

NORMAN GLAISTER AND SENSORY PROCESS BEFORE THE FOUNDING OF BRAZIERS PARK

Introduction

In 1919 Norman Glaister left Palestine and his experiences in the Royal Medical Corps in the First World War to return to Chertsey. Still raw from grief at his wife's early death in the influenza epidemic, he needed to become more fully acquainted with his three children, consolidate his medical status by taking the MB BS London (Surgery) and increase his knowledge and experience of psychotherapy. He was 37. As his sister Marion had also died in the same epidemic, Norman Glaister and his brother-in-law were able to give each other some support in the evenings and weekends, and rely on Grandma Sowerbutts for her continual care for, and interest in, the youngsters. This gave the fathers some freedom beyond their work and household organization. The house and bungalows at Chertsey were well suited to accommodate three households, an extended family, in fact, in a semi-rural setting.

Before this period, however, Norman Glaister, in 1916, had already begun formulating a constitution for a society "which would unite all men of goodwill and provide an instrument by whose aid the altruistic effects of such men (and women) could be directed into effective channels." This information was included in Norman Glaister's first letter to Wilfred Trotter, dated 19:1:19 and written at Haifa. He explains that three or four of the men had begun to live as such a society in which "absolute altruism was demanded of members in all their activities as members of the Society, but there was to be no restraint upon activities outside the Society, provided they did not bring it into disrepute. The final penalty was expulsion." Wilfred Trotter was the first scientist to explore the psychological differences characterising three species of herd animals and consider their implications for mankind. His book, "**Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War**", asserted that humanity's survival into the future depended on the urgent need for two types of people, whom he termed "resistive" and "unstable", to master a way of living and organising society with greater mutual understanding and co-operation. Glaister had found this book in the officers' mess in Palestine and it transformed his life. Trotter's idea was the stimulus for Glaister's making contact in the letter quoted above which described the calibre of two or three people whom Glaister thought he could bring to* Trotter if the latter already had a group working on his ideas. Glaister adds more details of the Society's programme. Members would be expected to find accurate information on any topic that others would value and use. Discussion of such national or general human interest would follow. The expression of opinions without an adequate basis of agreed fact was to be discouraged. A final record would be made of any important new views achieved, and of decisions – or partial decisions – commanding general acceptance. The dissemination of information and ideas among the members and the creation of subsidiary organizations would give effect to the considered views of the Society. Is there something of Braziers already in these aspirations?

Trotter was agreeable to Glaister developing his ideas but had no intention of experimenting himself, being concerned to concentrate on his career as a surgeon. Glaister too had to complete his medical qualifications, attend to the children's education and adjust again to life in England.

This was the period that he later referred to as those six or seven years when he had sought, among various organizations, without success, for a body of men and women

able and willing to devote some real part of their own lives to the service of a living social organism [Quoted by John Woodcock. in “**Research Communications** No.16” (pp 4-5).

For a time he contemplated opening a school, since he felt children learned their attitudes to life, situations and people, through the quality of the adults in charge who would offer the children experiences which would enable them to make positive and balanced choices at the time, and in later life. However, diminishing finances and lack of appropriate teaching skills made it impossible for himself to teach, or open a school. So, Glaister settled for general practice and psychological work for the Clinic.

The Order of Woodcraft Chivalry

The Order of Woodcraft Chivalry, a camping organisation, offered children the experience of living close to nature and of experiencing for themselves something of the early forms of survival – hunting and gathering, growing things to eat and the care of animals. This aspect of recapitulation theory in practice was probably a strong attraction for Norman Glaister to join the Order in 1924. Another inducement must have been that the whole family could go to the Folkmoot, the annual camp, since adults had recently been allowed to attend. Meeting Theodore Faithfull, head of Priory Gate School, and Dorothy Revel (whom he later married) enlarged his knowledge of progressive education. Since the war, Norman Glaister had begun to make a serious study of psychology – naturally Freud. He records that he had previously studied “a concept of the human mind as a biological unit resulting from a progressive experience of successful reactions to a series of environmental changes by approximately similar ancestral units in the past.” As well as this specialised approach he also claimed in 1926 in his letter to The Directors, Maltings House, Cambridge to have a strong interest in a great variety of subjects, an interest that had developed from the age of 18 but, significantly, he felt they “cannot be studied effectively when in isolated water-tight compartments.”

Norman Glaister’s own experience may well have had a bearing on his desire for a flexible, rather than a rigid, education for his own children. He was one of those rare people in whose youth a prolonged period of illness removes them from school, and provides them with plenty of quiet reading and thinking time. Such people often demonstrate originality, creativity and inventiveness later on. A back injury in Norman’s mid-teens required a year’s absence from formal education and it was thought that he would be unable to catch up sufficiently to go to university, but by 1905 he had qualified as a doctor. So to find at last, when he joined the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry in 1924, a number of intelligent, innovative and liberal-minded people with many interests, he must have been mightily pleased. Dorothy Revel, for instance, was applying Jung’s ideas to improving the education of youngsters and writing a book, which later became “**Cheiron’s Cave**” (Heinemann 1928). Here was fertile ground for him to apply and discuss Wilfred Trotter’s ideas.

He gave a lecture at a Wayfarers’ Camp only two years after joining the Order. It was entitled ‘The Order as a Social Organism’ and, according to Glynn Faithful and D. Edgell, was printed in Pine Cone for October 1925. So far we have found a copy but not the original. In it, Glaister has already replaced Trotter’s term “unstable” by “sensitive” and he considers that everyone employs both responses to life. On emerging from the womb and later, in moving from family security into the world at large, the infant and adolescent first assume a “resistive” approach, confidently expecting that external circumstances exist to satisfy their needs. When discomfort

accompanies failure to exploit a new situation, the individual, at both stages, has to adapt him/herself to be more in tune with the environment. This thoughtful self-modification is a “sensitive” one. Repeated experiment with both modes will establish which approach is preferred. Ultimately, those making the “resistive” choice will depend for decisions on what has worked well in the past, and those making the “sensitive” choice, in wanting to adjust to current changes and possibilities, try to facilitate what may bring benefit in the future. In fact therefore, each person and each culture is a product of all the previous stages of body and thinking, that have contributed to their physical and mental mind-set. We now, as conscious beings, learning from past experience, need to appreciate and develop a good balance of the two approaches. He suggested ‘a specialisation of minds’ to develop the organisation as a whole.

In fact, in the mid- 1920.s senior members who were over 25 constituted themselves as the ‘Wayfarer’s Guild’. Then, in 1927, 18 of these people ‘The Circle’, were selected to act as “sensitive brains”, meeting fortnightly to discuss topics that were already causing dissention – religion, attitudes to sex, alcohol, peace and war. Aubrey Westlake and Dr. Jennings White were the leaders with power to set up the group, which included Norman and Dorothy. The Circle made a mistake. To ensure the expression of frank and honest views, an element of secrecy surrounded their meetings of about 20 members. Such caution worked against them a year later when their uncomfortably radical reports were published. The Circle had influenced the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry’s Chieftain-Elect (Aubrey Westlake) but there was strong criticism from the Order for not taking more people into their confidence about their findings at an earlier stage and for taking action without being a constitutional body. The situation was clouded further in 1928 by Aubrey Westlake’s desire to become Chieftain in his own right. He proposed taking some power from Folkmoot by choosing his own Keeper of the Fire, Norman Glaister. This role was well suited to Norman, and allowed him to highlight the sensory possibilities of a structure already in existence.

The Order was divided into three layers, social Lodges, regional Guilds and, at the top, the British Chieftain with his Marshal and Council of Leaders on the executive side. There was, in addition, a parallel structure of advisory bodies at each of the three levels, the leaders of these being termed Keepers of the Fire. The Grand Keeper of the Fire, at national level, was responsible for the spiritual, creative, innovative and caring aspects of the Order. He also had an Advisory Council as support. Norman became Grand Keeper of the Fire in 1928 and, always working to familiarise people with the Resistive and Sensitive thinking, he aimed to embody the concepts in a new constitution. Despite opposition, he carried the day at the Folkmoot of 1929 so Clause A of the Constitution read “The British Chieftain shall represent the resistive, and the Keeper of the Fire, the sensitive side of the Order.” A later clause stated that “The Advisory Council shall actively explore, co-ordinate and promote the mental (social, religious, intellectual) life of the order, keeping in touch with all thought and ideas whether in or without the Order and shall ensure that the Council of Leaders is kept in touch with whatever is of value.” You notice the resistives are keeping the sensitives at a slight distance. There is greater cordiality later on where the Keeper of Fire is responsible for maintaining the traditions of the Fire and for preserving, as a living force, the spiritual life of the Order. (See pp 9-10 in “**Research Communications**” No.13 .

It must be said that Aubrey Westlake's desire in 1928 to take over the Chieftainship and demand the privilege of making an appointment normally in the hands of the Folkmoot had increased the anger of the critics of the Circle, though it helped pave the way for the passing of the new constitution which clarified responsibilities. In fact, though some changes had been made at the last minute, 248 people attended the Folkmoot in 1929 when the constitution was passed. It was a real achievement to have the recognition of a Sensory Advisory Committee and the executive Council of Guidance enshrined in the constitution.

It would be pleasant to report that the new Resistive/Sensitive management team functioned vigorously for many years, but the rise of fascism in the 30's with its emphasis on youth and a new order, began to affect the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry. A group of four, led by Aubrey Westlake, wanted a more rigid, hierarchical regime with power to discipline members. Faced with what promised to develop into a complete dictatorship, some feared it marked the total end of the Order. However, it was decided that the current top officials should withdraw from all administrative power for 6 months to give everyone a breathing space for negotiation, clarification and new planning. Meanwhile a group of younger Waywardens (18-25 year olds) was empowered to run the Order for that period. As Glynn Faithfull was the principal actor in this group, the Resistive/Sensitive idea was neither forgotten nor neglected. In fact, Edgell in his **"The Order of Woodcraft Chivalry 1916- 1949 as a New Age Alternative to the Boy Scouts"** (p535) quotes Glynn as very responsibly interpreting a problem concerning Grith Fyrd. This was a movement set up by Order of Woodcraft Chivalry members to offer young unemployed men the chance of a healthy and adventurous life in a non-military camp where they had experience and training in survival in a rural setting with a view to improving their self-reliance and their quality of life by building their own serviceable wooden huts and organising their activities. Glynn explained, 'When Grith Fyrd was founded, Desmos (Norman) was a sensitive but he had to take up resistive work and organisation. Consequently there was a clash between two people acting resistively, Desmos and Golden Eagle (Aubrey Westlake). The latter's drive for power suggests that he had little real understanding of Norman's and Wilfred Trotter's theories. He may simply have wished to set them aside or use the ideas serially to characterise different periods of Order of Woodcraft Chivalry's history. Thus in his "Outline History of the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry 1916-1976" – no.25 in the "Woodcraft Way" series – Westlake identifies three phases in the period 1920-35, the first being resistive, the next sensitive and the last returning to resistive. The middle period 1924-30 was the time when Norman was most active.

By 1935 Norman Glaister and Dorothy Revel were married, their troth-plighting having taken place at the Folkmoot in 1930 and their sons, Brian and Siward, were born in 1934 and 1936 respectively. The social experiment in the Order, as Norman had envisaged it, was over because, although the Advisory Council continued, the function of the Keeper of the Fire was shared among six people. Norman played a much less active and important role there. Nevertheless, dual governance had been tried for seven years.

Common Wealth Summer Schools 1947-49, and plans for Friends of the Future

In 1941, during World War II, Sir Richard Acland founded a new political party, Common Wealth, which Norman Glaister joined. In fact, it had been mooted that the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry should affiliate en bloc but this did not happen. Instead,

another group had been set up, called **“Our Struggle”**, in the late 1930’s and it was this group that became part of Common Wealth.

In May, 1942, The Hornsey Journal gives an unexpectedly long report of a “sparsely attended meeting” of the Highgate “Our Struggle” group of which Norman Glaister was the President. He strongly recommends that they should start thinking of peace aims since a protracted war would lead to negative ideas and result in attempts to structure a disorganised world in a dictatorial “purely Nazi way”, whereas “The kind of science to guide us is the science of living things not dead... We want to sow the seed of a living plant.... We must deal with our nation as a living thing and not merely as a piece of machinery.” The newspaper then reports Norman’s conviction about the ultimate significance of developing an equal balance of the two types of mind.

“The present world situation must be regarded not merely as a great crisis of Europe or of our civilisation, but also as an upheaval such as has only appeared three or four times in the history of this planet – a development in evolution. As atoms had joined to form cells, and cells to form bodies and bodies had developed by stages into mankind, so now there was a trend towards the linking of human minds. Modern psychology divided minds into two classes, resistive and adaptive; if these two classes could be linked, they would together cover the whole field of life.”

As early as November 1942, a resolution was submitted by the Hornsey and Wood Green Branch for consideration by the Constitution Committee. It is the opening gambit in Norman’s ambitious drive towards instituting a Sensory Committee in Common Wealth and it was to be five years before the first Sensory Committee meeting proper took place. The primary concerns of the National Executive committee would naturally be recruitment policy, candidates to stand for Parliament and issues to raise once there. Common Wealth’s desire to create a ‘Vital Democracy’ and common ownership would probably attract both strong idealists and also people wanting to get things done. It is also likely that executive-oriented people would form most of the committees at branch, regional and national level. In 18 branches located in Scotland, Wales and England there would be a lot of people to contact, so it is surprising that the creation of a sensory committee here was achieved in the same length of time taken by the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry which already had an advisory body.

The Hornsey and Wood Green resolution simply proposes a differentiation of function in the governing body, and also within the branches and future subsidiary bodies. What afterwards will be termed Sensory is introduced thus. ‘The self-critical or corrective function must be above considerations of time and expediency, and fully open to all criticisms from within or without the movement’. It should be regarded as of equal importance with the executive function. In comparing the actions of the two committees, the resolution continues ‘The advisory committee should express their opinions with as much sense of responsibility as if they had themselves to act upon them, and as if it were binding upon all executive action; and their members should feel at fault if their advice had failed to obtain ready acceptance from the corresponding committee’. Note that the advisory concept is retained from the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry and equality is stressed more than formerly. The executive committee is still the final decision maker, but its members “should feel profoundly uneasy if the committee has been obliged to act without the full approval of the corresponding advisory committee”.

The single sheet of paper suffered the fate of many a new idea. It was received by the area secretary but not put to the relevant committee framing a draft constitution to be discussed at the next conference. An attempt to raise the matter at the conference itself to reveal the wider implications of the ideas was quashed because 'they had run out of time'. New ideas do invite martyrdom. But we must remember that the crises of bombing, fire-fighting and air-raid duties, as well as rationing, formed a backcloth to the early years of Common Wealth.

When the resolution ultimately reached the appropriate destination, the Chairman doubted the competence of the committee to deal with such an innovation, clearly hoping the National Executive would take responsibility. They hadn't time. No doubt a true but familiar excuse! Only a few months after the conference in which the resolution was finally raised, Hubert Wilson and Norman, responding to the confusion and puzzled reactions prompted by the novel, innovative resolution, submitted four foolscap sheets in June 1943 entitled 'An explanatory memorandum on the need for an advisory or consultative committee'. This argues the need, the function, the constitutional status and the membership and method of appointment of such a committee. It also examines one or two incidents from the recent Easter conference to illustrate how an advisory body could have benefited the situation. Note the word 'consultative' instead of "adaptive" or "advisory"- added by way of conciliation?

Some enthusiastic branch members begin nominating people for the Sensory Committee straight away, not realising that the issue is not due to be raised till 1944.

Meanwhile, at the request of the Constitution Committee, Norman Glaister and Hubert Wilson (Chairman of the Hornsey and Wood Green Branch) had prepared nine pages of foolscap described as 'an essay on democracy' and entitled "The Advisory Function, Why and How". We have part of it in Norman's handwriting but, from the written side annotations and the accompanying letter by Hubert Wilson, it is clear that a few of the ideas and the format itself are in his hands. It deals with the unsatisfactoriness of knowing a limited part of public opinion only every five years, the failure of majority decisions often to deliver the best policies, and the interest in ideas based on whether they support party doctrine and not whether they are true. Minority opinions are not necessarily to be considered wrong. It points out the need for men of ideas (as opposed to men of action) who could function as a 'sensory body' rather than an 'advisory committee' since the word 'advisory' might suggest claims to superior wisdom for its members. The Sensory Committee "might be a nervous system for the Governing Body. The sensory system constantly brings to the brain up-to-the-minute information of the local conditions in every part of the body so that the motor action may be perfectly co-ordinated." This is the form that next goes to the Constitution Committee, along with the clearly emphasised idea that not all the brains in the movement are already employed on committees.

The whole paper is objective, appealing to reason and a desire for efficiency. It firmly counters potential criticism and reminds readers that democracy is not enough and a Vital Democracy should provide a permanent machinery to give a voice both to minorities and to changing opinions in the country. Softer words are used when describing the second committee which requires 'receptive or digestive' attitudes to new ideas.

The language used in the Common Wealth papers that we have is very revealing in my opinion. "Resistive" appears regularly, but "executive", the alternative, frequently. Various adjectives were used for the second body, some responsible like "sensitive",

tactful like “adaptive”, challenging like “advisory” but “sensory” seems only to be acceptable when the longer documents are seriously under discussion. This verbal dance suggests that, although it was adopted in the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry, the final “sensory” was not yet set in stone. Another interesting feature is that rejections of a second, balancing committee usually assume that all brainpower is executive; and that two committees would slow down procedures or result in rivalry. In fact there is a reluctance to share power. No-one seems to raise interest in, or sensitivity about, the psychological aspects of the terms for individuals, or whether it is more desirable to be one rather than the other.

It is inconceivable that Norman expunged them from his mind, but the pressures of the current state of the world probably inclined him to concentrate on group/herd reactions rather than touch on more personal issues, emotive as we know they can be.

There followed a period of caution. A ‘Sensory Committee Group’ was set up in April 1944 to explore the possible nature and function of this second body. The Group’s findings were to consider specific proposals, which could be circulated through the Branches before anything became official. It did not meet until July. There was still great opposition from Sir Richard Acland himself and important people like the Rev. Dr. Jas. Parkes, an Anglican clergyman, and Prof. John Macmurray, the philosopher. Preoccupation with the association’s financial problems – general and particular- did not help. Correspondence shows that after Norman had personally cleared up some misconceptions with these people, and the Sensory Committee Group had decided to give up the idea of the advisory function completely, the problems were resolved. So in January 1945, “ Why Sensory? – an essay in Vital Democracy” was circulated to Branches and to every member attending the 1945 conference. This was the latest version of ‘The Advisory Function: Why and How’ and is the document Braziers has adopted and used as its brochure [1950].

In May 1946 a conference committee spent seven weekends making a draft constitution for the National Executive. They then met with National Executive members to finalise it by March 1947. So, after the conference that year, Common Wealth’s first Sensory Committee meeting took place in April 1947. Olaf Stapleton the novelist and John Macmurray were to be invited to join later. The first Common Wealth Sensory Summer School took place only 4 months after that.

That Sensory Summer School took place within three years of the founding of Braziers, which occurred as a result of this and two subsequent Summer Schools. The fact that the proceedings of all three were recorded, duplicated and copies sold, shows how important they were to the Braziers group. I first read the last of them in 1954 but had access to the first only in the 80’s when Norman’s drop-fronted filing cabinet could be opened. I assumed that the report for 1948 had been completely sold out until Cassie Russell’s papers came our way. Even though I’d read all three, their significance escaped me until preparations began for this paper.

The advantages of a Summer School over regular committee meetings are the continuity in conversation, the sharing of meals and leisure, and the way the interplay of minds has a better chance of weaving an atmosphere that creates a new tapestry of thought.

The titles and aims are illuminating, “Our mutual fear, our mutual responsibility” in 1947 is set in the shadow of an atomic bomb holocaust with the anxious knowledge that power often rests in the hands of abnormal individuals. The group are “... a small

number of people anxious about the state of the world and feeling some responsibility for it, who have come together for mutual support and instruction. We hope, with each other's help, to work out and demonstrate a technique, which will combine self-control and deliberation with decisive action; and we may lay the foundation of a plan to restore a sense of agreed purpose and value to human life."

L.L. Whyte, whose book '**The Next Development in Man**' Norman had read with mounting excitement, was the principal speaker and he provided major inspiration. He asserted that Europe had lived through the dualistic interpretation of life and the universe, and had begun to replace this with a unitary view of reality. This view, as John Woodcock rightly pointed out, is now accepted by scientists like Rupert Sheldrake, who trace the pattern through every organisational level. L.L. Whyte maintained that all processes are to be understood as "form in development" and that every process will tend to perfect its own form. Mental processes are cumulative – the development of the whole system is really what happens; the interaction of the parts becomes the mechanism of part of the process so dualisms are aspects of a single process.

L.L. Whyte lit a torch for Norman. The biological approach to life, man's gregariousness, J. Huxley's views of progress and now process as form in development gave him his mature philosophy and his interest in evolution was strengthened by concern for the future. Others too caught the excitement and hopeful trust in possibilities. The strongly held conclusion from the week was that "there was nothing for it but unitary living whatever the cost". In Glynn Faithfull's words "Unitary man should not allow himself to be forced into blind partisanship or into saying that one view is right and the other wrong. Things for him should not be black or white: either/or should have no place in his philosophy. The positive approach is the only sane approach." At its simplest it involved trying to see what the other chap is getting at and looking for common ground for action instead of dwelling on points of difference. Later on, L.L. Whyte attended the opening of Braziers.

The last lecture, interestingly, outlined the creation of 'a ministry of individual approach' whereby sensory groups at every level of society would be aware of changes in current opinions and therefore be able to challenge politicians, or inform them of their views on a regular basis. Sensory process was for everyone. There is an echo here of what was proposed for Common Wealth.

The theme for the Sensory Summer School in 1948 had wide implications. 'The tension between East and West: a realistic approach to its solution' proposed 'to discuss the social and moral aspects of the world crisis, to work out some degree of orientation which can serve the purpose of action. Emphasis will be on the sensory element. Normal methods of debate will be abandoned and an attempt will be made to evolve a really democratic technique of discussion which will re-integrate the over-separated objective and subjective aspects.'

Formal lectures still sought for common ground or universal aspects of the chosen subject but, in addition this year, much more of the discussion was also reported. This year the major experiment was to increase awareness of the Resistive and Sensory elements in discussions. Two people were in overall charge of monitoring this. They arranged for pairs of observers on a rota to make notes on the sessions. One did the conventional (Resistive) recording of the lecture and the other took notes on how discussions might fluctuate from being Resistive or Sensory and what seemed to trigger that change. It was agreed that, if discussion came to an impasse, the observer

could interrupt, call for a sensory phase to solve the problem and thereby enlarge the group's self awareness. Time was made available, on the same day as a key-note talk, for observers to write up their findings while others sawed wood for the fire, helped the kitchen staff or walked.

In 1948 titles like 'Freedom and society' and 'The problem of social discipline' were typical, but, as has already been mentioned, for the first time as far as our records suggest, the full panoply of Trotter's ideas, the gregarious habit and the Resistive /Sensory concept were covered extensively as if laying down the framework for future development. There is a new sense of confidence, determination and an ambition to make progress from first principles – and to many, much of this would be new. I think 44 people passed through the Summer School during the fortnight.

Reference was made to the Resistive/Sensory team to stress the idea that it was the creative balance of the two functions that would improve action. Their main task was to increase the positive and reduce the negative element in all situations, to try to see issues not in dualistic terms but to find a unitary approach. It was noted that items for an agenda might be discussed in order of positivity. (Interesting experiments with the agenda have also occurred in recent years.) It was noted that the Common Wealth Sensory Committee's decision to drop the 'advisory function' had benefited its working progress. It had proved to be a matter of conviction not expediency.

Another example of social experimentation is referred to in discussing 'A positive plan of action'. This was the formation of another society 'Friends of the Future' in May 1948. See Maurice Roth's 'Friends of the Future' which includes the vital text of their proposed aims and principles. However, it was during the Summer School's session about the proposed Resistive / Sensory organisation of the new society that participants first used their new discussion technique. An 'executive' recorder noted the content and major points of the lecture, the 'sensory' observer noted ways in which the dialogue took shape and the interplay of participants' positive and negative reactions. In this same session these two observers halted the debate to correct the balance, so that the session began as Resistive, became Sensory and reverted to Resistive. Certainly the new society would have a freer agenda than Common Wealth with its themes of 'Conscription', 'The abolition of the House of Lords' and 'The law as it relates to the proscription of spiritualism'. Perhaps it is natural they should decide that Friends of the Future would be non-political or extra-political.

At first, it appears quixotic to start a new society within a year of establishing the Common Wealth's Sensory Committee. But I think that was the point. Under the banner of concern for the future, people would find it easier to move into other societies and the community at large to spread the idea of sensory input and the establishment of more sensory committees. Moreover, there would be a possibility of a second experiment, namely the comparison of how different sensory committees developed.

The current paper, which was presented as a talk in 2003, then referred briefly to the Sensory Summer School in 1949 on "The Future of Humanity". It indicated the breadth of topics relating to the serious issues in the national and world scene that concerned a responsible, thinking public. But chiefly it stressed the participants' increasing sense of satisfaction at the way both thinking and fellowship had developed through the blend of frankness in discussions, participation in walks, sharing domestic duties and tending fires. In fact, the enthusiasm, it could be argued, echoed what D. Edgell recorded about the Order of Woodcraft Chivalry early in 1930. "This

Movement was regarded by some of its members as consisting of more than the sum of its parts, somehow in possession of an indefinable, almost living quality...which made it akin to an organism.” The London Guild’s magazine “**The Scroll**” stated “It is significant of our Movement that few can explain it though many understand it. It is of the spirit, enlisting the heart.”

The paper ended with speculation as to what thinking and events occurred after August 1949 to bring about the founding of Braziers Park School of Integrative Social Research in 1950. Clearly it was time to open the box of archives labelled “Friends of the Future.”