expertise, looking particularly at the relevance of this for citizenship education and youth identities.

**Travelling experts – Home and away**

The 1930s saw a steady flow of educational experts in and out of Australia. The Carnegie Corporation of New York [CCNY] was one of the most prominent sources of external and philanthropic funding for Australian educators during the 1930s and 40s, and the Corporation was crucial to fostering international exchange and promoting an internationalist outlook among Australian educators. The reach of the Carnegie Corporation extended across the former British colonies and dominions and beyond (Glotzer, 2009): its influence advanced through various funding schemes and support for national educational agencies and research, conferences and expert visits was extensive (Lagemann, 1989). In Australia, the work of the CCNY is probably most well known for providing funds for the establishment in 1930s of the Australian Council for Educational Research [ACER] (Connell, 1980; Macintyre, 2010); it similarly supported the establishment of other national educational research organizations (on the Scottish Council for Research in Education see Lawn, 2004; for others, see Glotzer, 2000). The impact of Carnegie funding and associated interventions are the subject of a number of recent re-assessments of its philanthropic activity (Lagemann, 1989) – including its role in extending forms of US cultural and political imperialism (Parmar, 2012). In the case of education in the interwar years, however, there can be little doubt that the CCNY was extremely influential, especially in the spread of educational testing and psychological measurement (Macintyre, 2010) and also – and importantly – in the movement and translation of child-centred and progressive education ideas (Glotzer, 2009).

Discussing the establishment of the Scottish Council for Research in Education, Lawn (2004, p.727) observes that the Council 'appeared to be created and internationalized at the same time'. He emphasises the influential role of CCNY in shaping the SCRE research focus on intelligence testing, which he identifies, following the work of Ellen Lagemann (1989), as arising from the Corporation’s interest in ““race” and advancing the interests of the “Anglo-Saxon” lineage and the
approach of eugenicists’ (Lawn, 2004, p.730). Accordingly, Lawn suggests, Carnegie funding supported projects that advanced mental and intelligence testing and forms of assessment for differentiating and classifying students: he concludes that the SCRE became a ‘a major source of expertise on systems of education, distribution of intelligence and technologies of assessment, which were simultaneously modern and imperial. It became part of a wider network of Empire institutes of educational research, funded by Carnegie, in South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, and part of a wider association of expertise on testing and selection (Lawn, 2004, p.730).

Similar assessments can be made in relation to the establishment of ACER (cf Connell, 1980) and the role of Carnegie funding in linking this Council into wider networks of expertise (Macintyre, 2010) and in shaping its research programs and focus on testing and measurement (Connell, 1980). It is not possible here to consider properly Lawn’s claims concerning Carnegie’s interest in ‘race’ or the influence of eugenics in relation to educational research in Australia or in the development of ACER’s research agenda. Certainly, the influence of eugenics on the field of education in Australia has been well documented (Rodwell, 2003; Macintyre, 2010). Without wanting to downplay the importance of Carnegie funding and its impact in this area, however the key issue here is that Carnegie funding was not comprehensively or unilaterally directed to a single type of research agenda; it most certainly funded and encouraged research programs on intelligence testing and measurement. Yet it also supported substantial initiatives in progressive and child-centred education.

In his valuable assessment of Carnegie philanthropy in Australia in the 1930s, Michael White (1997, p.21) observed that: ‘The Carnegie Corporation activities, whatever else they might represent, stand out as perhaps the most remarkable phenomenon in Australian education between the two world wars. Along with home-grown educational ferment in the depression years, the Carnegie influences are crucial to understanding the sea-change that occurred in Australian education during the nineteen thirties’. Of interest here are two types of activities that were supported by CCNY to promote international exchange – Australians travelling abroad; and international experts to Australia. This covered experts travelling to Australia to deliver their views, observe, advise and comment on the systems and provision of education available in Australia (e.g Professors from Teachers College, Columbia, Isaac Kandel in the 1930s, and Butts in the 1950s); and study tours for Australian educators to seek out foreign expertise in places and people, notably in the US and the UK, and bring it back home (Stackpole, 1963). A range of prominent educationalists participated in the study tours, including teacher educators, administrators, educators associated with the newly-established ACER, practitioners from early childhood and kindergartens, and child psychologists (Stackpole, 1963; White, 1997).

The breadth of focus of the study tours is impressive: educational methods and administration (J.G. Cannon; E.A. Coleman; L.D. Edwards), research in education (F. Tate, K.S. Cunningham, G.E. Gilbert), secondary education (J. Rowell), special education for gifted children (H.S. Wyndham),
education and training of ‘mentally retarded and emotionally maladjusted children’ (P.H. Cook), modern educational methods (W.J. Adey), curriculum revision (G.S. Browne), school libraries and curricula (A.M. Buntine), psychology and educational testing (R.G. Cameron; H.L. Fowler; T.H. Lovell), educational administration (J.G. Cannon), child delinquency (R.J. Coombe), technical education (E.P. Eltham), transitions from school to work (C. Fenner), social work and child guidance (A. Fitzpatrick), girls’ education, education by radio and problems of secondary school students, especially girls (J.T. Flynn), teacher training (H. Lushey), child welfare (H.T. Parker), kindergarten methods (G. Pendred) and more.[ii] Financial support and enthusiasm for such exchanges not only indicates the scope and type of CCNY influence on Australian education – and on Australian cultural life more broadly (Darian-Smith et al., 2010). It also underlines why a transnational perspective of Australian education during this period is essential for fully understanding the circulation and construction of Australian educational discourses and problems, and especially those in relation to the education of adolescents. To further illustrate the importance of such a viewpoint, we turn now to another prominent example of the way in which transnational exchanges were instrumental in Australian education during the 1930s. As with the establishment of ACER and the provision of travel grants to Australian educators, this involved a series of events made possible by Carnegie funding.

Education for Complete Living

The 1937 New Education Fellowship conference ‘Education for Complete Living’ was one of the most striking events of international exchange on education in Australia during the inter-war period (Godfrey, 2004). This conference was part of a series of conferences convened by the UK-based New Education Fellowship. The NEF was founded in 1915 under the indefatigable leadership of Mrs. Beatrice Ensor, a former inspector of secondary schools in Britain, and had extensive international networks through its publications, including its magazine New Horizon, national and local branches, and the organisation of educational conferences, first held in 1921, initially in Europe and then further afield to the former colonies. The NEF declared itself to be a ‘rallying point for people of all countries who felt that a radical reform of education, based on a proper understanding of childhood and of the unity in diversity of mankind, was essential if ever world peace was to be assured’.[iii] In advancing this it established ‘a long tradition of service in the cause of international friendship and co-operation’.[iv] Its philosophy and approach were motivated by egalitarian and democratic principles and an optimistic view of the potential of education to achieve tremendous social changes, especially in the struggle for peace and international understanding (Abbiss, 1998; Godfrey, 2004).

In keeping with the tenor and structure of its preceding conferences, the 1937 conference brought together a mix of international experts to debate the state and future of schooling and progressive educational reform. The conference was organized in Australia through ACER, supported by a grant of US $12,000 from CCNY – which largely covered the travel costs of international speakers – as well as by grants from the Commonwealth and state governments.[v] Kenneth Cunningham,
Director of ACER and on good personal terms with the President of CCNY, Fredric Keppel (a former Dean at Columbia University), had been impressed by the 1934 NEF conference that he had attended in South Africa and proposed that a similar event be held in Australia; he was instrumental in obtaining funds from the Carnegie Corporation and state departments of Education. The 1937 conference was a travelling talkfest, starting in Brisbane on 4th August 1937, moving through the capital cities of Sydney, Canberra, Melbourne, Hobart, Adelaide, and after seven sessions, and seven weeks, the tour ended in Perth on 18th September 1937 (Connell, 1980, p.107). Guest speakers for ‘Education for Complete Living’ included US experts (notably those described by Glotzer (2000) as ‘Carnegie men’, a coterie of elites well-supported by CCNY, and many affiliated with Teachers College Columbia), with New Education advocates from Switzerland, Austria, South Africa, Japan, New Zealand, Scotland, England, Canada, Denmark, and Finland US.[vi]

According to reports at the time, it was a very successful event; with high rates of attendance, attracting a total of 8718 participants across the seven sessions, with many more attending single lectures.[vii] It received extensive press coverage (Godfrey, 2004); and warm and positive reports from the international participants, who praised the hospitality of Australia and conviviality of the conference, commending the achievements of such a young country (Connell, 1980, pp.103-116). In his foreword to the published conference proceedings, Frank Tate, former Director of the Education Department of Victoria, and President of the Australian Council for Educational Research, declared that ‘During the seven weeks in which the sessions of the conference were held, Education held a foremost place in the thoughts of the Australian people’ (Tate, 1938, p.xiii). In reflecting on the achievements of the event, Cunningham in his November 1937 report to ACER, considered the conference to have been of ‘the greatest interest and importance to a country like Australia which is handicapped by its isolation’.viii

The value of a comparative view, of seeing Australian education through other eyes was also noted, and was an observation repeated by many of the conference delegates, and in particular by the influential Isaac Kandel (1938), a strong advocate of comparative education and the benefits for nations in seeing themselves in wider view. In his February 1938 report, Cunningham reflected that ‘During the five months that have elapsed since the termination of the conference there has been a steady accumulation of evidence that it is likely to have a definite effect on the course of Australian education’. In support of this optimism, he gave as examples reports from school speech nights, affirmations from state Ministers of Education, a review of the examination system in Tasmania, groups of teachers meeting in study circles in South Australia to discuss the ideas presented at the conference. Further indication of the flow-on effects of the strong NEF presence at the conference is found in the establishment of local branches of the NEF each of the states [ix] and the Australian organization began to publish its own magazine New Horizons in Education. The excitement continued in the post war period, and a second, equally popular NEF travelling conference was held in July 1946, with the title of ‘Education for International Understanding’, reflecting an urgent appeal to foster education for world peace and harmony.[x]
The 1937 conference covered a great many topics, and resulted in a substantial volume of proceedings, some 682 pages. Many of the papers are relevant to questions about youth values and citizenship are, including: ‘Education and world affairs’; ‘Adapting education to modern needs’; ‘Education and social problems’; ‘Special aspects of education [art, physical education]; Adolescent and adult education’; ‘The psychological and mental life of the school child’ and ‘The school curriculum, with special attention to the subjects of social studies, history, mathematics, geography and the curriculum in the child-centred classroom’ (Cunningham, 1938). Other issues brought to the fore were rural education, the organization and administration of educational provision, teacher inspection – which again endorsing the value of comparative perspectives, were seen in a new light through learning about the experiences of other countries. The promotion of school libraries was seen as equally important. Discussions on art, religious education, and physical education, Cunningham observed, ‘gave a much needed direction of thought to education as the development of the whole personality’. [\textsuperscript{xii}]

The conference combined expression of the lofty progressive ideals and internationalist principle of the NEF alongside impressions of challenges and sober assessments of perceived problems with education in Australia, particularly in relation to its centralised system. In this respect the proceedings reflected contrasting strands of thinking about the education of children and adolescents, specifically in relation to equality of opportunity for all and processes of differentiation and classification. A focus on specifying individual and group differences, and the special learning and educational needs of different groups of pupils, reflected the growth in influence of mental testing and psychologically-based categorisation. However, alongside this there are many arguments in favour of child-centred learning, egalitarian principles and democratic and the citizenship building aims of education. Capturing the concern with education for citizenship and for the development of the ‘whole self’, one of the presenters, William Boyd (1938), Head of the Department of Education, Glasgow University, reflected:

\[\text{[w]e must think of citizenship comprehensively. Citizenship is not merely or mainly a matter of voting or holding political office. The good citizen is the good member of society in all its aspects: good neighbour, good family man, good politician … [w]e must clear our minds of the idea that we can make good citizens by imparting information about social duties or by moral injunctions. Good citizenship is a right way of life, which can be bettered by an intelligent understanding of the facts of civic behaviour, but depends on participation in community experience. … as to the part played by education in the moral and social spheres. The answer is that education is a conscious and deliberate attempt to do better what is already done without conscious deliberation.}\]

In a review of the conference proceedings to see what progressive educational thinking at that time had to say about comprehensive schooling, Craig Campbell and Geoff Sherington (2006b, p.193)
found advocacy of ‘forms of schooling that might lead to community building, common citizenship, childcentred forms of education and the strengthening of nation and economy’. The conference, they noted, promoted ideas which challenged ‘some of the old rigidities in the selecting and differentiating of students. The great thrust of the conference was toward communal, holistic, child-oriented and citizen-forming education’ (Campbell and Sherington, 2006b, p.193). Despite such a focus there was surprising little direct comment on comprehensive schooling; nevertheless Campbell and Sherington (2006, p.207) suggest that the conference provided a ‘a useable set of ideas that would be turned to justifying comprehensive secondary schooling in Australia at a later date’. We can similarly see the conference as providing a ‘useable set of ideas’ about education for citizenship, about attending to the whole person, and about the importance of the emotional life and psychological wellbeing of young people.

The ‘travelling ideas’ of progressive education, in its child-centred variants as exemplified by the NEF and given diverse expression in the Fellowship of Education conference, sought to bring to fruition the child’s potential alongside an overtly politically engaged commitment to democratic principles and the immersion and formation of the child and adolescent in that knowledge and sensibility. The focus on how best to educate the child and adolescent, debated through a mix of developmental and psychological explanations with child-centred and holistic approaches, generated a dual focus on the stages and differences of cognitive development and the imperative for how best civics and democratic orientations could be most effectively cultivated for all students. It is the combination and arguably the juxtaposition and tension between these ‘use-able’ ideas that have had a longer imprint on Australian education.

We have discussed this conference in order to illustrate of the types of international and debates about education and citizenship, and about egalitarianism and social differentiation that Australian educators were participating in during the 1930s. There is a strong resonance too, with the issues and subjects addressed at the conference and those which formed the basis of the study tours undertaken by Australian educators in America and Europe in the 1930s. The movement of people, ideas and philanthropic capital points to the different dimensions of transnational mobility during the interwar period, and the importance of looking beyond Australia’s national borders to understand the ambitions of educational reform projects, in this case particularly those concerning the education of adolescent. We have also tried to show some of the ways in which understandings about adolescent identity were influenced by emerging psychological discourses, and in turn the how such ideas were shaping developments in Australian education at this time.

**Concluding comments**

Much discussion about citizen education and the crises in student values has focused on national stories and local developments. The purpose in discussing the rationale and background to our
genealogical study of adolescence, citizenship and schooling is to argue for the importance of looking beyond these borders to the ways in which events and debates were also connected to wider international developments and currents in thinking about schooling and its purposes. In other words, our hope is that in bringing together what at first may appear to be disparate dimensions of Australian educational history, in effect piecing together different pieces of the puzzle, allows for a different history of Australian education, one that reveals the embeddedness of Australian educators in international discussions, in spite of their geographical isolation. In this article we have tried to illustrate this through various examples of international exchange and the varying dimensions that came to bear on Australian educational developments. As way of ‘managing’ the breadth of such an examination we focus, in the larger study, on these influences in the areas of curriculum reform and the development of student guidance and counselling.

As noted above, our interest is prompted in part by wanting to ‘problematis’ present-day constructions of the crisis of youth citizenship and young people’s values in relation to schooling, along with the apparent crisis facing young people today in relation to their psychological wellbeing. To do so, we are attempting to understand both how the past infuses the present in relation to educational discourses and interventions addressing young people’s identity and wellbeing; and we are attempting to understand the break or discontinuity between the past and the present. According to O’Farrell (2005, p.72), Foucault’s aim is ‘to write in order to make the past no longer present. He wishes to relegate the past to the past, to show how strange it is – to force his readers to live in the present to discover the connections there, not with the past…In order to be free, one needs to continually expose what remains alive of the past in the present and relegate it to the past’. Our initial investigations suggest that it is not so straightforward (nor perhaps so desirable) to disentangle the past from contemporary constructions of youth. Indeed it is the overlay and hauntings of the past in the present (Harootunian, 2007) that are perhaps most immediately apparent; nevertheless the value of these Foucauldian debates lies precisely in troubling and making problematic how we both think about and investigate past-present relations, specifically in reference to contemporary youth citizenship and education.

---

3 Brochure for conference: ‘Education for International Understanding’ 1946, held in Australia, Archives of the World Education Fellowship, Institute of Education Library, University of London, WEF/A/111/201
4 Ibid
Prior to the Australian tour, many of the conference speakers had presented at a similar event in New Zealand, funded under similar arrangements, with support from CCNY and active support from K.S Cunningham. See Abbiss, 1998.


Attendance numbers were: Brisbane 1343, Sydney 1847, Melbourne 2302, Hobart 677, Adelaide 1175, Perth 1374.

Cunningham (1937), op cit.
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