

Lectures by Roland Harris

The School as Counsellor

The first of 4 lectures given at the Tavistock in 1968 to launch the Schools' Counsellors' Course

We have convinced everyone by now that universal compulsory education is a good thing, with the exception perhaps of the pupils themselves. This conviction perhaps, and this exception certainly, have not simplified matters for the practising of education. Many 'ineducable' children have come, however unwillingly, to school; and there is none whom the teacher can reject as not his business. The confusion of social classes actually mixing together has meant that standards of behaviour can no longer be taken for granted, and that in consequence the justification for enforcing certain behaviours has had to be examined by teachers if it is not to be ridiculed by pupils. It is a consequence that has spread even to the most self-confident schools, such as those famous public-schools 'whose certainty about aims', as a recent *Observer* article suggested, 'separates them from their opposite numbers the state schools.' There, as Paul Ferris in his article illustrates, evasions take the place of Mosaic injunctions – e.g. 'compulsory chapel was more or less a waste of time but 'it's more tactful to keep the thing going for the present' (Dancy). Would Donald Lindsay object to *Last Exit to Brooklyn* for senior boys? 'Well, they wouldn't have much chance of getting hold of it, would they?' Although one London girls' school has had the drainpipes taken down to stop boys getting in, another school (in Kent) lets sixth-form girls go to London, admittedly 'in groups no fewer than three when they have filled in a form and satisfied the headmistress that their intentions are honourable.' 'Anything is a risk,' she concluded, but she would not have encouraged them to see *Mrs Wilson's Diary*. Boyfriends and girlfriends, says Ferris, are now accepted as normal by heads; or as one headmistress informed him in that *déshabille* language which reveals so much of the extent of the change in attitude,

“the pill hasn’t half made a difference at a girls’ school.”

It is easy to laugh at the dilemma in which the moralist schoolteacher finds himself whenever he has to make a specific public decision about the mores of the tribe. Yet it is a real dilemma, and it is this because the schoolteacher really has at heart the genuine good of the pupils under his aegis, and is puzzled at how to achieve this while preserving an image respected both by parents and pupils – he must not be fuddy-duddy, yet must not be hypocritical. Even the Headmasters’ Conference has to employ an advertising agency. It is a dilemma that is as sharp in the boarding school as in the day school, though not sharper; for though the power of enforcement is greater there, the responsibility is more complete.

During the first four lectures of this term, we shall be focussing on what the school in its everyday processes and organisation can do towards resolving this dilemma.

I chose to illustrate the dilemma in my introductory paragraph by examples taken from sexual and religious behaviour, because it is in such matters that the doublethink of our standards is most readily – and ridiculously – evident. Doublethink however could be as well shown in other forms of social behaviour in a school setting (‘this hurts me more than it hurts you’), or in methods and processes of teaching in such apparently unambiguous spheres as the teaching of English Grammar. It exists also, I am quite sure, in our group tonight, and especially in two areas which it is necessary for us to examine for a moment before going any further.

These areas are Educational Objectives and Counselling Terminology. We could probably have a nice cosy chat in which we all agreed that education is a desirable experience; and counselling is apparently, by our presence here, something in which we are all interested. The cosiness would persist as long as we did not examine what we meant by ‘education’ and by ‘counselling’.

The desirability of specifying the objectives of any educational process at an appropriate level of generality is frequently stressed in the literature of educational research. Yet to define an educational objective in terms of what the student should be able to do, or how he should think and feel, is less often achieved than recommended. This is so even where the objective is quite restricted (e.g. what grammatical structure should a seven-year-old child have mastered?) and the approach analytic – i.e. designed to separate

out the components, as the cognitive from the conative aspects of learning ('could do better' from 'must try harder'). In counselling, the difficulty of defining objectives sharply is greater: by its very nature it is likely to diffuse, hard to relate in terms of cause and effect, manifold in its activities, problems and instruments, and non-analytic in that it is to affect the child as a whole, the needs of the whole range of children, and the processes of the whole community.

[Section missing]

Inconsistency between our professed objectives and our practice is more common than we like to think. 'Membership of the cadet corp is optional, but everyone is expected to attend.' And in a comparatively uncentralised educational system such as our own, the variability between the objectives and values of different schools in different sub-cultures can be extreme. The mean or average weight accorded to a social objective – let us say 'co-operation' – may not vary very much from school to school; but the standard deviations of the school may differ widely. The school cannot, I think, help acting as a counselling agency; but if it wishes to do so consciously and directly it has first to examine its own values as these are embodied in objectives, and then it has to scrutinise what it actually does in order to assess how its programme of education embodies those values. How consistent is its preaching and its practice? The consistency rating for many schools would not, I fear, be high; and a very useful piece of local research for any of you who are in a position to influence the counselling operations of your school as a whole would be to plot the consistency (a) between professed values and values to be reliably inferred from what is actually done (the pedagogic methods, attitudes of staff, socialisation procedures and so on, (b) between what is done and the reliably inferred or operational values; and (c) between the operational values and the values judged estimable by the staff.

Such a piece of research is the initial necessity in reviewing the effectiveness of the school – your particular school – as counsellor. It is always likely to provide something of a shock, whether for society as a whole, for education as a whole, or for individual schools and teachers. It is the experience of seeing what you look like in the mirror after having had your eyes closed. The objectives of education always are statements of values, even at

their most mechanical; and indeed one of the major differences between cultures is in their hierarchies of values. The Navaho Indians according to Kluckhohn and Leighton (1946) seek out aesthetic experiences and consider them holy; because they value beauty, they learn motives for creating and enjoying beauty in many specific forms. We also value beauty after our fashion, but our stereotype of the artist is rather satanic than divine, when it is not simply rather squalid, unkempt, anti-social and ineffectual. Our higher ranked values are utilitarian, competitive, linked with power (preferably righteous). Generally speaking, I imagine, schools would deny that in the hierarchy of values they disparage the aesthetic experience. The Government Social Survey has recently produced through the Schools Council a report on the attitudes of young school leavers; in a catalogue of 27 school objectives, drama and poetry were ranked 26th and 27th by the fifteen-year-old leavers (girls and boys respectively). You are not surprised? In the ranking given by parents, these subjects occupied exactly the same positions. But what of the teachers... well, headteachers were rather more aesthetically inclined: drama ranked eighth – from the bottom; and poetry fifth – from the bottom. Assistant teachers saw things more in their pupils' eyes – drama was last but four, and poetry was last but one. Art was not mentioned as an objective by anyone. Nearly five thousand pupils and parents, and 1500 teachers, were involved in this inquiry. Inconsistencies of the greatest importance to the school as a counselling agent emerge in results of this nature – inconsistencies between the public avowal that the aesthetic experience is important, and the professional educators' admission that it is really ranked very low; and inconsistencies of an internal nature between the counselling objectives of the school and the hierarchy of values. For example, well over 90% of heads and a similar proportion of teachers ranked the development of personality and character as very important in their hierarchy, and 'speaking well' as only second to this. It is therefore surprising that the same people placed drama and poetry at the bottom of their list – experiences and skills which one might have thought had a direct bearing on the former objectives.

When teachers, parents and pupils all agree on a value we can be pretty sure that the value is both explicitly and implicitly (i.e. operationally) manifest in the school processes. Divergent opinions on values are however equally important guides to anyone aiming to look at the effective

processes in their own school, though they are often more difficult to interpret. Two examples from the Schools Council's report concern examination achievement and the learning of things of direct use in jobs. Now both heads and assistants ranked examination achievement very low indeed in the list of objectives – next to last, and last, respectively. In the heads' eyes only the learning of things of direct use in jobs came lower; and in the assistants' views only poetry came nearly as low. Roughly 70% of pupils, on the other hand, saw exam achievement as very important. They felt this, one might guess, because whatever the teachers said to their research workers about the unimportance of examinations (or the undesirability), what they said to the children either in words or in the frequency of tests and examinations showed very clearly that examination success *did* matter. Doublethink. The case of 'learning things of direct use in jobs' shows a disparity between pupil and teacher views which is different in its implications. 80% of pupils and parents ranked this objective as 'very important'; only 14% of heads did so. The disagreement about examinations lay in the pupils getting too many; that about things of direct use in jobs lay in their learning too few. The former inconsistency was between the teachers' precept and their practice; the latter between the teachers' practice and the pupils' (and the parents') wishes.

I have talked about values and objectives for a while because it seems to me unlikely that one can set up a sound counselling system in a school without examining them and realising, or anticipating, the demands made by them if consistency is to be obtained between what is promulgated and what is achieved. To add a counsellor to a school without this scrutiny of value-consistency is equivalent to deciding to add a blob of red to a picture without any consideration for the composition or the colour-harmonies you intend to create.

Terminology

There are many teachers who attach a very special connotation to the label 'counselling'. It means perhaps steering a child into a suitable job, or advising him on which of several school courses he should take; or listening to and helping him to resolve his personal problems. Each of these is an important activity in itself, but I would like to suggest that we broaden

the concept so as to cover much else that the school inevitably includes in its activities on behalf of the child. The *curriculum* is the educational programme: that is, it is everything that is intended to happen to the child in school. There is an inclusiveness, an interaction about this which is most important. When we discipline a child, we are trying to condition him to obey our injunctions; when we teach him to write correctly, it is not for the skill's own sake but for that of say his own self-respect, his adjustment to social pressures and needs; when we teach him the facts of history, it is not for the facts alone but for his better functioning as a member of our social and political system; when we pay attention to his personal troubles, it is not only out of human sympathy but because we want as teachers to make the educational programme effective – that is, we hope that the child will be able to learn more effectively after resolving his personal crisis. Counselling, as someone has said, is educational *and* vocational *and* personal. The point I would wish to underline here is that counselling (or pastoral care, or guidance – the terms used vary, and we are not ready to attempt a definition yet) has shown evidence of two important developments in recent years: the first is towards a view of counselling that stresses the positive guidance of the normal child, as distinct from (though not excluding) the rescue of the child who has broken down – a powerful preventive element enters in; the second is an increasing awareness that in the curriculum everything works together so that the school as a whole affects the child as a whole. There is still a strong and widespread tendency to think of counselling as essentially therapeutic, something to be done only when things go wrong. The departmental specialism of the academic curriculum still fosters the isolation of social from intellectual growth. And if the departments of the school itself remain separate from each other, so to do the numerous helping agencies from each other and from the school. This is why it is necessary to emphasise that the school is the central organisation for counselling, and that the teacher is the central functionary in the process, whether he operate under the title counsellor, house teacher, year-tutor, form teacher, subject teacher, or what have you.

It is perhaps pertinent at this stage to anticipate conclusions, by stating that I am of the opinion:

a) that schools should take some responsibility for more than intellectual and scholastic development of children, because they have a concern

for the entire child;

b) that current changes in the educational scene (particularly the development of socially heterogeneous and large comprehensive schools, and the steady postponement of the leaving age) will provide problems for the school unless teachers are actively concerned with the child's total personal development;

c) that the school's counselling practices will need to find more explicit emphasis on the timetable and in the curriculum;

d) that counselling can be in fact operative in nearly all school activities, pedagogic, organisational, and social, internal to the school or related to the external community. It is in short a fundamental process, and not simply an additional one.

The path towards these conclusions leads again through the study of values, for it is our values that dictate the methods of our teaching. Some teachers favour a subject-centered emphasis; some prefer one that is child-centered. Some stress society's needs, other the needs of the individual. Some – and they have been academically and bureaucratically eminent – have strait-jacketed individual differences into types of aptitude which are equated with levels of intelligence, so that academic/technical/secondary modern oppositions emerge; some favour an authoritarian, directive style of leadership in class, others one that is permissive or even abdicating. These differences cannot well be reconciled save by being set together within a unifying concept to which they are commonly directed.

One such concept, which I would advocate here, is the mental health of children. Mental health is largely a matter of values; we cannot reliably posit these values for the world in general, and even within our own society must no doubt accept large variations of emphasis. Nevertheless, a consensus description of mental health might include such elements as an optimal development of a child's intellectual potential, moral judgement, aesthetic sensibility, personal and social adaptation, skills (including social skills), feelings, and even physical well-being, all contributing to a pattern of total growth. Counselling owes as a conscious and theoretic system a great debt to the United States – such terms as 'globality', 'continuity', 'active client-participation', 'unity of role', 'preventive orientation' and 'school-system feed-back' will no doubt be familiar to you. Some of these have been operational in Britain, in a form suited to our own edu-

cational and social structure, for a considerable time. The strengthening of independence, for example (active client-participation), has long been – though under various disguises – a love-object of the schools. The ‘forming of character’ the ‘making a man of you’ (even if you are a woman) the ‘standing on your own two feet’ – these are all images of independence, persona, masks of the beloved. Beneath the mask, the face is different; indeed it is very like our own. One aim of education is to produce people like ourselves, and the dilemma of our age is that we are frightened lest we succeed.

The close liaison between mental health and education was already well established by the early 1950’s, when Unesco organised their regional conference on Education and the mental health of children in Europe (see W. D. Wall’s book), at which the justifications for adequate guidance procedures for school pupils were fully presented. In Great Britain, the National Association for Mental Health with its first conference at Bristol in 1964 probably had a share in the setting-up of some of the modern training courses for counsellors. Throughout, the teachers themselves have acknowledged ‘pastoral care’ as one – and sometimes a central – professional responsibility, adopting or adapting to their local patterns and pressures of local tradition. Educationalists and sociologists writing on the teacher’s role have noted that it is felt to operate in moral and social as well as in intellectual matters, and that indeed it is tending to become more inclusive or ‘diffuse’ as the roles of many other professional persons have become more specialised and restricted.

I would refer you again to the Government Social Survey report on the young school leaver, which reinforces these opinions. 66% of the boys leaving school at fifteen, and 76% of the girls, ranked as very important such school objectives as ‘helping you to become independent’ and ‘teaching you about what is right and wrong’; parents in almost the same measure agreed, and schoolteachers agreed even more emphatically: of headteachers, 90% and of assistants, 86% ranked ‘helping to become independent’ as very important; the figures for ‘teaching about right and wrong were respectively 84% and 76%. Well over 90% of the teachers saw themselves committed to shaping their pupils’ personality and character – it is perhaps a measure of their success in the other objective of fostering independence that many of their pupils did not agree in this ranking! In few other areas,

save in ranking poetry and drama near the bottom of the list of priorities, was there so much agreement between pupils and teachers as in this one of self-development.

There are thus well-established historical grounds for the school and the teacher in Great Britain acting in a counselling function. In addition, there are systematic grounds for considering the school to be in effect continually engaged in counselling. We have to assume, I think, that we have in the curriculum a total system, in which all the variables are interdependent. By variables in the curriculum I mean such things as the content, processes, and instruments of education: French or Woodwork; large group or Dalton plan methods, streaming or mixed ability classes; the teacher as person or as functionary – these are examples of the three variables.

In the pupil too we find a system of variables, and these include his general or factorial abilities (verbal skill, motor skills), his attitudes and interests, his history of failure or success, his family and social pressures and ambitions. There is in much educational theorising a great deal of post-hoc propter-hoc reasoning, in counselling theory and its so-called experimental validation not least; but even were there no ‘hard’ evidence available to show that (for example) a child who had suffered severe linguistic impoverishment in early childhood would be unlikely to succeed easily in using verbal skills, and in consequence would be backward in conceptualisation and (in our society) in intellectual attainment generally, we could still risk inferring that there was a systematic interaction taking place here. One damn thing leads to another.

The situation is infinitely complex in the long involved upbringing of a child. We can seldom from our educational information arrive at all the functional relationships of the systemic variables: we do not know for certain why little Johnny dislikes Geography – perhaps he had a sarcastic teacher before his present school; perhaps he was ill on the day of the examination; perhaps an elder sibling succeeded in it all too well; perhaps poor materials and presentation hindered his learning. Nor do we usually find a simple linear sequence in the system of variables: these instead are functions of each other without regard to the direction of their causation – affect determines cognition, and is determined *by* it. Their functional relationship will at times include conflict: Johnny’s need to escape from the Geography lesson may be overridden by his need to placate his headmas-

ter, or to prove that he does not give in easily. The complexity of relationships between the variables precludes certainty of interpretation; nevertheless, the hypothesis remains credible that within the system of interactions, change in one variable will at times and in some degrees modify all the other variables.

I hope this will be seen to be a truism. What is curious, however, is that it is rare to find it accorded more than a verbal acknowledgement in the practice of schools. There are numerous studies extant to show what are the values and objectives of schools as these objectives are described by the teachers concerned; there are none, I believe, in which the researcher offers an interpretation of the objectives as understood by an uncommitted observer relying only on what he perceives being done. Such an inquiry might reveal the lack of a consistent and controlled pattern of interaction among the variables of the system, one in which all things work together towards – whatever the school and its community determined to be ‘good’.

A complex doublethink, or possibly a random unthink, commonly exists. Indeed, it is more likely that an exemplar of consistency would be found in a traditional authoritarian simplicist academic school staffed and attended by members of a limited social range able to leave or willing to leave many of the social and personal variables to a remote but acceptably similar home background, than in a more modern school cross-sectional in its social structure and compelled thereby to accept a responsibility for a much wider spread of variables. This is not a comment intended to favour one type of school system against another; it is merely to state that one order of efficiency may be more easily attained by the exclusion of objectives and by the limitation of values than by their *inclusion*. The relevance for us as counsellors is that it is no longer possible in the British system (especially as the government presses on with its Comprehensive regulations) to proceed on a basis of exclusion and the simplification of objectives. Size of school, social structure, range of abilities and background, the complexity of the services the school is expected to offer society, and the historical actuality of the acceptance by many teachers of a pastoral role forces the school as a counsellor to consider the implication of the truism, that all variables in the system interact.

In a later talk we shall be looking in more detail at what this means for the teacher. For the moment one may relate it simply to the earlier

comments on values; for our values are important variables in the system. If the school feels that some construct such as 'mental health', which it must analyse for itself, is a major objective, it has then to examine what it teaches, how it teaches, and the interchange between teachers and taught, to see how all these bear on the major objective. Are they consistent with the values and with each other? Some of us might single out, let us say, a trait such as 'independence' as reflecting an important part of the spectrum of mental health. This would certainly be consistent with much of the literature of modern counselling theory, in which independence – the power to make decisions, to be responsible for choice – is seen as a desirable value. On the other hand, there must be many individuals whose need is for dependence, and it would be perfectly feasible for a school to organise its pastoral care round this value. The question either way is crucial to the building of a school, though it is not one that Her Majesty's Inspectors always ask: their first question, as it statutorily must be, is about storage space and lavatories, or, as A. S. Neill complained, what is the state of the ceiling?

I have suggested then that there are two major developments in British education which explain or are explained by the emergence of counselling as a major procedure of the school. The first is the change from a negative to a positive emphasis in the teacher's view on mental health and in his injunctions to his pupils – and hence, as they perceive, in his expectations of them: a change from 'do not commit adultery' to 'we must love one another or die' [Brecht], or as some would say 'take a pill – and let the devil take cold baths'. Recognising all the necessary reservations about the differences between an expressed attitude and an attitude in action, we may still accept and even welcome that this concern to strive for what the literature calls 'positive mental health' is established, at least in intention.

The second development is the acceptance of the mutually reactive influences of the many variables in the curriculum, a development which may be seen in action in numerous contemporary modifications of syllabus content, of teaching methods, and of examinations of the effects of the teacher's attitudes on the self-conception and hence on the performance of children. As it happens, all of these developments tend in action toward reinforcing the values perceived as 'positive mental health' in the first group of changes, or toward the concept named 'independence'. Syllabus content

normally changes in the direction of providing information more relevant to responsible participation in society; the teaching methods often embody self-tuition and self-criticism; the teacher's attitudes are rather those named 'democratic' than 'autocratic'. A school is a statement of belief, and our values are among its instruments. The variables would still interact, were our values entirely opposed to those at present expressed, as indeed was the case in say Nazi Germany.

Perhaps we have now come far enough to risk proposing a notional definition of counselling, which I have based on some views expressed in a pamphlet being prepared as the outcome of the deliberations of a working party set up by the National Association for Mental Health. 'Counselling' is a title representing a complex of means of helping to promote the mental health of children, and so one will hardly expect an attempted definition to be short and simple. It is because counselling has this complex connotation that there is sometimes uncertainty and confusion, and inconsequential debate, about the role of the counsellor in schools. Here then is the suggested definition:

Counselling is the operation of a **system** of pastoral care suited to the needs of **particular** children in a **particular** society. It implies the acceptance of a **conscious** responsibility by school **and** community for the development of a curriculum which will operate in person, social, educational and vocational fields to help a child grow towards independent co-operative adulthood.

There are I think some key words that need underlining there. Thus:

'**system**' – implies co-ordination, consistent pattern, deliberate provision of machinery and opportunity to operate pastoral care without relying on the chance availability of (for example) a sympathetic teacher when a child wants help;

'**particular**' – indicates the specificity of detail which allows for the wide range of individual needs which must inevitably be met;

'**conscious** responsibility' – calls for the acceptance of what follows in the definition as an agreed educational objective whose realisation depends on the awareness that every aspect of the curriculum – its content, process or method of teaching or guidance, the attitude and accessibility of suitable helping agencies

or personnel – contributes to the effective operation of pastoral care. The responsibility, being conscious and explicit, may be expected to lie within the educator's power to modify and adjust;

‘**school and community**’ – proposes a common responsibility and in the present context the primary responsibility of the school in the operation of the system of pastoral care;

‘**the curriculum**’ – is everything within the control or influence of the school which is intended to happen to the child;

‘**personal**’ aspects of growth are intended to include (for example) a child's self-knowledge, ability to reconcile fantasy and reality, to realise strengths and limitations;

‘**social**’ aspects include the ability to form constructive relationships with other people and groups, to adjust to society without losing independence;

‘**educational**’ growth involves development in the command of those bodies of skill and information which are traditionally conveyed by the schools;

‘**vocational**’ growth is achieved when a child, following satisfactory development in the other fields, is able to focus on a work ambition which will at once satisfy his own nature and contribute to society;

‘**independent, co-operative**’ – express values; these chosen are in keeping with the aim of the group framing this particular definition of counselling. Another group might wish to substitute say ‘submissive, obedient’ or some other terms here. It is not my purpose to instruct you as teachers and counsellors in the values you should adopt – that is a problem for each school and teacher himself. It is however a mainstay of my argument that the values must be included in the definition, because it is the values that command the system: that predispose us to react in certain ways to the particular needs of children, to make or refuse to make links with the community, to decide the nature of the curriculum, and finally to guide us in determining the nature of the internal consistency of the school's procedures.

We are back then where we started, with values and their consistency.

Summary

The school as counsellor has first to examine its values and objectives – where there is serious disagreement within a school about these, the school will fall apart. (Risinghill?)

It has then to organise its various processes round a central value system (e.g. mental health), so that consistency can be demonstrated:

- between what is professed and what is practised;
- between staff and students and community;
- between methods and objectives.

There is no need to defend the idea of counselling in schools. It is long established in practice and under one title or another. Debate or anxiety is not so much about the process itself, as about who should operate it – the new professional ‘counsellor’, or the old ‘teacher’? Or both? Weaknesses in Britain have been that aspects of counselling, rather as the departmental disciplines, have tended to be treated quite separately – careers guidance from personal guidance, intellectual achievement from emotional maturation, and so on; similarly the function of counselling has been conceived as quite separate from that of teachers. The recognition of the interdependence of all aspects of the curriculum suggests that this separatist attitude towards counselling is not only unnecessary but harmful: it creates needless friction between ‘teacher’ and ‘counsellor’, and blurs the understanding that the schools as a whole is a counselling agency. Counselling is a normative school process in which all the curriculum matters.

We shall in the next three talks be looking at the resources of school, the needs of children, and the relationship of resources to these needs from the point of view of counselling as a normative, school-centred, interactive process. This will involve us also in some principles of counselling, and some of its problems in the school situation, including the problem of the role of the counsellor.

END OF TALK

[There follows the first part of an earlier chapter on a related theme, ‘Co-operation and the growth of the child’, written in the early 1960s; the manuscript is incomplete.]

Co-operation and the growth of the child

What we are talking about

‘When I use a word,’ Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, ‘it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.’

It is valuable to discuss the meaning of terms we use.

It is customary to start even a light article with some sort of definition of terms so as to clear the ground of possible subsequent misunderstandings and evasions, and to be able to look our betters, and linguistic philosophers, in the face, as well as those of our friends who listen to the brains trust. The title of an article used to be sufficient to tell us what the article was about; now we have the duty of first saying what the title is about. This is perhaps all to the good for it would astonish many of us if we were to think what we are saying before we have said it, instead of saying it and hoping after the event that our words made sense. We should all speak less, but more to the point. Co-operation and many other desirable public and international virtues would become practical possibilities; and this may be what the philosophers had in mind in exhorting us to define our terms.

Co-operation has many meanings. Some, as for example a compelled or falsely aimed co-operation, or weak compliance, are not valuable forms of co-operation.

A writer on co-operation has of course a double duty to obey such sociable exhortations: the general good, and the need to set an example of his subject. And yet to define ‘co-operation’ is very difficult and probably unrewarding; and you will always find that when something really should be done, it is a thing not at all easy to do, which is why it has been left until last with the forks in washing-up. Like the words ‘democracy’ in politics, ‘scientific’ in advertising, or ‘fiddlededee’ in *Through the Looking Glass*, ‘co-operation’ is a vogue word in education and psychology. That is to say, it is used so often and by so many

people that it seems to have established a firm and generally accepted meaning. But when we come to a discussion of practical examples of co-operation – and this it is often best to avoid if we don't want to quarrel – we find that the word has fallen apart and fact means almost what each person wants it to mean. Thus, the Nazi youths who betrayed their friends or parents to the Gestapo were valued co-operators to the Party; and I have read in no mean history book that the slaves of the Pharaohs co-operated in building the pyramids and the Sphinx itself (did those impassive lips stir ever so slightly, wrinkle sardonically, to hear the word in such a context?).

'Every man has his price', claimed a leader of our own country; and yet we are all so romantic as to hope for co-operation deeper than the depth of our purse, or at least to be a little disappointed when we do not get it. What of the yes-men of the world – and they not only on the grand scale, not only the sycophants who in past days have gilded thrones or been the unthinking right arms of dictators, but lesser assenters, folk such as you and me, who have smoothed things over that really were rough, and given our vice the virtuous title of co-operation? For a little peace and quiet, a little security; for some small ambition, or self-importance, or fear of disapproval; through ignorance, or indolence, or possible loss to ourselves or to those we would protect – we have nearly all at some time or other said yes and been praised for our co-operation, when we should have said no and be damned to this mask which is not the real face we could love.

I daresay that a number of my readers will have served on a committee in some matter of local government or philanthropy. I would not suggest that you enquire into the motives of your fellow-members; but no doubt you can think of a hypothetical case in just such a co-operative

We do not want to create such forms as the violent, the self-deceiving. We value instead co-operation in finding or establishing truth, even at the cost of our self-interest.

venture where a Mr X or a Mrs Y served only to dominate and you might come to the conclusion that the useful work they did was not an unmixed blessing.

We have not come to the borders of a definition but the vague suggestion of its topography may now be seen. On those old maps which charted the fears and dreams of primitive explorers, and are still the most exciting parts of children's books, you may see the geography I am trying to describe. The desert of storms – here are serpents; the sea of no end – here are whales and the bones of beaten ships; the marshes of deception – here is a green apparent peace, but here men sink in bogs and their holdfasts fail. Violence, a false goal, a seeming complaisance. On such maps you do not know where you are, nor where you are going, but only that 'here are dragons' and that you have not yet arrived. We can see where not to go. The place we seek, our idea of co-operation, is not a place of violence and conscription; we do not want to make a tomb, but a house to live in, and cannot trust our present or our eternity to slaves whose work any robber can destroy when the whips have fallen from our hands. Nor Pharaoh, nor slave, can co-operate with us. So much is clear. But we must always remember that it was not clear to Pharaoh, nor is now. We live in a certain place and time, and our view is circumscribed by the here and now of what we wish, and fear, and are. We do not wish simply to work together to the 'sieg heil' of some totalitarian end; and this being so, we should have been traitors to the millions who in Germany twenty years ago worshipped in that terrible co-operation.

[The rest of the manuscript is lost]