# IN  THE  SPIRIT

# OF  THE  FAMILY

WILLIAM N. OATS

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR:**

William N. Oats is the Headmaster of The Friends' School, Hobart. He has held this position since May, 1945. Previously he had been Headmaster of King's College Adelaide. From August, 1949, to December, 1951, he was on loan to the International School of Geneva as Director of the English-speaking section of this School. He had already taught at the International School from 1938 to 1940. He is a graduate of two Universities, gaining his B.A. Honours Degree (First Class) at the University of Adelaide in 1934 and his Bachelor of Education at the University of Melbourne in 1952. He was a Foundation Member of the Australian College of Education, and in 1964 he was invited to be a Fellow of this College. At present he is Vice-President of the Australian College of Education. He is also Deputy-Chairman of the Schools' Board of Tasmania.

William Oats has twice been overseas as an officer of Rotary International-in 1959 as District Governor of District 282 and in 1960 as an R.I. Counsellor for five Australian Rotary districts.

In 1965, while on long-service leave, he and his wife Marjorie spent three months at Woodbrooke College, Selly Oak, and in October both were members of the Quaker United Nations Programme Team at the U.N. Assembly.

William Oats is a member of Hobart Regional Meeting of the Society of Friends.

## *The James Backhouse Lecture*

This is the fifth in a series of lectures instituted by Australia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends on the occasion of the establishment of that Yearly Meeting on January 1, 1964. This lecture was delivered in Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, on January 7, 1968, during the sessions of the Yearly Meeting.

James Backhouse was an English Friend who visited Australia from 1832 till 1837. He and his companion, George Washington Walker, travelled widely, but spent most of their time in Tasmania, then known as Van Diemen's Land. It was through this visit that Quaker Meetings were first established in Australia. James Backhouse was a botanist who published full scientific accounts of what he saw, besides encouraging Friends and following up his deep concern for the convicts and for the welfare of the aboriginal inhabitants of the country.

Australian Friends hope that this new series of lectures will bring fresh insights into truth, often with some particular reference to the needs and aspirations of Australian Quakerism.

RICHARD G. MEREDITH,  *Presiding Clerk*

*Australia Yearly Meeting*

### *The nature of the educational process*

Kenneth Barnes points out that "education" is derived not from "educere,"[1] to lead out, as most people seem to be fond of assuming, but from "educare," to nourish. Education is, therefore, to be thought of as the sum of those forces which nourish the growth of the individual self, as it develops increasing awareness and responds to these forces.

If we would seek to know both what this nurturing is and what it is that is nurtured, I can think of no better answer than that which Jesus gave to the earnest enquirer:

What must I do to inherit eternal life?

Jesus in reply described both the way and the life:

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind and soul, and thy neighbour as thyself.

Love is both the way and the life.

It is both the nurturing and that which is nurtured.

It is both the seeking and the response.

It is the knocking on the door and the opening from within.

Faulty etymology has led us off the track and we seem to have been dealing with "eduction" rather than education, or perhaps the cynic would say we have "educed" the young and led them away from real understanding of themselves and of the world in which they live.

If we consider education as nurture, then the order of the three commandments should be revised, not that love of self is the most important, but that it is the starting point, and hence educationally we might rephrase the question that James put so logically:

> If you love not yourself with whom you have to live all the time, how can you love your neighbour whom you have to put up with only part of the time?

The self is the nucleus, the growing-point. Awareness begins here.

The self is not only the object of our first awareness; it is also that which remains the material element of our awareness. Many have attempted to define its nature. I shall quote only two such attempts.

Iqbal, the modern Islamic poet and educator, based his philosophy on the concept of individuality. To him, "self-hood" or "ego-hood" was the centre and basis of the entire organisation of life. He attacked the Hindu and Buddhist philosophy which regarded the self as a mere illusion of the mind and which held that the highest objective of life was the loss of the identity of the self and its absorption into the ocean of the Infinite or the Absolute.

> "Creative experience is not the finite ego, effacing its own identity by some sort of absorption into the Infinite Ego: it is rather the Infinite passing into the loving embrace of the Finite."[2]

I am indebted to Arthur T. Jersild for a most helpful approach to a definition of "self." He opens his book "In Search of Self"[3] with the following words quoted from Soren Kierkegaard's "The Sickness unto Death":

> "As an heir, even though he were heir to the treasure of all the world, nevertheless does not possess his property before he has come of age, so even the richest personality is nothing before he has chosen himself, and on the other hand even what one might call the poorest personality is everything when he has chosen himself: for the great thing is not to be this or that but to be oneself."

A definition of the self involves, according to Jersild, the following concepts:

> The self is a nucleus, a centre, "both constant and changeable."
> It is a centre of awareness.
> It is a growing point which assimilates the authentic, the significant, the essential, "while renouncing what is unessential, strange and harmful."[4]

I used to fall back on dimensional geometry to explain the relationship of self to neighbour and to God, and it seemed convenient to see love of self as one dimensional experience, love of neighbour as two-dimensional and love of God as three-dimensional, each dimension bringing not only an additional but also a comprehending, inclusive function. Thus love of neighbour gave meaning to love of self, but did not displace it, for in turning awareness from the self outwards to the needs of the other the self finds its satisfaction. And further, it is only in the depth of awareness of the third dimension that love of neighbour can be rescued from mere "do-gooding" and love of self from narcissism,

But I see now that this geometry, like the Euclidian of my schooldays, is quite inadequate to describe the nature of the relationship of the self and of the neighbour and of God to each other. What is need is a geometry of forces rather than of dimensions.

In the self, the nucleus, there lie all the possibilities of becoming, both in terms of potential and of uniqueness - that is, the power to become unique.

Initially, the lines of force are directed inwards, the self seeing others as existing only to minister to its own needs; the mother is not as yet loved for her self, but for what she does to meet the physical and emotional needs of the child-self.

The dynamics of growth are aptly described in the phrase - "You must love your neighbour as yourself" - for there can be no true growth of the self if growth remains only within the range of self-awareness. The implications of the injunction are two-fold. First, unless the direction of awareness moves outwards towards the environment of other "selves," unless the unique self not only recognises the existence and the right of existence of other unique selves,

7

but knows also that its own wholeness is determined by its acceptance of relationship with these other selves there can be no real growth of the self-the lines of force must be directed outwards from the centre. The other implication is that love of neighbour cannot develop except on the basis of acceptance of the self.

> A. S. Sullivan says:
>> "As one respects oneself so one can respect others, '.' if there is a valid and real attitude toward the self, that attitude Will manifest as valid and real toward others. It is not that as ye judge, ye shall be judged, but as ye judge yourself so you shall judge others."[5]

In 1951 I made an investigation into the influence of the International School of Geneva on the attitudes of those children who remained long enough at the School to feel something of the impact of living in such an international community. One of the questions put was: Did your experience at the International School change any prejudices held before coming to the School? 23% of those replying said, "Very definitely"; 21% "considerable influence"; 45% "some influence"; 11% "none whatsoever."

In the comments accompanying the answers there was one revealing sentence written by a girl of German nationality.

"Yes, the School did change some of my prejudices for it took from me the feeling of inferiority which I'd had from being regarded by other nationals as a 'sale Boche' at a time when I couldn't have a clear attitude to such things myself."

The girl had taken the judgment "sale Boche" (dirty Hun) as directed against her personally. This sense of inferiority is a dangerous breeding-ground in which prejudices are easily planted. It is only a short step to hating others as a release from the intolerable burden of self-hatred. The history of Germany between the two wars is in itself a sufficient commentary on the way the sense of guilt-generated self-hatred is relieved by projection outwards through mass prejudices against races or national groups. Prejudices do not, however, take root easily in a community whose members have learnt to have mutual respect

8

for each other and for the differences that mark the variety of human personality. Such respect can be based only on acceptance of oneself, and the German student quoted above recognised that respect for others was possible only when she was able to rid herself of the feeling of inferiority and thus to re-establish her self-respect.

From the replies to the questionnaire, it was possible to draw up the components of that active tolerance which so many of the students seemed to feel the school generated in them:

> Acceptance of oneself as the basis for acceptance of others.
> A spirit of frankness towards each other and towards oneself.
> An enlargement of horizons by the experience of living with people and finding them basically alike.
>
> An understanding of why others act differently.
>
> Judgment of others according to their merits and not according to their origins-"When we criticised, it was the poor sports, the bully, etc., and not the French, the Jew, the Protestant. "
>
> Seeing others as human beings and not classifying them according to nation, class, creed and colour.
>
> One British old scholar commented: "The strongest effect of the School on me was that I just couldn't do as all those around me were doing-hate the Germans. Nor could I rejoice when atomic bombs fell on Japan. Japan, for me, was not a far distant country, but the home of the most beautiful girl in my year at the International School-Kasu Sugimuri."

I take "tolerance" to mean this positive attitude of respect for and acceptance of others and not a mere negative putting-up-with-others-because-I-have-to attitude. This is why negroes have reacted against what they have interpreted as the white man's "tolerating" attitude, which leaves the negro still feeling shut out and unaccepted.

Back of the problem of acceptance of black by white and white by black is the same basic question of self-acceptance. We can see clearly enough that the sin of apartheid lies in the white man's acting on the assumption that the black man is inferior, permanently and incontrovertibly so by reason of the pigment of his skin. We can reason logically enough, too, that if white men persist in labelling a people thus as inferior, they are creating the self-hate in the black man which must inevitably one day turn and wreak a terrible vengeance. This is the latent danger of the "Black Power" movement, for already self hate has bred intolerance and all that is lacking is access to power to forge the weapons of hate's vengeance.

What is not so clearly understood is that the white man's seeming compulsion to brand the black man as inferior is itself the projection of the white man's own sense of inferiority, of fear and insecurity.

James Baldwin, with rare insight, brings out this point:

> "White Americans find it as difficult as white people elsewhere do to divest themselves of the notion that they are in possession of some intrinsic value that black people need, or want . . . there is certainly little enough in the white man's public or private life that one should desire to imitate. White men at the bottom of their hearts know this. Therefore a vast amount of the energy that goes into what we call the Negro problem is produced by the white man's profound desire not to be judged by those who are not white, not to be seen as he is, and at the same time a vast amount of the white anguish is rooted in the white man's equally profound need to be seen as he is, to be released from the tyranny of his mirror . . . The white man's unadmitted-and apparently, to him, unspeakable-private fears and longings are projected on to the Negro."[6]

The first commandment is that we should love the Lord our God. Is it not true that it is only when we have experienced the love of neighbour and the love of self and known the tensions that hold these two forces in balance that we can begin to be aware of the totality of our experience which is God, who is the

ground of our being, the element itself within which our own selves have their being, live and move and are related to each other?

P. W. Martin links "the truth about God" to the truth about self and about neighbour in the following summing-up:

> "For a man to "know the truth about God" it is necessary to make the discovery of his own inmost being. To become one with God, a man must become one with himself. Jung's constructive technique, Eliot's 'intolerable wrestle with words and meanings,' Toynbee's search of history for the true return, all arrive at substantially the same conclusion: by facing inward and finding himself, a man may again find and make the creative contact: by turning outward and truly becoming himself, a man grows whole in action and the world grows whole through the creative power thus channelled into being. The truth about God becomes not a matter of belief only, but of direct, practical, concrete experience. When this is the way of life, freedom no longer loses itself in emptiness and futility. .The answer to the question 'Freedom for what' is the coming of the Kingdom: the Kingdom of Heaven within a man, his depth, his integrity, his inmost truth: the Kingdom of Heaven between and among men, where depth answers to depth in fellowship: the kingdom that is the different spiritual dimension, inter-penetrating and renewing the life of the world: the Kingdom beyond the life of the world, transcending death.
>
> And this is not as some far-off ideal; a quixotic Utopia never to be achieved, but a present Kingdom wherever men set themselves to discover it."[7]

But the commandment is descriptive not only of the object of our awareness, but of the intensity of our awareness - we are bidden to love with all our being, with an intensity which fuses self and neighbour and God into a wholeness.

It is the nature of the self not only to be aware but also to respond. Martin Buber said: "Man's uniqueness is unfolded by his way of living with others and the more truly unique he is, the more he can give to others."[8]

Awareness and response are complementary inter-related functions of the growing and developing self. Where there is no awareness there can be no appropriate response, and unless awareness is followed by response, growth will cease. Is this what Jesus .means when he warned that if the light that is in us be darkness, how great would be that darkness?

Iqbal's way of saying this is that "the spirit within him turns to stone." Iqbal was illuminating the following quotation from the Quran -"Verily God will not change the condition of men till they change what is in themselves." Iqbal's rephrasing of this is given by K. G. Saiyidain as "If he does not take the initiative, if he does not evolve the inner richness of his being, if he ceases to feel the inward push of advancing life, then the spirit within him turns to stone and he is reduced to the level of dead matter."[10]

Jesus stressed the importance of response in his parable of the Judgment. Those who were aware of the needs of their neighbours, sick in prison, hungry, naked and who responded were rewarded with deeper insight. Henceforth to them no man would be a stranger for he bore in himself the likeness of the eternal Christ. Those who were aware and who responded were indeed the blessed ones, the happy ones, for they could "walk cheerfully over the world answering that of God in every man."[9]

This is the "beatific vision" that is within the range of any man's experience.

One does not have to be endowed with special mystic powers to see the likeness of Christ in ordinary people - here, perhaps, more vividly than in the overwhelming beauty of a sunset one may feel with Wordsworth that "presence which disturbs. . . with a joy," or what T. S. Eliot calls "the timeless moment," "the point of intersection of the timeless with time."

I have attempted to describe the educational process in terms of the development of awareness and response within the self. I want to examine briefly the aims of education before we consider the means which the institutions of education use to achieve these aims.

Education is concerned with the nurture of the full growth of the person as one in whom there is a uniquely developing self. Friends have philosophy which is closely akin to this view of education.

> "The attitude of the Society of Friends towards education has been determined by their belief in the Inner Light. Holding as they do that there is something of the Divine in every man, they have regarded education as the developing of the Divine seed or as the fanning into flame of this Divine spark. To Friends, therefore, education is an intensely religious thing: it means the training and development of the spiritual life, the liberating of the Divine within us."[11]

Full emphasis needs to be given to the recognition of and concern for uniqueness. "God does not do the same thing twice," says Martin Buber.

> "Every man is unique, and his uniqueness is given to him so that he may unfold it and make it flower. No one ever lived who was the same as he: for had there ever been one who was the same as he, there would have been no reason for him to exist. Each person is a new thing in the world, and he should bring to perfection what makes him unique."[12]

Educators have no right to decide beforehand that they shall train or mould or produce according to the type they think best fitted to survive. In one of his novels H. G. Wells said: "When God made Mr.Trimblerigg, God had no idea how he would turn out." Educators often tend to assume to themselves what God doesn't attempt - the right to determine beforehand what the final product is to be.

Gandhi recorded his reactions to the attempts of well-meaning Christian friends to convert him to Christianity.

> "There was even a time in my life when a very sincere and intimate friend of mine, a great and good Quaker, had designs on me. He thought that I was too good not to become a Christian. I was sorry to have disappointed him."[13]

The motives may be most laudable, but education of the sort that has designs on persons is not nurture at all, it is exploitation-an offence against what Quakers would call "that of God within every man."

But education is also concerned with the community in which the self develops, to which it responds, and through which it realises its essential nature. The self cannot develop in isolation from but only in relationship with the community. At this point educational aims can be startlingly divergent. On the one hand there are those for whom the claims of the community are paramount. For these the individual exists to serve the State, whether it be the classical city State of Sparta or the modern totalitarian State of a Hitler Germany or a Maoist China.

Even though the West bases its democratic theory on the sacred rights of the individual to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," it upholds this theory in practice more in the sphere of economics where it defends the right of the individual to make money with the minimum of interference from the State, than in the area of human rights where it only grudgingly, if at all, acknowledges the individual's conscience when that conscience conflicts with the claims of the State for unquestioning obedience.

The opposite view is taken by those who hold strongly that the institution of the State was made to serve the interests of man, and not man the interests of the State. Those who hold this view look with some alarm on a world which threatens the stronghold of the individual, either with a philosophy which denies him meaning except as a servant of the State, or with a practice in which material values threaten his integrity as a person.

Professor M. V. C. Jeffreys says:

> "The most serious danger to which our civilisation is exposed is the undermining of personal values, for it means that a world in which persons are less valued will become a world in which persons play less part in determining events-a world in fact which is depersonalised in the profoundest sense."[14]

Education is concerned with the passing on to the individual of the. cultural heritage of the community, for the individual cannot develop in isolation from his present environment, nor can he develop without reference to what has gone on before. He is in very truth the heir of all the ages and he has the right to be made aware of that inheritance.

But in carrying out this duty educators are bound to be selective and they will select on the basis of what they believe to be of value for this will determine how the claims of the individual are reconciled with those of the community. Education can be considered neither in terms of the nurture of the individual alone, nor in terms of the demands of the community alone. Professor Jeffreys uses the term "personal": as implying both individuality and community, "because no human being can come to his full personal stature in isolation. The growth of personality is essentially a social experience."[15]

To be selective in terms of personal values is first to assign value to the individual self and to treat each self as a person, as an end in himself and not as a means, even for allegedly "good" ends. It is to see the individual self as growing through and in relationship with others - hence personal values are those concerned with relationship between persons. It is to see fullness of personal life coming from the mutuality of this relationship, of awareness of the other and of response to the other. Love is a relationship between persons, a relationship of mutuality, of awareness and response in which each gives and receives and grows in consequence.

Kenneth Barnes says of the love relationship:

> "We must think of love between two persons if we are to understand its nature. This love contains a very sharpened

awareness of the other person, a deep perceptiveness, a continued interest in him or her-not as one who will gratify our desires, but as interesting in himself and deeply enjoyable in his otherness. The 'otherness' of the beloved person takes away nothing from the unity of those who love each other, indeed it nourishes that unity. Love is destroyed and unity is meaningless when one person is absorbed or possessed by the other. The predominant feeling should be of enjoyment rather than gratification - enjoyment of the other person's reality."[16]

This is what I understand by Christian love, that is, love as revealed in the life of Jesus.

In his relationship with people, Jesus always affirmed the value of persons by accepting them as they were, and by awakening them to an awareness of what they might become. His use of the metaphor of Father to describe the relationship of God to man underlined his faith that persons were of value in the total scheme of things - personal values were absolute and universal. Our spontaneous reactions under unexpected crises provide the crucial test of what it is we value. Jesus reacted unerringly because of his concern with the person involved. Thus, to the righteous who accused him of breaking Mosaic law by healing on the Sabbath, he reacted with: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," and without hesitation, to the man himself he said, "Stretch out thy hand." Similarly, in another incident of confusion between the claims of the individual and the demands of the community as embodied then in Mosaic law, Jesus reacted immediately on the level of the personal. He confronted the would-be upholders of the law with a personal decision - "Let him amongst you who is himself not personally guilty of this same alleged crime cast the first stone," and he met the woman on the personal level of forgiveness that both lifted the intolerable burden of lonely guilt and reassured her by awakening in her a sense of what she herself might become.

When Judas judged an action by calculating what the jar of ointment might have fetched when sold for charity, Jesus reacted by seeing it as the response of an uncalculating love of person for person.

And even when Judas himself came in the role of a betrayer, one of the records at least seems to rise above the portrayal of Judas as the one who "had to betray," and sees him as a person, not as a mere instrument for the fulfilment of prophecy. "Friend, why have you come."[17] At that moment Jesus saw Judas not as a mere automaton but as a friend, and Judas too late saw that Jesus' Kingdom was indeed a kingdom of the spirit. The personal tragedy for Judas lay in the finality of this last meeting, for he himself had guided the soldiers to his master and contrived his own isolation from the one who could have reached through to him even in the betrayal. The arrest ended all further personal contact with his master. The only response left was the bitterness of remorse, for in betraying his master he had also betrayed himself. Those who still see Judas as a mere pawn of prophecy do less than justice to the personal nature of the tragedy.

So when Jesus answered the question:
> What must I do to inherit eternal life?
>> (What must I do to know life that is eternal?)

Jesus replied with an insight born out of his own experience: "You must love the Lord your God and your neighbour as yourself."

Love was the way and it was the life. Love was of God. Love was the very nature of reality.

Kenneth Barnes concludes, as he began, his chapter on "A Philosophy of Education for To-day," with emphasis on nourishing as the aim of education.

> "The recognition of the true needs of human beings growing up in relation with each other and the proper nourishment of them in their need is the true task of education."[18]

### The Agencies of Education - Family, School, Society

There are three agencies whose impact on education can be examined.

These three are the Family, School and Society.

The first two are well defined and their influence can be more easily identified, but the third term is used to cover all those more random and more complex forces which begin to exert an influence even while the child is within the family, and certainly when he begins to move out from the relative shelter of the family into the wider community of the school.

The church represents one of the most powerful of these forces, but its influence is not exercised so directly on education now that the State has asserted secular authority in much of this field. The church still operates as a direct agent of education in its own schools, but in the State system it operates only by invitation of the secular authorities. The church exercises, however, a powerful educative influence through the family, though here again it tends to have a random, and not a consistent impact, for many families retain only a ritual link with the church through a marriage ceremony, a baptism or a burial service, and many no link at all.

For these reasons I have not identified the church as a separate agent of education, along with the family and the school. I have included it in the wider context of society. Among other informal associations of community groups which have direct or indirect educative influence are peer groups, clubs and community societies, but more subtle and possibly more powerful is the influence which the mass media of communication-the newspaper, magazines, television, radio and cinema-exert on the attitudes of children.

I propose to concentrate my comments mainly on the school as an agency of education, for the school is an intermediary between the family and society. From one point of view it is an extension of the family, from another it is a means whereby society most powerfully exerts a socialising influence and moulds the individual according to what society regards as an acceptable pattern. I hold strongly to the view that the school should be conducted in the spirit of the family rather than that the school should be an instrument of the State.

The family is the primary agency both in point of time and of importance. Dr. Elwyn A. Morey, in a lecture included in the collection "The Family To-day," says:

> "The family is the most important group with which any individual has associations during his lifetime. It is the group whose influence begins earliest and lasts longest: the only group into which he is received without any choice on his part: the group which has the widest expression of age differences and the group in which the emotional ties are most intimate and most lasting."[19]

In moments of disillusion or frustration the cynic may say of his family - "Well, I didn't ask to be born into it." True, but if the individual is born into the family without choice on his part, he is also accepted without question and lodged without payment.

The family is the main educative agency in the life of the child. Before the child goes to school he will have already acquired an amazing assortment of skills, including considerable physical coordination, a language, the elements of how to win friends and influence people, including parents, and a fair sprinkling of information, particularly if he is already addicted to TV. Sometimes in fact the school may even appear to be interrupting the education which has begun in the family and been supplemented already by society.

There is a story told by John H. Fisher, Dean of Teachers' College, Columbia, to his graduating students. It is a story of two boys of kindergarten age who interrupted their game in the playground to watch a jet plane pass overhead. They at once began to talk about it, the name of the model, the number of the engines, the cause of vapour trails, probable speed and so on. "I wonder," says the first, "whether its speed is up to Mach I?" "Couldn't be," says the other, "or it'd be making a shock wave and we'd hear a sonic boom."

At that point the bell rang and the Kindergarteners were summoned indoors. "Come on," says the first to the second, "we've got to finish stringing those blessed beads."

Clearly these two would have agreed with Bernard Shaw's comment, "My education was interrupted by my schooling." Clearly, also, this kindergarten didn't use the Cuisenaire method of teaching mathematics!

But what is important about the family as an agency of education is not so much **what** is learnt but **how**. The family is the child's first experience of the group. Within this group he needs to feel himself accepted, so that he can accept himself, with all the obvious limitations of childhood. This is where the truth is first seen of the affirmation: "We love because he first loved us." The child learns to love because he feels assured he is loved and he recognises the mother as the central giver of love.

Recent investigations into the effect on the child of early deprivation of this mother-love are reported by John Bowlby. There are two points of particular interest. The first indicates the extent of the effects of early deprivation of mother-love on the mental as well as emotional health of the child. Observations of war orphans and refugees indicated that "a long period without individual attention and personal relationships leads to mental atrophy."[20]

Comparisons of the subsequent emotional development of children from institutions with children from what might be called "bad" homes (that is, where parental care was lacking and where children were even ill-treated) indicated that a "bad" home appears to be better than no home at all.

> "In another follow-up study, comparing the social adjustment in adult life of children who spent five years or more of their childhood in institutions with others who had spent the same years at home (in 80 per cent of cases, in bad homes) the results were clearly in favour of bad homes, those growing up to be socially incapable being only about half (18 per cent) of those from institutions (34.5 per cent)."[21]

These investigations underline, therefore, the basic need of the child for the love and security which the family-and particularly the mother - provides.

The second important point is that the child needs to feel a sense of personal belonging, even if he belongs to what the social worker can identify as a "bad" family.

> "He may be ill-fed and ill-sheltered, he may be very dirty and suffering from disease, he may be ill-treated but unless his parents have wholly rejected him he is secure in the knowledge that there is someone to whom he is of value and who will strive even though inadequately, to provide for him until such time as he can fend for himself.."[22]

Good institutions, unless they are organised to provide a substitute for the continuing personal caring of the mother, are not equipped to answer the deepest need of the child for a sense of belonging to a group where he is of value, and hence where he can begin to affirm the worth of self.

Realising this, a young Austrian medical student named Hermann Gmeiner some 17 years ago became so deeply concerned about the plight of his country's hordes of homeless children that he gave up a medical course to do something about it. He was disturbed at the effect of the orphanages on the children who slept in bunks, were ordered around by attendants, marched everywhere in formation, were dressed alike.

> "No one thought of the simple, natural solution-to give these children a normal life again. Not life in an orphanage or any other kind of institution, no matter how 'advanced,' where the child was only a temporary charge (and knew it) but life in an ordinary house with a hearth, a living-room and a bedroom, where the child could live with a resident 'mother' and with other children, who would become his 'brothers' and 'sisters' . . . a dozen or more such houses would form an S.O.S. Children's Village."[23]

The first of these houses was opened at Imst in 1950 and named "The House of Peace." At the centre of this house was the "mother." To supply the masculine influence, Gmeiner appointed a manager for each "village" to act as adviser to the "mothers" to take a genuine interest in the children and to be "judge, mediator and father confessor."

Gmeiner's experience only underlines the importance of the family as the basic factor determining the mental and emotional health of the growing child, for it is here that the child feels himself of value as a person in his own right, and it is here also that he makes the first step towards acceptance of others and hence of loving his neighbour as himself. A sense of security will reassure him that no matter if he falters, whether in his attempts at walking or at understanding others, he still belongs - he knows that nothing can separate him from the love which he feels surrounds him.

Professor Jeffreys therefore sees the family as the "primary community,"

> "the natural context in which personal values are learnt and the meaning of personal living understood. It is in the family that relations are essentially personal and each person is valued as a person."[24]

Hermann Gmeiner's views on the effect of institutional life on the nurture of children have relevance also to the institution of boarding schools. This seems, therefore, to be the appropriate place to consider briefly the value of the boarding school as an agency of education, because many people hold to the view that the boarding school when children reach a certain age is to be preferred to the family. I want to examine it as a family substitute.

I was particularly conscious of this problem in 1965 when I was listening to discussions in London Yearly Meeting about the future of Friends' Schools in relation to the national system of English education. English Friends' Schools are mainly boarding schools with only a few day students, who tend, therefore, to be regarded as semi-boarders. Something of the English Public School tradition still seems to linger in the assumption that boarding schools are a necessary part of educational experience and that parents should

not be trusted with their children during the impressionable and formative years.

Critics of the English Public School tradition attack the assumption that it is essential for a boy (and perhaps less so for a girl) to be taken out of the home environment at an early age and exposed to the formative influence of the boarding community. Thus Robert Graves in "Goodbye To All That" sees the boarding school as threatening the influence of the home and the parents.

" 'Prep. schoolboys live in a world completely dissociated from home life. They have a different vocabulary, a different moral system, even different voices . . . School life becomes the reality, home life the illusion. In England, parents of the governing classes virtually lose all intimate touch with their children from about the age of eight, and any attempts on their parts to insinuate home feeling into school life are resented.' "[25]

A writer in the Manchester "Guardian" of 17/7/65 makes much the same point:

> "As a rule, the child of prosperous British parents is exiled from his home for at least two-thirds of the year throughout the
>
> most sensitive and vulnerable period of his life."

It is difficult to think clearly on this issue. For one thing, we are conditioned by our own experience. If we have been happy as boarders, we shall assert that boarding school experience is indispensable to the right education of our own children. If we have been unhappy as boarders, we may resent the boarding school as Robert Graves did, and refuse to subject our own children to the same misery and sense of rejection by one's parents.

Another difficulty is that in England the subject is bedevilled by "class attitudes" - implied in the above two quotations where the parents of boarding school children are labelled as belonging to the "prosperous governing" classes. As a result, defenders of boarding schools are seen as defending a position of privilege; critics of boarding schools are seen as attacking a parental right in the

name of social equality. In neither case does the issue seem to be debated on educational grounds.

It is generally agreed that community living can provide a very effective educational environment, particularly for children in special categories, for example, those from broken homes, from homes where one or both parents may be abroad, and in Australia particularly from homes that are geographically isolated in areas where educational facilities are limited or non-existent.

It is also commonly accepted that some community experience is good for all children. Hence, though it may be good for all children some of the time and for some children all the time, it is neither possible nor necessarily desirable for all the children all the time.

English Friends may also need to consider the effect on local Meetings of the withdrawal of the greater number of the 12-18 age group from active participation in those Meetings. It is possible, too, that a child could feel consciously or unconsciously that his being sent off to boarding school is a rejection of him by his parents. In this case it is probable that he would harbour resentment not only against his parents for what he takes to be a rejection, but also against the school and the Society of Friends to which his parents have exposed him for his own good. The resentment noted above could, in fact, be making it more difficult for these schools to communicate specifically Quaker ideas and attitudes to such children.

In any case, it is clear that there is no general agreement amongst members of the Society of Friends about the value of boarding schools for their children. For every parent who feels strongly the importance of such experience for his child, there will be one who feels equally strongly that no boarding school can be a substitute for the influence of the home during the years of the child's greatest emotional insecurity.

The differing attitudes of parents and the differing needs of children should be recognised and respected. Those parents who prefer to have their children with them at home during the formative years of adolescence will prefer a day school if such is within reach but, if not, they may prefer the local

secondary school to sending the child away for the greater part of the year from home. Other parents may hold that boarding school experience is what their children need, perhaps as necessary experience for an only child, or because of distance from a suitable school, or domestic tension, or absence of parents occasionally or frequently from home, or an unsatisfactory neighbourhood environment. I can well understand, for example, a parent whose home is in a crowded suburban or urban area in England or America wanting for his child the pure air and peace of the countryside where some of the Friends' boarding schools are located.

In any case, boarding schools may need to take note of Hermann Gmeiner's criticism of orphanages and see to it that where boarding schools are necessary, they approximate more in spirit and organisation to a family than to a barracks.

## *Society*

Before considering the bridge-like role of the school, coming as it does between the family and the society in which the child functions, I want to comment on the impact which society makes upon the child, an impact which commences even before he attends school and increases during the years of attendance at school.

Does society with its government, its laws, its attitudes as expressed openly in mass media of communication and unobtrusively through the unspoken assumptions of what is or is not done, promote the conditions in which the individual self is nourished and in which satisfaction is felt through the development of mutuality in relationship with others? Does society enhance or threaten personal values by which the self is nourished and through which it finds meaning and satisfaction?

It is difficult, I think, for those of us brought up within the more personal and more intimate relationships of a rural society to understand the extent to which those who live in big cities are denied such contacts. The personal face-to-face groups of a country town are unknown to those who live

in the relative anonymity of our sprawling cities, and yet the undoubted trend is away from intimate grouping of small communities to the impersonality and anonymity of the big city and of the "Great Society."

I want to deal with some of the effects of this depersonalising. In the first place, it breaks down the essence of responsible relationships, whereby men really do care what happens to their fellows and their fellows really know that someone cares.

The more impersonal the relationships within society, the less a man wants to love his neighbour and the more ready he is to love himself and stop at that. From faith "that caring matters most," he succumbs to the belief that he "couldn't care less." Society therefore appears to make love of neighbour difficult by making it easy for a man to say, "But who is my neighbour?" "Am I my brother's keeper?" With these questions, man disclaims personal responsibility.

The second comment concerns the effect which certain conditions of society have on the individual person subjected to those conditions.

We are all well enough aware of the social problems of big cities; the soaring crime rates tell their own story. The "Time" Essay of 24th March, 1967, on "Crime and the Great Society," gave an alarming report of the rate of increase of crime, particularly among the young members of society. "One boy in six," says the Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, "will turn up in a juvenile court for a non-traffic offence before he is 18." The Commission concludes: "A community's most enduring protection against crime is to right the wrongs and cure the illnesses that tempt men to harm their neighbours." This is the negative side of love of neighbour. This is what happens when love of neighbour is denied. The "illnesses" of society create conditions which "tempt men to harm their neighbours." They are tempted because love of neighbour has not been nurtured.

For an understanding of what, for example, slum conditions do to persons, one turns to the evidence of those who themselves have suffered. Some years ago, Paul Crump, a murderer, of Illinois, who had lived under a

death sentence for nine years and finally had the death sentence commuted to imprisonment for 199 years, spoke with a reporter and told him of his early life and of the change that had come over him while still under sentence of death. He, a negro, knew what slum conditions had done to him and he also knew that society disclaimed responsibility.

> "We breed our own delinquency, and we do so with the full awareness that we do it. You know and everybody knows that in slums the crime rate is higher among coloured people than it is among whites, and people are puzzled as to why this is so. This puzzlement is really a matter of their throwing sand into their own eyes. The slum spawns the different resentments and rebellions that end in breaking laws. People don't want to live in squalid conditions. People don't want to be second-class citizens. I mean, this is something they can't help . . . I don't know, but I'll say this, that within every man there is goodness . . . and the influence of the society in which he lives brings him to bad."[26]

Paul Crump knew what conditions had done to him as a person - they destroyed his own sense of the goodness that was in him, they made him feel less than a person, and the injustice of it dug deep into him, for he said he was "born into inferiority" and therefore "was not permitted" to show his individual worth.

The analysis of the social malaise at the personal level reveals, then, the following: social conditions (poverty, slums, "second-class" citizenship) breed in the person self-hate, and this in turn breeds hatred of others, and "harm of neighbour."

But Paul Crump's reformation also reveals the way out. "A sympathetic warder," he said, "started showing me things about myself. He helped me to understand what I was trying to say." From this warder's belief in his possibilities came a growing-point and a desire to help others find some belief in themselves, and so he directed his energies in prison to acting as a counsellor to others and to helping them to awareness of themselves.

Paul Crumps are rare, for most succumb to the handicaps that society places on them and don't get beyond the starting-line. The real danger in western society comes from our own unawareness of the threat that this society makes to personal values, for lip service is paid to democratic ideals of truth, justice and freedom, and in the names of these ideals men are urged to join the crusade against an anti-Christ dressed out in communist garb.

Poverty, unemployment, violence, inter-racial or inter-class hatred, all destroy a man's sense of his own worth and so make him an easy prey to those who feed his self-hate by urging him to turn his hate on to a Jew, a negro, a communist.

But society has other more subtle means of destroying a man's worth and so making him exploitable. Instead of promoting and nurturing man's growth to an adult maturity, society (or powerful interests within society) can easily contrive to keep man at the emotional level of a child, with a child's ego-centric desire for attention, for indulgence and for an easy life with no responsibility. This de-personalising influence is most powerfully felt in the use made of mass-media through which today a view, a gimmick, an appeal can reach millions at a sitting. This influence often operates against the interests of personal growth. One of the vital aspects of growth is that the child learns to turn outward towards others and to re-direct his love of self towards love of neighbour. Unless he makes this transition he will remain self-centred, imprisoned within the limits of his own self. An American sociologist, H. A. Overstreet, in "The Mature Mind,"[27] identified six criteria of maturity. The first four of these link maturity with the process of re-direction of the forces that relate the self to others.

A human being is born ignorant: he has to acquire wisdom.

A human being is born inarticulate: he has to master the art of communication.

A human being is born self-centred: he has to develop from ego-centricity to socio-centricity.

A human being is born irresponsible: he has to develop a sense of responsibility.

The task of the family and of the school in nourishing the growth of the person towards maturity is made immeasurably more difficult by the dominant features of mass media which tend to promote immaturity, and indeed which have a vested interest in keeping people immature.

Advertising has a vested interest in self-indulgence, that is, in keeping people permanently ego-centric. The perfect consumer is the individual who is so suggestible that he can be kept continuously engaged in the process of indulging his own "ego." The values that society underwrites are blatantly material. Success is material success. Money, not personal worth, has market value. A man tends to be judged by his bank balance rather than by the service he renders. Is it any wonder, therefore, if the young regard material values as worthy of acceptance and personal values as irrelevant to the main business of life?

Mass media simply reflect the values operating in society at large. They make, however, the task of the educator in nurturing the life of the self and of helping it to grow outward in relationship to others sometimes appear to be an almost impossible one. It may well be, also, that if the educator were more effective in his nurturing, the tender plant would be more resistant to these attractively packaged poisons.

But these media have enormous potential for promoting maturity and it is the responsibility of the educator, instead of bemoaning their misuse, to seize the initiative and use them "to the greater glory of God."

This leads me on to an examination of the positive role of the school, placed as it is between the intimate personal group of the family and the powerful forces of society which so often appear to menace the individual with whose "wholeness" all three agencies are concerned.

The title of my lecture indicates that what I have to say about the task of the school is rather with respect to how the experience is gained than to what is taught. It is method rather than content that concerns me.

Paul's letter to the Corinthians can be used to sum up the role the school should play with respect to the society in which it operates. There was a proverb in Paul's day - "They live as they live at Corinth" - which suggested that Corinth was the city of luxury, of self-indulgence and godlessness, of tensions and arguments, a city where selfishness was the basis of living.

What worried Paul was that the Church was being invaded by this attitude of Corinth, its strength being sapped, its message weakened. In brief, the Church of God was tending to become the Church of Corinth. Corinth was corrupting the Church instead of the Church converting Corinth.

To what extent is society corrupting the school?

How can the school transform society?

My approach to an answer is to say simply what Samuel Clemes, the first Headmaster of The Friends' School, Hobart, said in 1887:

"The school should be conducted in the spirit of the family."

## The School

In considering the role of the school as a bridge between the family and society I have already indicated that I see the school more as an extension of the family than as an instrument of society, as concerned with nurture rather than with training, for nurture implies a fundamental respect for the uniqueness of individual growth, whereas training implies the moulding of the individual in accordance with a predetermined pattern.

True, the school is involved inevitably in the social role of communicating knowledge and techniques to the individual. It is bound to undertake responsibility for promoting the intellectual development of the child, but too many people see the school as concerned only with this and as having little or no concern for the emotional health of the child.

If a school is conducted in "the spirit of the family" it will endeavour to create in the larger framework of the school something of the same emotional security which a child finds within the family. In this sense it will, therefore, be an extension of the family. I said that what is important about the family as an agency of education is not so much **what** is learnt but **how**. Similarly, in dealing with the school I am going to comment for the purpose of this lecture not so much on content, on what subjects should be taught or on the techniques of teaching, but on the quality of the persons who teach and who learn, and on the quality of the relationships that are made within the "family" of the school.

There is much, therefore, that we can say about the school which we have already said about the family. If it is important in the family that a child feels himself accepted by his parents - for this is the basis on which he can build up his own self-acceptance - it is equally true in the school that the child should feel an emotional security. In this sense the teacher's role is an extension of the parental role. If the teacher is to meet the child's need for acceptance, the teacher must first be at peace with himself. This point was well brought out in a UNESCO Seminar at Sevres in July, 1947. Here the theme was "Educating for Peace," but the emphasis was the same-on the vital role of the teacher. If the teacher is to free the child from prejudice, from fears, from feelings of inferiority, he must himself be free from these warlike predispositions. "We must be psychologically equipped to keep the peace," said Goodwin Watson in the key talk of the Seminar. He continues:

> "The sad fact is that ambitious men who have risen to positions of power by taking selfish advantage of opportunities to push others aside, are not psychologically equipped to keep the peace. It is not that they personally want war . . .but some of these psychologically maladjusted individuals have a burning need to assert their own importance. Their impulses of antagonism are more easily aroused than their impulses of benevolence. Each is likely to confuse a bruise on his own sensitive ego with an intolerable insult to his own nation . . . This is a hard doctrine. It teaches that some of the roots of war are in each of us. Teachers who are themselves insecure, cringing before the authorities and tyrannising over pupils,

easily believing the worst about other people, struggling for preference and prestige, belong to the unconscious warmongers."

Such teachers find it hard to "accept" children with their immaturities, insecurities, inferiorities and uncertainties. The child, particularly the young child in his early experience of school, needs to feel himself accepted by his teacher, to know in himself that the teacher will be on his side even when he goes wrong, that the teacher may disapprove of what he does but never of him as a person. Or, to put it positively, the child must feel himself appreciated and accepted as a person if he is to build up his own self-acceptance. A teacher has to play a sensitive and delicate role here, a role very similar to that described by Jung when he was outlining the importance of the doctor's "personal appreciation" of his patient.

"If the doctor wants to offer guidance to another, or even to accompany him a step of the way, he must be in touch with the person's psychic life. He is never in touch when he passes judgment. Whether he puts the judgment into words or keeps them to himself makes not the slightest difference. We can get in touch with another person only by an attitude of unprejudiced objectivity. This may sound like a scientific precept and may be confused with a purely intellectual and detached attitude of mind. But what I mean to say is something quite different. It is a human quality-a kind of deep respect for facts and for events and for the person who suffers from them-a respect for the secret of such a human life."[28]

This is a view which we professional teachers need to appreciate in all humility, for if we have one sin we should readily confess it is that of our proneness to quick and glib judgment of others. We spend so much of our time correcting, marking, examining, assessing, judging, reporting, that we easily confuse the issue and transfer our judgment from facts and events to the person who, as Jung says, "suffers" from these "facts" and "events."

Let us take, for example, one of these "facts," the so-called "aggressiveness" of the young child and its "event" or outcome which so often can take the form of a spate of destructiveness. This aggressiveness is a "fact" of development. It is the drive at the base of the child's desire to acquire mastery and build up confidence. He wants to do things for himself, to find out for himself: he is impatient when others would do things for him, he thirsts for knowledge and is eager for action. This aggressiveness then has a creative aspect, and only when it is frustrated does it turn to wilful destructiveness of person and of property. Experienced parents and teachers are not shocked at the "fact" of aggressiveness - nor at its "event" - they will indeed react not by "judging" but by keeping on hand plenty of ideas and material ready for such emotional crises. They know it's much more satisfactory for the child (and for the parent) to hammer nails into a block of wood than into the piano.

I have been constantly amazed at the swiftness with which a child's behaviour can change its direction of flow from one to the other of the two courses just described. The important thing is that the home and the school should help the child deal **creatively** with this aggressiveness, or it will persist into adulthood in an anti-social form. That is why, I believe, war makes an appeal subconsciously to the masses of people. It represents a return to the emotional level of the nursery and provides an outlet for the destructive impulses which should have been outgrown in childhood, when violence was accepted as the only way to handle a frustrating situation. That is why war has such an incalculable effect on the outlook of the young child. Normally, the child finds that the creative expression of his aggressiveness receives the backing and approval of the adult world and this gives him confidence. But when the whole resources of the community are bent to destruction, the child, as it were, reasons within himself: "Why should I struggle with that part of me which says 'destroy, destroy,' when the world proclaims the supremacy of the powers of darkness!"

The school and home must help the child to find creative outlets for this aggressive tendency. Art provides for the young child such an outlet, particularly painting and modelling (if paper and paints are liberally supplied and clay is in really good supply). At one school during the war years we tried a minor experiment to test the effect of art upon the social behaviour of the 6-7 year olds. One class had two afternoons a week for painting, the other had

none. The boys in the first class covered their papers with all the themes of war: splashes of red to represent bombs falling on ships, planes crashing and destruction let loose. The boys of the other group had no such outlet in art and this, I believe, caused them to seek an outlet in "destructive" play they incessantly "bashed" each other in the playground, whereas the former group were much less anti-social in their play.

If education is conducted "in the spirit of the family," the teacher then has a role akin to that of the parent - that of accepting the child as he is, so that the child can accept himself, believe in himself, and free himself from the fears and anxieties that have their root in self-hatred.

One conclusion needs to be underlined, and that is the importance of the teacher in the community. His role is indeed a decisive one, for he has the power to influence for good or ill the children in his care. This is why teachers must be mature persons.

And yet so often we see people attracted to teaching for trivial reasons. Some drift into it because they can't think of anything else to do, some are attracted by the over-generous enticements of teacher studentships, which promise them a comfortable passage financially through a university first degree course, some assume that anyone can be a teacher if he has a mere smattering of knowledge. And there is also inherent too often in teacher-training, the assumption that teachers are being trained to teach subjects rather than children.

One could well apply to the role of teacher Paul's famous letter on the necessity of love - for a teacher may have acquired all knowledge, he may have won high academic distinction, he may have been well trained in all the techniques of teaching; but if he has not love, if he lacks the charity which means "caring" for children as persons, all his knowledge, all his distinctions, all his brilliant techniques will be of no avail as far as real education is concerned.

I want to comment briefly on two tools which are used in "training" (I deliberately use "training" and not "educating") children - the fear of failure and the lure of competitive success. These two act as poisons that destroy

emotional health. The first corrodes the growing child's confidence in himself (thus contributing to self-hatred) and the second, by representing the neighbour's success as a continual threat makes it more difficult for the child to begin to love his neighbour as himself.

Many children go through school with an unrelieved sense of failure because teachers are constantly making fail-pass judgments that convict the children of the sin of falling short every time there is an examination, an assessment or a report to take home to parents. With little regard for individual needs and abilities we subject them to an educational diet which may be quite unsuited to them or, to change the metaphor, we drive them along at a pace which is quite beyond them and then we brand them as failures when indeed it is we who have failed, by evoking little or no response from them. These children leave school, therefore, conditioned to failure. The emphasis on competitive success also contributes to this sense of failure.

Seventy years ago, Samuel Clemes, Elijah-like, identified competition as a dangerous educational "idol," too often worshipped by teachers (and parents).

> "We have no marks and no prizes for school work. . . What future headmasters may do here I cannot say, but as long as I can have my way, the old idol of marks, prizes and cramming shall be no more set up."

And on another occasion, a speech day, with parents as a captive audience, he affirmed:

> "What I want is not for them to strive to do **the** best but for each to do **his** or **her** best, which is quite possible even for them who are lowest in the class."

Modern educational philosophers, like Jersild, are saying the same thing:

"A person's conviction of his worth is weak if, even to himself, he can find no evidence of worthiness save that which comes from competing with others. He has no inner measuring rod. He has no merit of his own, for his merit rests on a scale of comparison."[29]

Anthony Storr also sees competitiveness as a type of motivation which not only impedes the growth of self-acceptance but also prejudices the development of acceptance of others-competitiveness indeed "does harm to love of neighbour."

"The more a man has succeeded in realising his own personality, the less compulsion will he feel to be competitive and the less hostile will he be to others."[30]

In nothing so much as the school's promotion of competitiveness do we see the incursion into the school of the ways of Corinth. In a poll conducted by the American magazine "Fortune" in 1949, Americans were asked: "Why send your son to College?"

66% replied: "to get a better job and increase earning power."
19 % replied: "to find out how to lead a fuller life."
15 % replied: "to acquire knowledge."

"A chance to get ahead" in terms of a better job comes out a clear winner, and this, I think, is an accurate reflection of Corinth's sense of values, for competitiveness is at present everywhere.

Stuart Chase, the American social psychologist, has some very pertinent comments to make on the competitive element in modern living and its effects on the attitudes of the individual involved. He says that competition makes a man feel he is surrounded by rivals, if not by enemies, rather than by friends, that it puts the emphasis not on quality of endeavour but on the rewards which follow, that by forcing the individual to concentrate on striving to outdo others it leads him to concentrate on a limited and restricted pattern of activities. But ironically it also has the effect not of producing the "robust

individuality" which a competitive society claims is developed by tough competition, but of regimenting the individual.

"The price paid for competitive success," says Chase, "may be the abandonment of individuality and the acceptance of fashion and social norms for living."

John P. Marquand, in "Point of No Return,"[31] also stressed this by showing how the young American, if he wants to get to the top in business, must conform to a rigid unwritten code in dress, in choice of his club, or of a location for his home, even in his wife's appearance.

The net effect of this emphasis on the competitive element is twofold: it tends to keep people ego-centric and it hinders the development of a satisfactory relationship with others. It threatens, therefore, both love of self and love of neighbour.

And yet our schools still back the competitive approach to life by placing emphasis on competition as an educational tool. Class positions and prizes are still used as techniques of motivation, and so a child may leave school with an armful of prizes and distinctions and only a hazy idea of how to live "at peace" with other people. Competitive situations breed tensions, anxieties and aggressiveness.

The school must provide the nurturing experience of "love of neighbour." To deny the child this is like denying the body the vitamins necessary for healthy physical growth. His emotional health depends on his ability to love his neighbour, to co-operate with others and find satisfaction in working with others.

This brings me to a consideration of the positive role of the school in promoting the "love of neighbour." Here again the school is an extension of the family by providing a much larger and much more diverse group of "neighbours" to whom the growing child can be "related."

This concept of the school as an extension of the family has several implications for the community life of the school. Just as in the family, where

the child feels he belongs, and therefore feels he is valued for himself, so in the school, this sense of belonging is an important element. It would indeed be rash to claim that Friends' Schools have always provided the warmth of personal relationships that are typical of the family. In fact, some of the early stories of Ackworth Friends' School would seem to give the lie to this claim.

W.A.C. Stewart, describing the founding of Ackworth in 1779, had no illusions about the comparative starkness of its communal life at a time when Quaker family life itself was not warm by our standards:

> "If adults had to regulate their lives to the Quaker pattern, how much more severe was the control of children who were susceptible, as Friends thought, to all the wayward gusts of evil. They were placed in a "guarded" community presenting the Quaker pattern of life, and taught subjection of own-will. One of the results was a record of punishment during the first half-century which is at times astonishing in a body which was responsible for so many humanitarian reforms."[32]

By 1904, however, a group of independent inspectors labelled the climate of English Friends' Schools as

> "A quiet family life averse from the stimulus of competition and all artificial forms of rivalry . . . of a character which is retiring and peaceable rather than combative and ambitious."[33]

Today Friends' Schools are not exactly quiet places of retirement, sheltered or "guarded" from all worldly pressures, but they do provide a distinctive "family" atmosphere within which their members feel a strong sense of belonging. I base this statement on my own observations made during visits to twenty Friends' Schools in Lebanon, Holland, England, Ireland and the U.S.A. during 1965. This family feeling is derived from a strong sense of continuous family participation; in those schools, sometimes going back over several generations. It comes, also, from the continuity of school staffing, where the school is identified with a core of devoted members of staff who have themselves "belonged" to the School over a long period of time.

At The Friends' School, Hobart, there is also the added strengthening of this sense of belonging from the fact that about a third of its students spend the whole of their school life within the family of the School from 5 years of age up to 17 or 18. One such student (not a member of the Society of Friends), who left the School after 12 years to take up nursing, wrote back to me in the midst of her hospital training to thank the School for "those twelve good years, all of which were years of great plenty," and she added, "even with its increasing size, Friends' has retained its position in society as a school which is more than "just a school." What struck this girl as significant about the School as she looked back from the vantage point of two or three years' distance, was the sense of belonging to a "family," and this, I believe, is the something "more" which she felt.

By comparison with English Friends' Schools, the Hobart School, with 1,000 students, is large in size; but in determining this number as its maximum it has deliberately planned to stress the importance of person-to-person relationships by keeping classes at a size of 25-30 and smaller where possible, and by organising the School into more intimate groupings - Preparatory School, 5-7 years; Junior School, 8-10 years; Middle School, 11-12 years; Intermediate School, 13-14 years, and Senior School, 15-18 years.

The quality of the relationships in a school community is best seen in its reactions to the crises which are an inevitable and necessary part of school as well as of family life. Richard Brayshaw, Headmaster of Sidcot Friends' School, England, said:

> "We know that the group-any group-cannot hope to be happily integrated all the time. The phrase 'all one big, happy family' conjures up a gruesome picture of subterranean tensions and impending eruptions. No community can honestly claim to be at peace with itself all the time. But this is the meaning of Christian love for all men: it is to have a sense of fellowship and understanding of such depth that one can emerge from the differences and conflicts that trouble the surface with one's basic attitude to others unchanged unless it is strengthened and deepened even further."[34]

The school provides less intimate but more varied situations than the family for the development of awareness and response in the individual. To love one's neighbour is not simply a matter of understanding. Awareness is more than this - it is a compound of sensitivity and imagination. Unfortunately the word "sensitive" sometimes has the derogatory meaning of "thin-skinned," as when we say that Mrs. X is very sensitive about her neighbour's opinion of her (or of her new hat!). To be sensitive implies rather a readiness and an alertness to receive impressions as a photographic plate is quick to receive impressions of light. It means being quick (in the original sense of "quick"-"alive") to feel another's pain, as well as to understanding another's point of view. But it also means being responsive to impressions that come from within as well as from without. This is perfectly expressed in the Advice of Friends:

> "Take heed, dear Friends, to the promptings of Love and Truth in your own hearts. . ."

There is deep within each one of us this spiritual sensitivity, this radar of the spirit, which can put us in contact with those who come within the range of our awareness. The daily life of the school is full of opportunities for the practice of this sensitivity of awareness. It is through the imagination that we can escape from being imprisoned within our own self-centredness and reach out towards others. It is imagination also which increases the range of our caring. Modern discoveries have immeasurably improved educational aids for the development of imagination. If we haven't the time or the money to travel around the world ourselves, the radio, the cinema and television can bring the world into our home and help us to see the people of other lands as people like ourselves, with similar hopes and aspirations and with the same fears.

There is, however, a serious imbalance in our school curriculum favouring the purely intellectual subjects to the detriment of those which nurture the imagination. In "The Rainbow Bridge," Sir Richard Livingstone says:

> "Many men meet the gods but few salute them. Hence the importance in education of developing and feeding not only the

intellect but the imagination, by which the vision of greatness is seen."[35]

In the earlier years of Quaker tradition, truth and goodness needed no recommendation as worthy of pursuit, but beauty was not accorded any place in the trinity of virtues. She was, in fact, a muse of doubtful reputation. It is less than a hundred years since art and music were admitted into the curricula of Friends' Schools, but although they have no need now to justify their presence, they are still regarded by some with suspicion as belonging to the fringe and not the core of a school curriculum.

Awareness must be followed by response. Imagination is needed to see the implications of the question: Who is my neighbour? But the school needs to provide constant opportunity for love to issue in action.

Education can claim to be religious only when the values which are upheld in the name of religion are practised in the daily life of the school, in the attitudes of staff to students (and of students to staff), in the rewards and punishments the school employs, in its concern for persons rather than programmes. The quality of the corporate life of the school is by far the most effective witness to the worth of the values which the school upholds before its students. In recent years it has been encouraging to see schools involving their young people in such activities as work-camps, where the stress is on "what service can I give?" and not on "what is in it for me?" From Hobart in two successive years, 1966 and 1967, matriculation students from State and Independent Schools have gone to work-camps in New Guinea and discovered the joy of giving service. If only we could multiply such opportunities, finding them not only in the rather exciting surroundings of a primitive New Guinea highland village, but in the community around us as well. There is so much idealism in young people which is simply this longing to be in use, in strenuous use. Just as a young child's destructiveness is often the result of his frustrated desire to create, so later many delinquent acts of young people are the result of a thwarted idealism.

An important need of the adolescent is to see religion concerned with response, with functioning, with doing and not merely with ideas and intellectual concepts. He will therefore grasp more readily, for example, the

41

meaning of "love of neighbour" by taking part in personal service, such as in a work-camp, than merely by discussing this as an intellectual concept.

The mood of the present-day student is to desire the contemporary experience of brotherhood-hence the emotional appeal to the U.S.A. student of participation in the Freedom Movement by walking with the negro in his fight for civil rights, or by helping him through personal tutoring to reduce the educational gap between negro and white. The hundreds of young people who each year seek opportunities for personal service through overseas service programmes organised in England by the Friends' Service Council and the Government and in the U.S.A. by the American Friends' Service Committee VISA programme and the Peace Corps, provide further evidence of the importance of giving this age-group opportunities for active response and not merely for discussion. The school can be the seed-bed for such ideas.

Professor Jeffreys says that the most important thing the school can do to help young people in this moral development is:

> "to give young people opportunity to experience, in the right kind of social group, the meaning of fellowship. What kind of community the school is matters far more than what kind of instruction is given there."[36]

I have already affirmed that the quality of the corporate life of the school is the most effective expression of religious education. It will, therefore, be realised that in my view religious education is not what the school does at its morning assemblies or in special services or in lessons called Religious Instruction. That education is religious which attempts to communicate the values it believes to be worth holding, not through precept (though there may be occasions when it will be explicit) but through practice in the daily life of the school. Quality of corporate life depends on the quality of the personal life of those who are members of the community.

Professor W. R. Niblett, Dean of the Institute of Education, London, was a visitor to Australia in 1960, and in his Guest of Honour address for the Australian Broadcasting Commission, he said:

"A successful school is the one which manages through a genuine sharing of experience to give its pupils some insight into the deeper values of life. . . into values that go beyond self-interest and beyond the temporary."

Religious education is education of a depth and a quality that gives meaning and value to personal and community life.

Professor Jeffreys, with great insight, underlines this concept of religious truth:

"It is of the greatest importance to understand that religious truth is not a special kind of truth, nor religious experience a queer, unnatural kind of experience belonging to some strange and other world. Religious experience is normal experience, and we have religious experience every day, whether or not we recognise it as such. Religious truth is normal experience understood at full depth. What makes truth religious is not that it relates to some abnormal field of thought and experience but that it goes to the roots of the experience which it interprets."[37]

What makes education religious, therefore, is the depth of our insight into the nature of children as persons and the quality of the life of the community in which we and they are related to and responding to each other.

From 1959 to 1961 religious education was the main theme of a succession of articles in the English educational periodical, Education for Teaching, inspired by an address given by P. W. Martin to a group of teachers in which he stressed that teachers are the main agents in the community through whom can come "a renewal of values." He went on to explain that it is the depth and quality of insight that man has into himself that will bring about a renewal of values through which personal, social and international harmony can be secured. The main points of P. W. Martin's affirmation were as follows:

The one thing that is certain is that there is a creative source which is actively at work in the world.

The "great hypothesis" is that man can make contact with this creative source. P.W. Martin finds evidence for this hypothesis in all the great world religions, in literature and in modern depth psychology (particularly in C.C. Jung).

When man lives from this source, he experiences a new and deeper relationship with the deep centre within himself;

he feels himself at one with all creation;

he is aware of the seed within from which a new being grows,

no longer ego-centred, but a being in which love, truth and wholeness are potentially operative;

he places himself at the service of the creative source, for he realises that this is the motive for existence.

The letters and the articles that followed, the subsequent talks that teachers asked P.W. Martin to give, all indicated both a deep dissatisfaction with what normally passed as religious education and a widespread desire to take a fresh approach to religion and to see it not as abnormal experience but as common experience viewed in depth -"every common bush afire with God."

If children as they grow up are to be aware of "that of God" as the creative centre within them, and if they are to respond, then it is important that their experience within the family and later within the school is such as to establish confidence in this unseen world. The parent and the teacher are first-hand sources of evidence. They are the child's first authority for the values that are held to be important. In family and in school, neither parent nor teacher can abdicate from the responsibility to be bearers of values, but there comes a time when both parent and teacher are no longer necessary as the source of authority. The question then is: Has the individual found that within himself on which he can build his own authority of value?

Some years ago I was in correspondence with an Italian professor on problems of youth and he wrote from his experience of youth in Italy:

"The youth of today appreciates more the authority of value than the value of authority."

I think it is true that our generation has fought a losing rearguard action trying to get our young people to accept what we say as true because we say it. If young people today are in revolt against authority it is because so often they have found those exercising authority insincere and belying in action what they affirmed in word to be the truth.

The most difficult task for a parent or teacher is to relinquish ultimately his role as the authoritative value-giver, and yet it is "in the spirit of the family" for this process to take place. For parent and for teacher this is the sternest test of our faith - to believe that the young person will find for himself values worthy of belief, not because we have given them to him but because he is sure that they work for him. We need to trust the authority of the value itself.

Let me illustrate this from the world of science. No matter how good an authority Einstein is, a scientist does not say: "This law is true because Einstein formulated it." He says rather: "Einstein formulated it because it was true." The authority comes ultimately from the structure of scientific truth itself, not from the one who gives temporary expression to that truth.

Similarly, no matter how excellent an artist may be, even a veritable genius like Michelangelo, his Pieta, for example, that wonderful expression of religious devotion in stone, is not beautiful because Michelangelo created it. Michelangelo created it because this was how beauty broke through under the hands of the master, Michelangelo.

In the realm of goodness, of moral values, we may say of Jesus whose spiritual and moral stature was so far beyond that of anyone before or since, that what he said was not true because he said it. He said it because it was true. "The pronouncements of Jesus himself make their way into our hearts not because he said them but only when they make their terrible anonymous appeal to something within us which says: 'That's true.' "[38]

The contemporaries of Jesus plagued him with demands that he present his credentials of authority, that he produce proofs that he had been sent by God. When they asked,

"Art thou he that should come or look we for another?" "By what authority do you these things? Is it of God or of man?" he countered with, "Was John the Baptist's authority of God or of man?" And when they could not answer, he replied, "Neither shall I tell you by what authority I do these things." He called on men to believe him because of the works that he did.

The authority to which he appealed was that within each individual heart, the "answering" God within each man.

The authority of Jesus lay in the authority of the values which his life so perfectly expressed. This is why his life speaks to the condition of our lives, because these are the values that endure, that last on, that give meaning to our lives.

What are these values?

The Greeks identified them as truth, beauty, goodness. These were the "vitamins" of the spirit.

Paul described them in his letter to the Corinthians:

These three last - faith, hope, love,
and the greatest of these is love.

Jesus showed us what love really means. Love requires a change of direction, a change from looking at people in terms of "what can I get out of them?" to "how can I give myself to them?"

To love is to live at a deeper level, it is "to be born again" with a new awareness and a new response. Education is religious if it awakens this awareness and encourages this response. The family is the primary agent of "religious education" in this sense, and the school if it is to share effectively in this responsibility, must be conducted

"in the spirit of the family."

=======000=======

# REFERENCES

(1)     Kenneth Barnes, *The Involved Man* (National Children's Home, London, 1966), p. 20

(2)     K. G. Saiyidain, *Iqbal's Educational Philosophy* (Ashraf Publication, Lahore, 1938), p.21

(3)     A. T. Jersild, *In search of self*, Teachers' College, Columbia, N.Y., 1952

(4)     A. T. Jersild, ibid., p. 10

(5)     A. S. Sullivan, *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry* (Washington, The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, 1947)

(6)     James Baldwin, *The Fire Next Time* (Penguin Edition No.2237, 1964) pp.81-2

(7)     P. W. Martin, *Experiment in Depth* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London), p. 253

(8)     Quoted from *The New Year of Grace*, an anthology ed. by Victor Gollancz, London, 1961, p. 313

(9)     George Fox, quoted in *Christian Faith and Practice*, London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, London, 1960, Extract 376

(10)    K. G. Saiyidain, op. cit., pp. 28-29

(11)    Christian Faith and Practice, op. cit., Extract 442

(12)    *The New Year of Grace*, op. cit., p. 313

(13)    M. K. Gandhi, *The Message of Jesus Christ* (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1963), pp. 13-14

(14)    M. V. C. Jeffreys, *Glaucon* (Pitman, London, 1961), p. 45

(15)    M. V. C. Jeffreys, ibid., pp. 10-11

(16)    Kenneth Barnes, op. cit., p. 42

(17)    *Gospel according to Matthew*, Chapt. 26, verse 50

(18)    Kenneth Barnes, op. dt., p. 33

(19)    Ed. A. Stoller, *The Family Today* (F. W. Cheshire, Melbourne, 1962), p. 18

(20)    J. Bowlby, *Child Care and the Growth of Love* (Pelican A.271, London, 1965), p. 50

(21)    J. Bowlby, ibid., p. 79

(22)    J. Bowlby, ibid., p. 78

(23)    J. Wechsberg, *Profiles-A House called Peace*-a Profile of Hermann Gmeiner, founder of S.O.S. Children's Villages (The New Yorker, Dec. 22, 1962), pp. 39-40

(24)     M. V. C. Jeffreys, op. cit., pp. 59-60

(25)     R. Graves, *Goodbye to all that* (Penguin Books 1443, London, 1960), p. 24

(26)     F. Hamilton, *A Voice from Death Row*, article in The Progressive, Wisconsin, U.S.A., September 1962, pp. 31-32

(27)     H. A. Overstreet, *The Mature Mind* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1950)

(28)     C. C. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (Kegan Paul, 1941), p. 270

(29)     A. T. Jersild, op. cit., p. 47

(30)     Anthony Storr, *The Integrity of the Personality* (Pelican A.603, Penguin, London, 1966),p.58

(31)     John P. Marquand, *Point of No Return* (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1949)

(32)     W. A. C. Stewart, *Quakers and Education* (Epworth Press, London, 1953), p. 197

(33)     Ibid., p. 213

(34)     Richard Brayshaw, article in *The Friend*, London, July 12, 1963

(35)     R. W. Livingstone, *The Rainbow Bridge* (Pall Mall Press, London, 1959), p. 176

(36)     M. V. C. Jeffreys, *Personal Values in the Modern World* (Pelican A.569, Penguin, London, 1962),p. 139

(37)     M. V. C. Jeffreys, *Glaucon* (Pitman, London, 1961), p. 118

(38)     The Editorial in *The Friend*, April 17, 1964, p. 467