

not heading or thinking in that direction. The pronouncements of individual leaders of the United Nations with few exceptions presuppose a return to the old pattern of absolute national sovereignties. The Atlantic Charter—the only document stating our aims in this struggle—accepts unquestioningly the anachronistic ideals of nationalism. It does not point the way to integration, to a closer unification of nations, to a system that would embrace all nations in ever larger and larger units. On the contrary, it again asserts that each nationality has the right to its own sovereign state and to its own form of government, no matter how anti-democratic. It again gives some nation, in another decade, the right to set up another Hitler regime if it so wishes, because—let this be quite clear—there can be no intervention until too late even if we possess an international police force so long as we base our international life on the notion of full national sovereignty.

The point is not that the Atlantic Charter lacks clarity—it is all too clear—but that its principles are basically false, and will lead us back into the morass of war. It is a recapitulation of the utopian Wilsonian ideas, which we have seen in

operation between the two world wars. It is folly to imagine that they will operate otherwise after the present war, because they remain at variance with the realities of the industrial epoch in which we live.

The Atlantic Charter must be seriously reconsidered. Its two authors, in particular, must ponder the perpetuation of nationalism, implicit and explicit in that document. To endure, the new democratic world order must be built upon a rock and not upon sand. We need to lay the foundations now of a democratic world order that will make intervention a duty, whenever the laws of the established order are violated. We need a new interpretation of "the nation" and of sovereignty—one that gives all nationalities total autonomy and full sovereign rights in their own cultural, national and local problems, but not beyond that. Only a division of sovereignties—reserving national sovereignty for national matters and international sovereignty for international matters—can give us the framework of a world constitution which will express again the democratic thought that sovereignty "resides in the community."

Towards a Greater Freedom

By ERNEST BARKER

THE British Empire is a growth of more than three hundred years. Each state of the growth was intended; the whole result was not. Each geographical part was incorporated by design: the whole mass was formed without planned design or previous resolution. That is the way in which things "grow" in the course of history—if we may use the word "growth" of human doings, which can never be strictly a matter of growth.

When things have grown in this way, and we find that we have builded better

than we knew, we have to take stock: we have to consider the whole result: we have to enquire what it means—and, still more, what it can be *made to mean*. That is what has been happening to us who are members of the British Empire: we are "taking stock." It is an old process, which may be said to have begun over a hundred years ago, in the beginning of the reign of Queen Victoria, with the publication of the Durham Report of 1839 on the problem of colonial self-government.

It is a process which was speeded up, a quarter of a century ago, about the year 1917, when the idea of Dominion

EDITOR'S NOTE: Ernest Barker is a distinguished Cambridge scholar, writer and expert on Political Science.

status swam into view, and the progressive realization of responsible government in India was enunciated as a goal of policy. It is a process which has been speeded up again in the course of the present war, when the position of the colonies in Africa, the West Indies, and the Far East, is being brought under review.

We have been asking all along, and we are asking more than ever to-day, "What does it all mean, and, still more, what can it be made to mean—not only for us, but also for the rest of the world, which may possibly find some help, some rallying-point, and some model, in this majestic, unintended, but always growing thing?"

Free Institutions Are the Life Blood

The British Empire, as it now stands, is a triple society. It is, in the first place, the British Commonwealth of Nations, or a Union of the United Kingdom and the self-governing Dominions in a voluntary association which is not a federation, nor even a confederation, but has none the less the intimate warmth of a common allegiance to the same Crown and the same ideals.

"Free institutions are its life-blood: free co-operation is its instrument." Such is the first, and such (in the genius of its freedom—but only in that genius, and simply by virtue of that genius) is the dominating, society of the British Empire.

In the second place, the British Empire is the Indian Empire—an empire standing next to the British Commonwealth of Nations, an empire coloured and moved by the genius of the Commonwealth, an empire already beginning to enter the Commonwealth, and destined to enter it plenary; but an empire so great, so varied in its communities, and raising such vital and peculiar problems of the contact and co-operation of East and West, that it must always stand as something unique and something entirely of its own kind. It offers, on a long view, the greatest opportunity in human history—the opportunity of bridging and uniting the Occident and the Orient, the two great halves of mankind.

Last, and in the third place, the British Empire is the colonial empire, or, as it is sometimes called (perhaps less happily) the dependent empire—an empire of colonies ranging, by infinite gradations, from the responsible government of Ceylon to the system of tutelage or trusteeship in other areas, but an empire which is being educated, and is more and more educating itself, to an ultimate consummation of full self-government in which it too, like the Indian Empire, will enter the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Meanwhile the colonial empire is the most remarkable of laboratories, full of tentative experiments in the great art of human government, tentative experiments always directed to the greater broadening of freedom. (On the day on which these words are written, the Colonial Secretary has just announced the offer of a new constitution for the island of Jamaica, in the West Indies, with a new scheme for an executive government half elected by a popular assembly, based on universal suffrage, and half nominated by the British Governor. The progressive experimentation of the great laboratory never stops.)

Control That Gives Way to Liberty

All the three societies of the British Empire are *one* round the pivot of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland—*one* round its King, who is not only *its* King, but the King of all the societies that are one round his person. To be one "round a pivot" is not necessarily to be controlled by the pivot. To some the pivot may be simply a magnet, drawing them into a system of voluntary co-operation for common and mutual benefit.

That is the case with the Dominions: it is coming to be the case with the Indian Empire: it is coming to be the case with the parts of the colonial empire which achieve responsible government. To others the pivot may be a control as well as a magnet. That is the case with the major part of the colonial empire.

But it is a control exercised in the interest and for the well-being of those

over whom it is exercised—and not only that (for that in itself might be a dominating and domineering thing, however well-intended), but also a control intended to give way to the liberty of free self-government, and so exercised, in the meantime, as to encourage and elicit the capacity for such government.

Political systems generally cohere by virtue of a large element of compulsion—legal or constitutional compulsion, backed in the last resort by that compulsion of force which always stands behind the compulsion of law. The political system of the British Commonwealth of Nations, which sets the tone and gives the colour to the whole of the Empire, is the only political system hitherto developed which coheres neither by law nor by force, but purely and solely by consent and the common acceptance of a "gentleman's agreement" as its basis.

A gentleman's agreement—a set of uncodified and unlegalized, but not unexpressed and certainly not unfelt, understandings—that is its foundation, and that too is its cement.

All Brothers Under the Skin

The compulsion of law, backed by the ultimate compulsion of force, may still continue to exist for a period of transition, in the Indian Empire; and it will continue to exist, for many years, in the colonial empire—but in differing degrees in its different parts—during the period of its progressive education and emancipation. But it is just and proper to repeat that the genius of the Commonwealth colours and inspires the whole; and the pattern of the Commonwealth is set before every part as the ultimate pattern and design for the structure of its own life. That pattern and design is one of agreement and understandings—not of law and force.

All this is a lesson and an example in the art of keeping together and living a common life—the art of tolerating differences, and of weaving differences together in a common agreement which is all the richer for the differences. It is a proud thing to be a British citizen in

company with the Australians and New Zealanders, the South Africans and the Canadians—in company with Punjabis and Bengalis, Rajputs and Sikhs, Hindus and Mohammedans—in company with Ceylonese and Malayese, Africans of Nigeria and Africans of Uganda, the peoples of the West Indies and the peoples of the Pacific Islands.

It is not only the magnitude or the dimension of so great a company that makes one proud; it is also, and it is even more, the rich sense of variety, and the feeling of a community in all the variety. We are brothers under the skin: we know how to keep together: we know how to pull together. Human fellowship—human neighbourliness—is a great and cardinal virtue. If we are to have peace in our children's time, and their children's time, it is a virtue that must be practised. The British Empire, with all its defects, deserves a salute from those who honour that virtue.

The Genius of the Empire

In that Empire all hold together; but each develops the genius of his own idiosyncrasy. We take the holding together for granted; nor have we greatly worried about systems and plans for securing cohesion. Ideas and schemes of imperial federation have indeed been mooted; but they have not been carried or practised. We desire no cramping system; we prefer an easy and loose-fitting vesture which permits and encourages growth; and the working of this preference may be seen in the proceedings of all our Imperial Conferences, and especially in those of the Conference of 1926, which gave us the great outlines of our working agreement and understanding.

The thing in which we are really interested, and the idea with which we are most concerned, is the idea and practice of variety of free growth—of the cultivation of every garden on its own lines, for the free production of its own fruits: this is the genius of the Empire; and it is the genius particularly and peculiarly of the colonial empire, with all its mosaic

of differences—a mosaic susceptible of no general pattern.

There is no typical colonial constitution for the colonial empire. May there never be any such thing! It is far better, infinitely better, to have the rich crop of experiments, each adjusted to local circumstances and local needs, which gives us the peculiar pattern of Ceylon (where one of the most significant and suggestive experiments has recently been made), the peculiar pattern of Nigeria (where a system of Indirect Rule began

which is one of the boldest of the Empire's constitutional experiments), the peculiar pattern just offered to Jamaica, and everywhere else, in all the continents and seas of the varied and diversified colonial empire, pattern on pattern as varied and diversified as the colonial empire itself. To proliferate, to germinate, to experiment, to grow—this is the genius of the colonial empire; and this is the genius of the whole empire, of which the colonial empire is so fascinating and so richly promising a part.

Adult Education and the Crisis of Democracy

By WATSON THOMSON

THE history and evolution of modern Democracy can be read between the lines of the story of Adult Education. From the beginning the two have gone hand in hand. Where democracy has flourished best (as in Britain, the Scandinavians, New Zealand, and certain parts of North America), there adult education also has been a sturdy growth. When democracy has been most heartily given over to individualism and the private profit motive, then was adult education mostly an affair of vocational evening classes to better one's economic and social status. And again, latterly, the glory having departed from the *laissez-faire* system, adult education comes to consist of handfuls of puzzled and disconsolate citizens meeting together as study-groups to discuss "the economic problem." It is not surprising therefore that the present war, being a struggle in which the very existence of democracy is jeopardized, is also a time when adult education has to accept changes which alter its character and may transform it out of existence, so far as any liberal understanding of the term is concerned.

Let's see, then, what's been happening to adult education in Canada in recent

years. The depression decade was the "study-group in economics" phase just described. But the meaning of that phase is worth fuller analysis. As compared with the earlier, vocational type, this later sort of adult education was more free from academic discipline and was an education, not of workers and careerists, but of citizens and persons. It was, in fact, more *total*; first, because it was a response to a deeper and more complex need; and secondly, because in the study-group setting it involved a more active and personal type of participation. Very often, too, in that same period, it was made still more inclusive and total by virtue of being related to an active social or political objective. Cases in point are the credit-union and cooperative study-groups of Antigonish and the partisan study-groups of the CCF and of Social Credit in Alberta. Needless to say, it was extremely worrying, if not positively distasteful to the academic purist, to find that, in such study-groups, emotional values crept in alongside the intellectual, and that tendenciousness of one sort or another began to undermine the straight, factual objectivity beloved of scholarship.

Then came the war. I well remember, as I sat up through that cataclysmic night listening to radio flashes confirming

EDITOR'S NOTE: Watson Thomson, well known throughout Canada from his radio broadcasts, is Director of Adult Education at the University of Manitoba.