Sense and Sensibility

We remember once using the word 'wonderful' and being told by a reader critic that it was 'effeminate' and that the word 'vast' would be more appropriate. Our critic, a person of uncommon sense and unusual sensibility, immediately saw the point in the few words necessary to explain the use of 'wonderful.' Concerning the possibilities which modern methods of production open up it is true to say that they can be wonderful or they can be vast; and we venture to assert that if they prove to be vast, they will not become wonderful. What, for instance, is the effect of television on a viewer, be he literate or illiterate? Does it fill his mind with wonder, or does it merely tease his senses?

The word 'vast' has two connotations. To quote the dictionary: 'huge, immense; shapeless.' Or, 'barren, void, waste, empty.' The miracles of the New Testament, and the marvels of culture, were achieved without mechanical aids; they were achieved through the mind. They are wonderful.

A correspondent has written to say:

"If the Leisure State were established among these Western de-personalised masses, as they are they would only grose away their leisure, wait for pubs to open, go to mechanised amusements and sports. If you sent them travelling they would be like the bus-load of young typists and Woolworth girls who looked neither at the countryside nor the cities they passed through, but sang popular songs at the top of their voices as on any village outing. Every man or woman would have to be induced or forced to belong to a club or society: Literary, Gardening, Musical, Religious, Carpentry, Stonemasonry, Carving, Painting, Drawing, etc. As Dr. Demant has said, many people have now no such affiliations, being reared and educated to desire sense satisfactions and to obtain them from the God, Science. They could not organise themselves. We don't want the Pleasure clubs for juveniles which were organised during the war and since."

What is producing these huge, shapeless, barren de-personalised masses of people? It is a society which refuses to be, or is not allowed to be redeemed from the Curse of Adam; it is our Industrial society of the Work State. Not long ago an African child, which had been lost as a baby was found living with baboons. It was dehumanised. Our Industrial society is not dehumanised, but it is largely de-personalised. No one can deny that the de-personalisation is the result of the mode of society.

If Christianity is concerned with anything in this world it is concerned with the personalising of people, and for that reason, if for no other, the Church can only betray her Founder if she fails to be actively concerned with a social policy which destroys the basis of a Christian society. The present attitude of the churches seems to be governed by a futile belief, which appears to have been wished on them, that they can work effectively within the system in the field of what is known as industrial relations. An article in The Tablet for July 2, on the decline of the Grammar Schools demonstrates how wrong they are. It shows how the 1944 Act, "like so much of the social legislation that has created the Welfare State" has had the opposite effect of what was allegedly intended. "The present growing gulf is, simply, that which exists between an educated and an uneducated man, and the simple charge to be levelled at the grammar school is that, even where its 'results' are good (i.e., a high number of examination successes) it fails to educate.

"... there is a growing army of uninformed, cultureless, rootless, but not unintelligent technicians, owing their status in society entirely to the State, and ready to be organised entirely in its service." Two out of three in the Sixth Forms are already reading Science.

Now that the general public has been given some information about automation the cry has already gone forth that there is a great dearth of technicians; and it is clear that the move to technify education will be greatly accelerated. It is clear that we are headed not only for robot machines, but for robot men to control them. True education is being crowded out.

The de-personalised masses are not a product of the Leisure State; they are a product of the Work State. When a living is dependent on a job and the job becomes more and more technical, then education will become increasingly technical.

Before we can have the product of a Leisure State, or more accurately a state of leisure, we must have a state of leisure. Before people can learn to ride a bicycle they must ride a bicycle; and even that requires a certain maturity of mind and limb. Whether rightly or wrongly we were once described as a nation of shopkeepers. During the past century we have increasingly become a nation of machine or function minders. The question at issue now is whether we are merely to become mere technical functionaries, the creatures of scientific materialism; or whether we are to be released to become persons, developing our sensibilities in
the fulness of a personal individuality. This is not a question which can be answered with authority by a hard-headed business man. Hard heads cannot appreciate the issues. Nor can mechanics, or even, apparently, engineers. It is a religious issue, which devolves on the question: what is man? With the rapidity of modern developments, in a few years time there may be no one capable of answering this question with authority. At the present time there is still a large minority, at least ostensibly, concerned with religious issues and the humanities. It remains to be seen whether they can be brought to see the issues clearly, and if they can, whether they have the spiritual and moral integrity to do battle for what they believe. If so, skillfully used, a sanction still exists in our society which can guide it along saner paths.

No sterile piety will resolve this issue, which is concerned with the incarnation of Truth in this world, that same Truth for which the Founder of Christianity said that He came. It is a strange thing that there is a country which is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, and in which there is a powerful movement for the establishment of a leisure economics, in which there is a powerful movement for the establishment of a leisure economics, and that the Church stands aloof and the leaders of the movement adopt the view that what they stand for is not religious. And yet the pronouncements of the present Pope leave no doubt about where Christian doctrine stands in regard to temporal matters. The intervention of the Church can be decisive in the introduction of a holy, that is to say, a wholesome order which permits the development of the whole individual in which sense and sensibility are the natural media for spiritual development. If that is denied, it is a denial of the Incarnation in any realistic, which is to say, truthful sense; and the promise of life more abundant a chimera.

**Personality**

(From The River Line novel by Charles Morgan, Pan Books Ltd. (1955), first published Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1949. The play from the book 1952 has a preface 'Transcending the Age of Violence.')

... "Investigating the nature of being? Wonderful! Are you preparing a thesis?"

"No," Sturgess answered ... "And we needn't give the thing quite so grandiose a name as the 'nature of being.' But the world is in an unspeakable mess. Everyone talks of 'frustration,' which means what?—that whichever way you turn, left or right, you are up against it. No way out that anyone can see. All the expedients built on the idea that man is a political animal or an economic animal appear to have been exhausted. U.N.O. began to rot as soon as it was born. And I thought—not because I proposed to convert the world, but because I wanted to find a way to live—I thought it would be worth while to ask again what the human personality is. Not an intellectual exercise. A practical question, God knows. If it isn't a fragment of Class and it isn't a fragment of Nation—You see," he said, looking from one to the other with embarrassment and wishing he hadn't gone so far, "what is now called 'frustration' looks to me very like what used to be called 'tragedy' about twenty-three centuries ago. Man thinking he's in a trap, and in it because he thinks he is. And on this level—the level, I mean, on which rival ideologies are for ever wanting our bodies to change their uniforms—I think he is in a trap. It has all the grip and finality of tragedy. And if he exists only on this level, as the materialists say, then that's the end. And even if there's another world, that doesn't help us here if we are cut off from it. But if the human personality doesn't have its being on this level only, but exists in depth—here and now three-dimensional, not two—then there's a way of living in depth."

Julian answered: "As you say: 'a practical question, God knows,'" but Marie put in:

"Does tragedy teach that?"

"Doesn't it? Tragedy isn't a shut box. It it were —" 

"Athalie?"

"Marie, you know I can't debate Racine with you."

"Lear, then? Did he find 'a way of living in depth'?"

"I think he did."

"He went mad."

"And sane.

She did not answer. They were, he knew, far apart. ... (pp. 22, 23.)

**Recipe for a "Healthy Society"—**

**Lord Hailsham**

"A free society requires the existence of at least two parties, each more or less (sic) respectable, and each devoted to a more or less reputable set of political principles. A society in which the political struggle can be plausibly represented as a battle between right and wrong is clearly on the verge of losing its liberty or of attaining it only by violence. In a healthy society, the quarrel between the parties is on lines altogether more sedate, a debate as to the exact proportions in which ingredients shall be mixed, rather than as to the inclusion or exclusion of important ingredients altogether."—Lord Hailsham in the Spectator, July 8, 1955.

Lord Hailsham claims to be a "sincere Christian." We don't doubt his sincerity. But in regard to Christianity, does it claim to be concerned with the Truth or doesn't it? Is the Truth divisible or indivisible? If a political struggle is not to be between right and wrong, is it to be between right and right, and if so how can that be? Or, if it is to be between wrong and wrong, who wants that? Presumably Lord Hailsham is willing to defend his extraordinary thesis. We suggest that someone should write and question him about it; an interesting correspondence should ensue.

**Nearly Right**

"The HUMANIST or rationalist without faith, without principle, is in an untenable position. And if he thinks mere humanist sentiment will preserve even his basic liberties from the forces at work in the modern world to regiment all lives, to organise all opinion, he is widely mistaken.

"Only an organised authority can fight State power; a disciplined force always on the watch, a university, a union, a Church."

Curse of Adam Redeemed

Who Spurns Redemption?

It is doubtful whether there was any period in history when the ten commandments of the Old Testament and the one commandment of the New Testament were ignored so contemptuously by those in the seat of political power as to-day. Instead of condemning this deplorable tendency, as is their duty, some leading churchmen, even clerics, try to excuse it. There was a time when men became politicians from a sense of duty towards their fellow citizens. Now most politicians are professionals, i.e., going into Parliament is treated as a career. Although the moral deterioration has more or less coincided with the change in type of politician, it would be wrong to say that the former was a cause of the latter. It is not as simple as that.

Parliament being filled with careerists need not in itself cause moral deterioration. Invest those careerists however with power and we have a situation where men are thrown like froth to the top who are either themselves power maniacs or are content to appear to wield power while in fact serving occult forces of Evil the public know little or nothing about and the existence of which the majority not even suspect. The unperverted British Constitution had a safeguard against this situation, the intervention by the House of Lords. It was precisely the Lords Spiritual whose duty it was and is to condemn the moral deterioration in politics and its causes. The Lords Spiritual with the exception of a few half-hearted efforts have signally failed in their duty.

Many instances of violation of Christian principles arise from adherence to financial “laws,” most of which are mere custom with a superficial legal backing. As if such man-made customs and regulations could contend with God’s Law, the Law of the Universe! Mercy, Charity, Self-development, Altruism, Generosity, Responsibility and all other Christian virtues can only be exercised freely in a society where members are financially unembarrassed, economically independent. How is it then that the Churches have not yet openly condemned a policy that forces almost all people to work for a system that withholds that independence, that is to say, a system where the means of production, when the means are already adequate, are not accessible to the free service that is a Christian ideal. It would subvert the forces of Light and of Darkness fought so openly and so desperately for the salvation of or the supremacy over mankind as in our day. The critics who contend that the Church should not interfere in politics or finance in active condemnation of evil practices are agents of the forces of Darkness, of Evil. Alas those in the armies of the forces of Light are few and Evil is entrenched in key positions. To many the situation seems hopeless because mankind seems smitten with a blindness that passes comprehension. Remember what difference a glimmer of light can make in a room up to then pitch dark. For the Churches to stand idly by without identifying themselves with so eminently Christian a solution, as we have been advocating, is nothing less than a betrayal of Christ. But we laymen are also members of the Church and as such we must continue to fight the Good Fight.

H. R. PURCHASE.

Training Technicians

The Fate of the Grammar School

by PETER DOWDEN.

By kind permission of the editor and Mr. Peter Dowden we reprint below an article which was published in The Tablet for July 2, 1955.

The most discouraging fact about the post-1944 Act Grammar School (would it be wrong to call it the Butler-Ede Grammar School?) is that it is quickly ceasing to be an educational institution for human beings and is fast becoming a forcing-bed for technicians. This is not altogether the fault of those who framed the Act, which is in fact, in its effects, a measure both of what politicians can set in motion and of what they cannot possibly control. Not that, in this case, they did initiate the most important developments: on the contrary, they terminated the most hopeful of these when they abolished the fees, and gave a notable encouragement to those which promised ill. It is a classic example of what happens when the State interferes directly with a social organism without regard to what might be called the laws of its being.

As a result of abolishing the fees of all except the Direct-Grant Grammar Schools (and these are a very small proportion of the whole) those who framed the 1944 Act ensured the opening of the doors of these Schools, not to children any more educable than before, but to children of a different sort of parent, the skilled and semi-skilled artisans and lower-paid clerks. Whereas before the Act the
sons and daughters of the local doctor and solicitor might
be found at the local Grammar School, now they are much
to more likely to be found elsewhere. The professional parent
today tries hard to avoid the grammar school if he possibly
can. This does not mean that the new kind of parents are
all without interest in the education of their children. Few
of them have any idea what education implies, but a large
number are pathetically anxious that their children shall have
“a better job” after school than they had when they left, and
therefore mind very much that the requisite examinations
shall be passed. Thus there is within the school a great
pressure to push and force unwilling and unable candidates
through unsuitable examinations and it is impossible to avoid
the comparison between this sort of thing and the activities
of a sausage-machine.

When it comes to the choice of a career, the majority of
the parents are quite helpless. A meeting of parents is held,
and the local Youth Employment Officer gives an address,
working through all the possibilities and all the combinations
of passes in examination subjects required. From this welter,
one thing emerges pre-eminient. It is possible to go to the
University with very little expense, and, if your son reads
Science there, a well-paid future is assured. Even if he does
not read Science, there appears to be something attractive
in sending your son to College, since it does not apparently
cost anything. And so the Sixth Form is filled up, roughly
in the proportion of two to one in favour of the “Scientists.”
A few examples will bear this out: two London Suburban
Grammar Schools possess between them 162 Sixth Form
boys, of whom 104 read science subjects. On the other hand
a Catholic Grammar School in London has twenty-six reading
Science and fourteen humane subjects. Another
Grammar School in the North has forty Sixth Formers of
whom twenty-six read Science. In the case of the Girls’
Schools there are, naturally, a much higher proportion of
pupils reading humane subjects.

Whatever the reasons for this marked devotion to the
natural sciences (and the ease with which science graduates
obtain highly-paid posts in industry is obviously one of them)
the fact is that the best brains in the Boys’ Grammar Schools
do not receive a humanist training beyond the elementary
level. Humanists are not coming out of the Grammar School.

It is the notorious complaint within the schools of masters
responsible for the humane subjects that when they find,
rarely enough, a promising pupil in the Fifth Form, if he goes
into the Sixth Form at all, it is to read Science.

It is, of course, perfectly possible for a scientist to be
an educated person, and the debate between the humanists
and the scientists, pursued ad nauseam in most Grammar
School Common Rooms, is very unprofitable; but, because
the average Grammar School pupil starts with so very little
in the way of a cultural background, and because it requires
such a great effort to get him through his chosen Science
subjects to a University Scholarship or Award of one sort
or another, leaving no time or energy for broader pursuits,
he generally comes down from the University, having there
pursued his single study to the exclusion of all else, with a
mind even less cultivated, and sometimes even more narrowed,
than when he went up. Worse, he not infrequently ploughs
himself back into the ground from which he sprang by be-
coming a Science Master. But there is no need to go beyond

the average science Sixth Former’s general essay, forced upon
him by Headmasters struggling bravely with the tide of
illiteracy, to see what sort of an end-product the Grammar
Schools have to show. It is common ground between all
who teach in the Sixth Form that, in this vital matter of
writing a short piece of good English, the “Scientist” norm-
ally never gets further than the point at which he just scraped
through the English Language paper in the Fifth Form.
Once into the Sixth, and he abandons any serious study of his
native tongue. There is simply no time for it.

The recent substantial salary awards, wrung out of a
quite inadequate Burnham Committee by the Minister him-
self, as a result of which, in a large Grammar School, the
Head of a Department is to receive, as a minimum allowance
above his basic scale, £350 per annum, may have far-reaching
results, possibly the opposite of those intended. The awards
may, though there is no reason why they must, attract more
and abler science teachers for the pupils of whom there is
no shortage. But as the new salaries must be paid equally
to those responsible for the humane subjects, there is an
equal, and perhaps a greater, possibility of attracting the
ablest of the Arts graduates. There is for them a much
greater difficulty than for the Scientist of obtaining suitable
employment in other fields, and it is at least arguable that
education is a more attractive activity to the humanist, than
it is to the scientist who today finds it more rewarding to
apply his techniques to the world about him than to instruct
others how to do so. It is therefore possible that a new
enthusiasm for the humanities may reach the Sixth Form.

It is certainly vital that it should do so. It is one of
the ironies of recent history that, whereas the 1944 Act, like
so much of the social legislation that has created the Welfare
State, was intended to smooth out inequalities and offer
wider opportunities, what it has in fact done, and is doing,
is actually to widen the gulf between those who can afford
to pay for their education at a Public School and those
who have to avail themselves of the “free” system. There
may be little to choose between the incomes of an Industrial
Research Chemist—educated at a grammar school and “Red-
brick,” and a Senior Civil Servant educated at a public
school and Oxford or Cambridge, but there is a great deal
to choose between their cultural levels. Indeed, the gulf is
wider now than it was between the Wars, when, with fees
and a generous number of free places for the really able,
Grammar School was moving towards a position much nearer
to that of the public school. The present growing gulf is
simply, that which exists between an educated and an un-
educated man, and the simple charge to be levelled at the
Grammar School is that, even where its “results” are good
(i.e., a high number of examination successes) it fails to
educate.

The implications are far-reaching. On the one hand
there is a relatively small number of civilised persons, with
a long and noble tradition of independent struggle and initia-
tive behind them, and these on the whole preside over the
nation’s affairs; whilst on the other hand, there is a growing
army of uniformed, cultureless, rootless, but not unintelligent
technicians, owing their present status in society entirely
to the State, and ready to be organised entirely in its service.