

**THE WORLD
WE MEAN TO MAKE**

*and the part of education
in making it*

by

MAXWELL GARNETT

sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

FABER AND FABER LTD

24 Russell Square

London

THE WORLD WE MEAN TO MAKE

THE WORLD WE MEAN TO MAKE

TO
MY CHILDREN
AND THEIR CHILDREN

**THE WORLD
WE MEAN TO MAKE**

*and the part of education
in making it*

by

MAXWELL GARNETT

sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge

FABER AND FABER LTD

24 Russell Square

London

*First published in Mcmxltiii
by Faber and Faber Limited
24 Russell Square London W.C.1
Second impression May Mcmxliv
Printed in Great Britain by
Latimer Trend & Co Ltd Plymouth
All rights reserved*

*This book is produced in complete conformity
with the authorized economy standards*

PREFACE

This is a book about education. But people's education should depend in part upon the lives they are likely to lead. What sort of a world, then, shall we find, or can we make, during the next two generations?

The first chapter glances at the political, economic and social aspects of the world which the children of to-day must learn to live in. They may learn to alter it into a better world for their children. If so, they will need to share a clear enough vision of the world they mean to make. In fact, their education has a double task. It must fit them for life as it is. And it ought to give them a vision: an outlook on life as it might be. The vision, seen of many, tends to become the real thing as, in the end, men's thoughts and feelings bring forth fruit in deeds. Because it can translate to-day's vision into to-morrow's reality, 'education'—I quote Mr. Butler—'is the main arm with which to win the next peace'.

The topic of the second and third chapters is the right education of people who will be good citizens of their own countries and, at the same time, feel a common loyalty to the family of United Nations or, eventually, to all nations. Without a bold bid for world loyalty and a clear vision of the oneness of mankind, we can never create a common bond of ideals between all civilized peoples; and, without this common bond of ideals to keep the nations united, political and economic measures will never ensure that future generations live out their lives in freedom from fear and freedom from want. 'In dealing with this question of education,' a predecessor of Mr. Butler's (Mr. W. E. Forster) told the Cabinet in 1870, 'boldness is the only safe policy.'

The fourth chapter treats at greater length of education in England. It also plans some changes in the English system of education. They are, however, incidental to the other changes proposed. Otherwise there would be small excuse for adding a private person's plan to the many programmes of public bodies for reconstructing the system. A dozen or more of these schemes were published during the writing of this book. But very few of them—the first interim report of the Conservative Sub-

PREFACE

Committee on *Educational Aims* was a notable exception—had much to say about the aims of education. It was the system they were out to alter.

A fifth chapter sums up the main points made in the earlier paper. It is not a Summary of Recommendations. But perhaps it will serve to recall the argument and even to clarify it by focusing attention on some of the major issues and keeping minor matters out of the light. The gist of the book is not, however, to be got, or even guessed, from this summing up. For instance, of one vital subject it contains no hint: it repeats nothing of what little the book has to say about the education of the teachers whose vision, devotion, wisdom and skill are essential prerequisites for making the world we have in mind.

Many footnotes record my indebtedness to the thought of others. Here I acknowledge my gratitude to them all and to many more from whom I may have borrowed without knowing that I did so.

J. C. M. G.
Oxford,
2 April 1943

Note added in September 1943:

Since the printing of this book began, the White Paper (Cmd. 6458) has outlined the British Government's proposals for Educational Reconstruction in England and Wales, Sir Cyril Norwood's Committee has reported on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools, a majority of Lord Fleming's Committee has recommended the abolition of tuition fees in grant-aided secondary schools, and a series of short reports has come from the British Association's Committee on Post-War University Education. In the light of these documents I have made a few changes in my third and fourth chapters. In particular I have gladly borrowed the White Paper's happy description of 'day continuation schools' or 'part-time secondary schools' as 'young people's colleges'.

J. C. M. G.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

page 5

1. THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

page 9

1. *The Atlantic Charter.* 2. *The Commonwealth of United Nations.* 3. *The Rule of Right.* 4. *Human Welfare.* 5. *The Four Freedoms.* 6. *The Constitution of The Commonwealth.* 7. *The Charter and The Commonwealth.* 8. *The Pope's Five Peace Points.* 9. *President Wilson's Fourteen Points.* 10. *The League of Nations.* 11. *Why the League failed.* 12. *The League and The Commonwealth*

2. THE GOOD CITIZEN

page 38

1. *The Rule of Law.* 2. *Loyalty and Power.* 3. *A Common Purpose.* 4. *Reflexes, Habits, Interests.* 5. *Mind and Spirit.* 6. *Inner and Outer Worlds.* 7. *Oneness of Mind.* 8. *What is Truth?* 9. *The Oneness of the World.* 10. *The Final Link-up.* 11. *World Loyalty.* 12. *Religion and Natural Science.* 13. *Religion and Citizenship*

3. THE TRAINING OF GOOD CITIZENS

page 71

1. *Brains and Backbone.* 2. *Nature and Society.* 3. *Religion and the State.* 4. *A Religious Outlook.* 5. *John or Latin?* 6. *Equality of Opportunity.* 7. *Young Peoples Colleges.* 8. *Universities.* 9. *Adult Education*

4. A PLAN FOR ENGLAND

page 122

1. *The Aim.* 2. *The Christian Tradition.* 3. *The Teaching Profession.* 4. *The Board of Education.* 5. *The Consultative Committee.* 6. *The Churches and the State.* 7. *England and the World.* 8. *Reading the Map.* 9. *Primary Schools and Private Schools.* 10. *Christian Education in Primary Schools.* 11. *The Dual System.* 12. *Secondary Schools.* 13. *Selection at Eleven.* 14. *Eleven to Thirteen.* 15. *Re-selection at Thirteen.* 16. *Higher Secondary Schools.* 17. *Fourteen to Eighteen.* 18. *Young People's Colleges.* 19. *The Service Year.* 20. *Residential Universities.* 21. *Adult Education.* 22. *Administration*

CONTENTS

5. TO SUM UP	page 224
APPENDIX A—AN ENGLISH PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE 1870's	241
APPENDIX B—RELIGION IN AMERICAN STATE SCHOOLS	244
APPENDIX C—EDUCATION IN NAZI GERMANY	246
INDEX	252

1. THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND	page 38
1. The Atlantic Charter. 2. The Commonwealth of United Nations. 3. The Rule of Right. 4. Human Welfare. 5. The Four Freedoms. 6. The Constitution of The Commonwealth. 7. The Charter and The Commonwealth. 8. The Pope's Five Peace Points. 9. President Wilson's Fourteen Points. 10. The League of Nations. 11. Why the League failed. 12. The League and The Commonwealth.	
2. THE GOOD CITIZEN	page 71
1. The Rule of Law. 2. Loyalty and Power. 3. A Common Purpose. 4. Reflexes, Habits, Interests. 5. Mind and Spirit. 6. Inner and Outer World. 7. Oneness of Mind. 8. What is Truth? 9. The Oneness of the World. 10. The Final Link-up. 11. World Loyalty. 12. Religion and Natural Science. 13. Religion and Citizenship.	
3. THE TRAINING OF GOOD CITIZENS	page 122
1. Brains and Backbone. 2. Nature and Society. 3. Religion and the State. 4. A Religious Outlook. 5. John or Jesus? 6. Education Opportunity. 7. Young Peoples Colleges. 8. Universities. 9. Adult Education.	
4. A PLAN FOR ENGLAND	page 122
1. The aim. 2. The Christian Tradition. 3. The Teaching Profession. 4. The Board of Education. 5. The Consultative Committee. 6. The Churches and the State. 7. England and the World. 8. Reading the Map. 9. Primary Schools and Private Schools. 10. Christian Education in Primary Schools. 11. The Dual System. 12. Secondary Schools. 13. Selection at Eleven. 14. Eleven to Thirteen. 15. Selection at Thirteen. 16. Higher Secondary Schools. 17. Fourteen to Eighteen. 18. Young People's Colleges. 19. The Service Year. 20. Residential Universities. 21. Adult Education. 22. Administration.	

Chapter 1

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

1. The Atlantic Charter

On a summer day in 1941 a British convoy, homeward bound across the North Atlantic, was overhauled by H.M.S. *Prince of Wales*. As she came up, the merchant seamen, keeping watch over their fleet, rubbed their eyes in astonishment. It seemed impossible, yet there could be no doubt about the fact: some of the destroyers escorting the battleship were not flying the White Ensign but 'Old Glory'. In such a setting these star-spangled banners were a sign that something strange had happened. Could they be heralding the birth of a new unity between the British and American Commonwealths? In the long run, what good news of great joy that would be for all peoples! It might mean peace on earth.

The battleship, passing through the convoy, made the signal: 'Good Voyage, Churchill.' It was received with enthusiasm and answered by the flying of the V flag from every ship.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom was on his passage home after his talks with the President of the United States. Their meeting at sea had accomplished a great deal. It had provided all the world with an object lesson in sea-power. It had put new heart into the nations who were resisting the aggression of Hitlerite Germany and her allies. It had settled questions of supply to the belligerents, particularly to Russia, and of the working of the Lease and Lend Act.¹ It had prepared the way for the English-speaking world to work as one—at sea, on land, and in the air—whenever America might enter the war. And it had produced an authoritative declaration² of the common peace aims of the British Government and the American Administration.

This document is known as the Atlantic Charter. 'A simple rough and ready wartime statement of the goal towards which the British Commonwealth and the United States mean to make their way': so Mr.

¹ The Act of Congress of 11 March, 1941

² On 12 August, 1941.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Churchill called it in his broadcast on 24 August, 1941. It reads as follows:

'The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing his Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

'1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

'2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

'3. They respect the rights of all people to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

'4. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

'5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security.

'6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

'7. Such a freedom shall enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

'8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.'

The scope of this joint declaration was limited by the circumstances of its authors. Mr. Churchill took care not to stir up trouble among the allied Governments in London or Moscow. He avoided, for example, any hint of where to look for the eventual Russo-Polish frontier, or of

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

how to solve the problem of the racial, religious and linguistic minorities dispersed over Europe. Mr. Roosevelt had no power to make a treaty save 'by and with the advice and consent of the Senate . . . provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur'. Neither the Prime Minister nor the President could afford to ignore public opinion or go far beyond it; and, while opinion in Britain was divided upon such questions as the future of Germany, or the need for parting with some national sovereignty to a new or reinforced international authority, America was in two minds on the main issue whether the United States should take part in making war and organizing peace.

Yet, despite these handicaps of its negotiators, the Atlantic Charter was a conspicuous success. It showed how different was the new World Order likely to follow Germany's defeat from the new European Order planned by Adolf Hitler. It awakened the hope that the United States might join the United Nations, first in conquering Hitlerite Germany and then in reconstructing the world. It was approved by the Inter-Allied Council, including Soviet Russia, meeting at St. James's Palace on 24 September, and again by the American Republics at their conference in Rio de Janeiro in December, 1941. And it was formally endorsed in a 'Declaration by the United Nations' on 1 January, 1942, when representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China, the Netherlands and twenty-one other nations signed an agreement pledging the use of their full resources against the Axis and binding themselves not to make a separate peace or armistice with the enemy. On 23 February, 1942, Great Britain and the United States concluded an Agreement one of the objects of which was to work out jointly the means of applying the economic principles of the Charter. The Anglo-Russian Treaty of 26 May, 1942 expressed the intention of the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. to collaborate closely with one another, as well as with the other United Nations, at the peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction, on the basis of the Atlantic Charter.

2. The Commonwealth of United Nations

In order to appreciate the outstanding achievement of the Atlantic Charter, and also where it fell short of the ideal, let us attack the problem which faced the British and American leaders. We can do so without the disabilities under which they worked because we lack their responsibilities. Unless the peoples of the democracies discuss peace aims among themselves, the unprepared state of their public opinion may prevent

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

their governments from saying the right thing at the right time, and so winning the peace as well as the war.¹ Mr. Lloyd George, at Paris in 1919, had his peace plans upset by a telegram from 370 Members of Parliament. 'Our constituents', they wired, 'have always expected that the first action of the peace delegates would be, as you repeatedly stated in your election speeches, to present the bill in full and make Germany acknowledge the debt.'² Unless the British people, in particular, prepare their minds for great changes at home and abroad, another British Prime Minister may some day find himself in Mr. Lloyd George's predicament.

The British peoples entered the war, not for any national or imperial gains, but to defeat Hitlerite Germany's policy of conquest and enslavement. When the German aggressors have been beaten, their European hangers-on—Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania and Finland—will also be out of the fight. There should follow an armistice, and the beginning of reconstruction in Europe, even if Japan is able to hold out for a little while longer before being overwhelmed. For some years after the final victory of the United Nations they will have to police the world and save it from anarchy and chaos. Then will come the time for the third and last stage of peacemaking, beginning with a World Congress to negotiate a final settlement.

There are thus three steps on the way to peace. They are:

- (1) an armistice between the belligerents;
- (2) a transitional period to end the war, restore order and begin reconstruction; and, later on,
- (3) a World Congress to begin the peace by negotiating a general settlement.

There may be more than one armistice, and possibly a separate provisional treaty with each vanquished State. But the general settlement must be one and indivisible. To the Congress that has to negotiate it, the few remaining ex-neutrals as well as all the ex-belligerents should be invited. The settlement might mean changes in the rights of some of the parties under existing treaties, including any that may be made to end the war.

The terms of the armistice with Germany, or with Japan, and of any

¹ 'The nature of the peace settlements concluded at the end of the present conflict will fundamentally depend on the desires and convictions of the great rank and file of the peoples of the United Nations.' (Mr. Cordell Hull, the American Secretary of State, speaking at Washington on 25 January, 1943.)

² See *The Origin, Structure and Working of the League of Nations*, by C. Howard Ellis (1928), p. 44.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF UNITED NATIONS

interim treaty following it, are to be 'unconditional surrender'. They must at least (a) put a stop to Nazi, or Japanese, aggression, by the instant reduction of German, or Japanese, armaments and by the prompt withdrawal of German, or Japanese, troops within their national frontiers as they stood, say, in 1930; (b) restore sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, but without necessarily preserving all the old frontiers; and (c) require the vanquished States to accept in principle the peace aims of the victors. They would have to ensure the disappearance of the Hitler regime. They would also have to meet the military exigencies of the time. On the other hand, the blockade would be lifted forthwith so as to supply the urgent needs of the civil population in the occupied territories, and then in Germany, or Japan.

It is convenient to describe these armistice terms as 'war aims' in order to mark them off from the peace aims to which we now turn. The achievements of these peace aims will take a long time. The general settlement negotiated by the World Congress can only be a beginning.

The assembly of this Congress may wait for say, four years, or it might be more, after final victory. 'Four years', said Mr. Churchill in his broadcast speech of 21 March, 1943, 'seems to me to be the right length for the period of transition and reconstruction which will follow the downfall of Hitler.' In order to prevent anarchy, the Axis countries and some of the lands which they invaded will have to be policed by the United Nations during this period. The interval will allow time for war passions to cool; for order to replace the chaos of the immediate post-war period; for self-government to be re-established in countries from which it had disappeared since Germany's rape of Austria in 1938, as well as in Austria herself if she prefers to be governed from Vienna rather than from Berlin; for new regimes to be set up in Germany and her satellite States and perhaps also in Japan; and, above all, for truth to enlighten the minds of men and women who have been kept in the dark, many of them since long before the war. Truth must help to win the peace. Truth is great and will prevail.

The general settlement negotiated by this Congress should bring into being an international authority¹ which we may call The Commonwealth

¹ On 2 December, 1942, the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden, told the House of Commons that 'Our general object is to form a world system for ensuring the peaceful development of all peoples'. Mr. Churchill, on 1 March, 1943, spoke of 'the future world organization'. Cf. also Field-Marshal Smuts in a broadcast to South Africa on 12 May, 1941: 'Security, reform, the better ordering of our world, all call for an effective common authority.' Again, Mr. Sumner

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

of United Nations or, more briefly, 'The Commonwealth'. It need not begin by being, but should aim at becoming, world-wide. Its chief functions would be to maintain the rule of right and to promote human welfare—social and political, economic and cultural—among the member States and, eventually, among all mankind.

3. The Rule of Right

We here speak of maintaining the rule of right rather than of preserving peace because peace is not always the greatest good. Of the *Pax Romana* it was said that the Romans made a desert and called it peace.¹ Where justice is not to be had by peaceful means there may arise the grievous need to break the peace in order to right a yet more grievous wrong. Moreover, too great a love of peace, as we learnt from the appeasers of 1938-9, may destroy the very peace it is intended to preserve. Every nation must be ready to share in stopping aggression by the use of overwhelming force.

In order to maintain the rule of right within The Commonwealth, its member States should regard its authority as supreme for certain matters of common concern. These matters would have to include (a) the nature or uses of armed force (especially the prevention of aggression), and (b) the administration or amendment of international law.

Under the first head, The Commonwealth would aim at reducing the crushing burden of armaments among its member States by using the strength of all for the defence of each. But, before there could be any general reduction in armaments, The Commonwealth would have to make sure that it had the necessary strength to enforce its authority and to defend itself. For these purposes it should have the use of such military or naval forces as it may require on each occasion from each of its member States. But, instead of having a similar right to use contingents

Welles, American Under-Secretary of State, on Memorial Day (30 May), 1942: 'I believe that the voices of the men who will make our victory possible will demand . . . that the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organization . . . to determine the final terms of a just, an honest, and a durable peace.' And the British Home Secretary, Mr. Herbert Morrison, spoke in the Guildhall, London, on 24 February, 1943, of the need for 'the creation in due time of a genuinely representative world political association. . . . A world association is the aim. . . . We cannot make progress except in organized association'.

¹ *Ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant* was said by the Briton, Calgacus (Tacitus, *Agricola* c. 30).

THE RULE OF RIGHT

of national air forces, it would be far better that The Commonwealth should have its own air force, and that its member States should cease to have independent air forces of their own. Partly to the same end, but partly also to link up its domain and to ensure the freedom of the air over all its territory, The Commonwealth should supervise civil aviation, and directly control international flying, within its borders.

In the second place, The Commonwealth's administration of international law implies that its member States should look to it to declare¹ what justice and good faith require for the peaceful settlement of any of their disputes which they are unable to compose by themselves, even with the help of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The amendment of international law by The Commonwealth means that, in such a case, its member States should accept its declaration and so act that in due time that declaration may take effect without violence, even when it involves revising a treaty or altering international conditions in some other way.

A regional group of member States should form The Commonwealth's first line of defence against aggression in their region, particularly where there is most risk that peace may be disturbed. The States in each regional group would pledge themselves to use at once all their resources—political, economic and military—to stop aggression within their own region, and this obligation would be the more certain to be honoured because disorder near home threatens vital national interests. The other members of The Commonwealth would give political and economic support to the regional group and would neither aid the aggressor nor assert neutrality. The regional group would also have whatever help it needed from The Commonwealth's air force. But if, even so, the regional group proved unequal to the task of stopping an aggressor in its region, the other member States of The Commonwealth would be obliged to give, so far as they could, whatever further armed assistance might be needed to ensure success. 'It is abundantly clear', said Mr. Cordell Hull on 12 September, 1943, 'that a system of organized international co-operation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the co-operating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace.'

¹ The declaration of The Commonwealth might very well be based on the advice of such an 'equity tribunal' as Lord Davies has proposed. The tribunal would be made up of persons who, by their nationality, their personal character and their experience, appear to The Commonwealth to furnish the highest guarantees of competence and impartiality. But the tribunal should find the facts and *recommend* what should be done. The *decision* must be left to the political authority of The Commonwealth.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

4. Human Welfare

Besides maintaining the rule of right, The Commonwealth, we said, is to promote human welfare. As a condition of becoming or remaining a member of The Commonwealth, every State would have to recognize limitations to its right to regulate its own economy.¹ It must also observe certain minimum standards of behaviour towards its citizens and other inhabitants. These standards would tend to rise as time went on. But, even from the outset, the practice of cruelty and other vices deemed degrading to mankind could not be permitted within The Commonwealth.

In order to improve the economic and social life of its member States, and eventually of all the world, The Commonwealth should invite the co-operation of an outer ring of friendly States who share its aims in this field but are not yet willing to accept the other obligations and rights of members. The Commonwealth and these friendly States would seek to establish, in place of economic nationalism, a system of world planning in the spirit of the International Labour Organization or the Health or Economics Section of the League of Nations. This new order would make the world as a whole materially better off than it could be under Adolf Hitler whose new order aims at concentrating the more important industries in Germany and exploiting the rest of mankind for the sake of their German masters. Speaking in the Mansion House on 29 May, 1941, Mr. Eden put it in this way:

'The free nations of America, the Dominions, and ourselves alone possess a command of the material means and, what is perhaps more important, these nations clearly have the will and the intention to evolve a post-war order which seeks no selfish advantage, an order where each member of the family shall realize its own character and perfect its own gifts of liberty of conscience and person. . . . It will be our wish to work with others to prevent the starvation of post-armistice period, the currency disorders throughout Europe, and the wide fluctuations of employment, markets and prices which were the cause of so much misery in the twenty years between the two wars.'

¹ Cf. Mr. Sumner Welles' speech in New York on 7 October, 1941: 'The creation of an economic order in the post-war world which will give free play to individual enterprise and at the same time render security to men and women and provide for the progressive improvement of living standards is almost as essential to the preservation of free institutions as the winning of the war.' (*The Times*, 1 November, 1941.)