

METATHINKING TOP-ECONOMY

Booklet Three

The SU-VOC Idea

Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community



*why and how to achieve a sense of
common purpose in the United Kingdom
and substantial new resources for the
voluntary sector through workers's
payroll giving*

Fred Freeman (edited by Eugene Halliday)

The Emblem

The Helping Hand emblem on the front cover is used by the members of *United Way International*. The UK member is the independent charity *United Trusts*.

Metathinking Top-economy

Metathinking is thinking which is directed to the true holistic and individual development of all humanity; *top-economy* is the economy of specific areas and places in which socially-functioning-profit is distinguished from (but may include) bank-account-profit. The aim is whole-group good. Not until *metathinking top-economy* is accepted and made operative by the majority of the electorate will all the propositions contained in these booklets on the subject prove their viability, but a suitable start forthwith can be made.

This booklet was published on behalf of Ishval in 2003 by:
The Melchisedec Press

ISBN No: 1-872240-23-2

Copyright has been waived

Institute for the Study of Hierological Values

registered charity No: 251136.

This charity, which is also known as *Ishval*, was formed in 1966 by the late Eugene Halliday with the following purpose:

the promotion and propagation of the principles of Truth in all religions, in order to achieve unity in the interpretation of sacred writings between all denominations. And mutual understanding and practice of the principles of Truth in a true spirit of ecumenism.

Contents

Preface	3
Introduction	4
the aim	
background information	
payroll giving and strong and healthy communities	
a co-ordinated nationwide service	
SU-VOC in Relation to Human Needs	8
the purpose and the idea	
the need for multacentralisation	
the role of the voluntary sector	
the role of SU-VOC within the voluntary sector	
belief forming the basis of the idea	
How SU-VOC Can Serve the Community	12
the concept of charity-banking	
the six SU-VOC bodies	
implementation	
Socio-Governmental Considerations	16
the effect on morale and donors' directive rights	
more response-able donors	
charity as the essential mediator	
ethical considerations on donors' directive rights	
a policy question	
support for the idea	
<i>Appendix:</i>	
Shared Giving and Workplace Trusts and Local Trusts	22
greatly increased payroll giving	
how the schemes operate	
shared payroll giving	
small employers and the self-employed	
administration costs	
co-operation from employers	
Glossary	28
Booklets on Metathinking Top-economy	<i>inside back cover</i>

Metathinking Top-economy

Booklet Three

The SU-VOC Idea

why and how to achieve a sense of common purpose in the United Kingdom and substantial new resources for the voluntary sector through workers' payroll giving, within a Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community ("SU-VOC")

Fred Freeman (edited by Eugene Halliday)

Preface

This booklet and the other booklets on metathinking top-economy have been written as an outcome of meetings with my enlightened friend the late Eugene Halliday, who died in 1987. The meetings mainly took place in the 1960s but, in accordance with Eugene's wishes, no action was taken during his lifetime to publish his wider teachings on metathinking top-economy.

The original aim of the meetings with Eugene was to formulate a socio-governmental justification for the development of a national charity-bank movement, which could be of service to the whole of the United Kingdom's voluntary sector. This was envisaged in a book then being written on why and how to form a Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community ("SU-VOC"). This was in due course published as *The SU-VOC Application*. Although it has been my privilege to be the author of that book, much of the philosophy and wisdom therein is from Eugene, who carefully edited the work. The SU-VOC idea is but one viable application of metathinking top-economy.

One justification for the wider work on metathinking top-economy was the likelihood of an eventual third world war which could have a cataclysmic effect on human consciousness. In the wake of such a calamity, there would be a demand for new institutions and new ways of looking at the socio-governmental order. Therefore, Eugene considered early preparation for such an eventuality would be prudent.

Even if the world is fortunate enough to escape Armageddon, the intensity of evolutionary movements will demand vast changes in social ethics. The growing and at present unchecked threat to the world environment is a typical example of this threat.

Eugene used *metawords* because, in a society which is increasingly knowledge based and participative, the determinative elements of that society require more facts and, either more precise definition and general understanding of those emotive words and phrases in common usage, which often are passively accepted in terms of the ill-defined concepts of bygone ages, or the replacement of those emotive words and phrases with new terms which will help modern man in society to create new understanding around the realities of the present, not conditioned by the myths of the past.

Introduction

the aim

“SU-VOC” is an acronym for “Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community”. On the basis of “where there is a will, there is a way”, the book *The SU-VOC Application*¹ suggests that in the United Kingdom substantial new resources for the voluntary sector could be developed through workers’ payroll giving, and that in the process, with the support of necessary widespread influential leadership, here termed “SU-VOC Confederation, significant progress could be made to achieve the following aim:

to achieve an organisation throughout the country which allows the human beings involved to co-operate with the greatest efficiency and with the least friction, and where there could be a community of interest and a sense of common purpose between all individuals and groups.

Work in furtherance of this aim could constitute a response to recognised need at this moment in time.

The SU-VOC Application has an extensive index and appendices, and outlines some feasible steps and procedures based on grass-roots democracy which might assist progress. It is however emphasised, neither the name “SU-VOC” nor any of the administrative suggestions need be considered as essential to the SU-VOC idea. They have been offered for consideration simply to provide positive responses to possible difficulties which might have been raised.

background information

Fred Freeman, a Liverpool businessman, deeply concerned with the social problems in the Liverpool City Area, saw the potential of the general application to the principles of charitable payroll giving for the voluntary sector as a whole of the National Savings movement idea.

¹ The second edition published 1983, of *The SU-VOC Application* by Fred Freeman (edited by Eugene Halliday) is available to borrow or to purchase from the United Trusts office. Alternatively, it may be purchased under ‘related works’ at <www.ishval.org.uk>. See inside back cover.

For 25 years he served on the Liverpool Trade Advisory Council for Industrial and Commercial National Savings, representing retail stores, and during this period he was closely involved with several well known voluntary organisations.

In 1973 he became Chairman of a charity *United Voluntary Organisations, Liverpool*, which had been formed in 1952 to raise payroll gifts to support a defined group of local charities. In 1975, the first edition of *The SU-VOC Application* was written, and in 1977 the charity's name was changed to *United Way of Merseyside*. It was also agreed that from 1983 onwards donor-groups at workplaces would be able to distribute their payroll gifts to their chosen charities. This principle was termed "*donors' directive rights*". The name *United Way of Merseyside* was later changed to *United Way* when the charity became an incorporated association and its services were extended beyond Merseyside.

In 1983, with the financial support of *United Way International*, a national charity was formed with the name *United Way of Great Britain*. This name was later changed to *United Funds*. The author was one of the two founders and its Honorary Treasurer. The other founder was the then Chairman of the *National Council for Voluntary Organisations*.

The work of *United Way of Great Britain* and *United Funds* led directly to the Government's legislation in 1987 and 1988, known as the *Payroll Giving Scheme*, which simplified tax-relief on charitable payroll giving. This led to the development of close co-operation between *United Way* and *Charities Aid Foundation*, which continues to this day, and to the introduction of the *Give As You Earn* and other payroll giving schemes.

When *United Way* became an impartial Inland Revenue appointed agency-charity, authorised to supply the *Give As You Earn (United Way)* payroll giving service, it was necessary for technical legal reasons for a new connected charity to be formed with the name *United Trusts*. The role of *United Trusts* is to assist local charities by encouraging united-community-wide fundraising through the formation of workplace trusts and local trusts.

Since the launch of the *Payroll Giving Scheme*, in 1988, nationwide payroll giving has been developed, but the results to date have been not achieved the levels of giving which were earlier

anticipated. This may be because the promotion of payroll giving has not been locally focused on a whole-community-good basis.

In the appendix it is suggested how greatly increased payroll giving could be achieved within the UK through what could be termed *shared giving*, and that this could be developed in addition to and parallel with existing payroll giving schemes, including the so-called *elective* or *standard* payroll giving schemes.

payroll giving and strong and healthy communities

There is at present a serious need in the United Kingdom for large numbers of citizens to participate in developing strong and active local communities.

One way in which this may occur could be through widespread workers' payroll giving focused on distribution decisions being made at workplaces or by local trusts formed by representatives of workplace trusts.

Experience has shown that workplace trust and local trust gift distribution decisions tend to support individual and local needs in the contributors' own local travel-to-work areas. This develops a more active community spirit and community awareness. It also benefits both the employee-contributors and their employers.

It is emphasised, it would not be the amount of the new money raised and distributed within the communities which would be of greatest importance - valuable, significant and much appreciated though that money could be. What would be most valuable, even if not consciously recognised, would be improved local community health. This would stem in part from the heightened morale experienced by donors, employers and community members in general, arising from the voluntary involvement and caring of large numbers of citizens.

There is no doubt that human-beings feel better if they are helpful to each other. For this reason, a labour force where management and workers are consciously co-operating to further the well-being of their community is likely to be a more productive labour force than otherwise. This obvious fact is one reason why enlightened managements at all levels could agree to supply their workforces, where requested, with payroll giving facilities which would encourage the distribution of payroll gifts by workplace trusts and by democratically structured local trusts.

a co-ordinated nationwide service

The voluntary sector is huge². Assuming large scale payroll giving for charitable purposes, it is recognised that it would not be a socially responsible policy to operate a gift distribution system solely dependent upon the decisions and actions of individual donors and workplace trusts. Inevitably some workplace trusts would prefer to leave to others the responsibility for distribution of their gifts through fund allocations. *The SU-VOC Application* envisages that local trusts as they develop may co-operate with other local trusts, and obtain access to skilled advice regarding gift distributions. This advice may be supplied multicentrally through a SU-VOC fund allocation advisory service.

It is anticipated the main function of each advisory service branch committee would relate to detailed fund allocations within its own committee-area. And that the concluding annual function of each advisory service branch committee would relate to the checking, approval and notification, direct to its corresponding charity-bank branch, of nationally co-ordinated advisory service recommendations applicable to the total sum available for fund allocations through that particular charity-bank branch.

To facilitate co-ordinated operation of the whole multicentral national advisory service, it is conceived that advisory service branch committees constitutionally could agree to follow harmonising recommendations, received by them from advisory service co-ordination committees, regarding the exact amounts of charity-money to be available for detailed fund allocations through each national, regional and local advisory service branch committee.

The delivery on a co-ordinative basis of necessary promotion, publicity and administrative services to workplace trusts and local trusts could be economically supplied multicentrally by a group of *service charities*. These charities could agree to use similar names with local identifications, such as "*United Trusts in Place-name*" or "*United Way of Place-name*".

² At the end of December 2002 the total number of charities in the UK was 186,582. Charity Commission report. Third Sector, 29 January 2003, pg. 2.

The service charities also could follow the successful examples of members of *United Way International* and seek, on a co-ordinated basis, to obtain free or sponsored television and other free media publicity. The appeal messages could be along the lines of requests to the general public to support their own local communities. For this purpose the service charities could agree to use a similarly designed and easily recognised logo.

If considered appropriate, the logo could be the internationally well-known *United Way Helping Hand Logo*. This logo is the one at present used by *United Trusts*, which is the legally independent UK member of *United Way International*. The logo is illustrated on the front cover of this booklet.

In 2001-02 *United Way of America* generated an estimated \$5 billion (£3.1 billion) to help American communities. Most of this money came from payroll giving. Despite differences between America and the UK, there is no reason to believe that individual citizens in both countries cannot prove equally willing to make payroll gifts in order to be helpful to each other.

With the exception of the appendix, the remainder of this booklet consists of summary information from *The SU-VOC Application*. Since that book was written, the *Government's Payroll Giving Scheme* has been introduced. It is suggested that many of the SU-VOC ideas are still relevant.

SU-VOC in Relation to Human Needs

the purpose and the idea

The purpose of the SU-VOC idea is to suggest how individuals within any area, who wish to benefit their community by direct personal voluntary involvement, may join with others to form local groups within an association which it is suggested could be developed either with the abbreviated title "*SU-VOC*", meaning "*Society of United Voluntary Organisations within Community*", or through use of some other name or names.

The SU-VOC idea, by whatever name, may be viewed both:

- as a way to improve further the social, economic and personal health of the nation at large and of its constituent groups and individuals, through increased free-will giving of services and monetary aid, and
- as a plan within the framework of national and local government boundaries to make charity more democratic, and thus to provide a responsible voluntary counterweight to national and local government bureaucracies.

A counterweight to government bureaucracy naturally will tend to orientate political thought towards a healthy relaxation of bureaucratic rigidity and the development of grass roots democracy. Grass roots democracy implies respect for the individual, and thus also the liberty of individual citizens to feel personally involved in the constructively peaceful ordering of society, through voluntary involvement in improving those particular aspects of community life in which each individual is most interested.

the need for multicentralisation

The SU-VOC idea aims to strengthen the nation's voluntary social services with increased free-will giving. Whilst successful realisation of this particular objective greatly can benefit the nation and its constituent individuals, its realisation alone does not offer any comprehensive solution to most of the wide ranging problems which today face the western world.

Political events indicate that the electorate are becoming more and more disillusioned with party utopias, and in view of the facts it cannot be expected that either side will for long gain total domination of the socio-political-economic situation.

To facilitate consideration and understanding of the SU-VOC idea in the context of the realities of the present, reference is made to the concept of metasociety. *Metasociety* (using *meta* to imply an attitude determined by the necessary evolutionary changes that must occur in the time process) is that society which becomes conscious of the necessity, not merely of creating the pre-conditions of its own well-being, survival and immediate development, but also of not destroying the pre-conditions of the survival and further development of future generations.

The SU-VOC idea seeks the attainment of metasociety through more widespread conscious understanding and approval of the propositions that strong and healthy charitable voluntary organisations and religious bodies are inherently immeasurably beneficial and necessary to the community and nation.

The SU-VOC idea is more than a simple method of giving. In addition it offers a practical basis for further voluntary involvement in community well-being and for the locality-relevant development of a more viable spiritual social policy complex of government. Thus the SU-VOC idea points towards effective efficacious interfunctional multacentralisation.

Within the concept of metasociety, *multicentralisation* implies recognition of the valid socio-political-economic function of each centre, and thus of a positive two-way contributory relation between bigger-self-government and smaller-self-government. Multicentralisation therefore implies a coming to consciousness of the necessity for individual and small group responsibilities within the large group.

the role of the voluntary sector

In addition to the commodities and services available to the public through the trade and business sector, which generally covers services supplied to exclusive private groups, it can be recognised that there are three possible modes of supplying the personal needs of the individual members of society which they are unable to obtain for themselves:

mode one - *person to person*: from private citizens singly to each other as the individual members of society.

mode two - *state aid through the statutory sector*: from the state as a body conceived as separate from its own members.

mode three - *charitable aid through the "third" or the voluntary sector*: from voluntary organisations, meaning all charitable bodies, which are the only conceivable free mediators between the state and the individual.

Here charity stands as the saviour, saving the individual from the state and the danger of totalitarianism, and the state from overburdening responsibilities and the dangers of anarchy, breakdown and chaos.

the role of SU-VOC within the voluntary sector

To a large extent the community is unaware of the benefit it receives from voluntary organisations. This is not the fault of those who do not know the facts, nor of the voluntary organisations themselves; it is because the information is not readily available.

Whilst it is desirable that individual voluntary organisations should continue energetically to appeal for funds and to speak directly for themselves whenever possible, it is believed that they also individually would benefit if the united voice of SU-VOC was heard proclaiming the overall benefit to the nation of increased free-willed-giving of services and monetary aid to the country's charitable bodies as a whole.

belief forming the basis of the idea

The SU-VOC idea is based in the following belief:

one: society requires an increase in the important and essential work which voluntary organisations can perform within the community.

two: today many socially desirable goals are not achieved due to lack of funds, and in the future such financial needs will increase.

three: the nation at large has services and monetary aid to spare for substantially increased giving to charitable voluntary organisations.

four: there is something basic in humanity that does not function on the merely immediate quid pro quo, and which has very little opportunity to find expression in our high pressure society. At a deeply felt emotional level, though not always consciously recognised, most men and women want to help others, particularly the less fortunate.

five: the idea of SU-VOC is a relatively small but significant gesture towards fulfilling the need to reinforce the idea of personal creative freedom, through voluntary giving and receiving, with a clearer definition of individual corporate responsibilities, beyond the idea of the generally accepted obligations of the statutory services.

six: excessive monistic bureaucratic control has a crippling effect on the social, economic and personal health of national life. If the government will multacentralise its system of controls wherever local conditions may better be handled by local intelligences, it can release vast sources of latent energies through voluntary services. This policy is the essence of *metathinking top-economy*.

How SU-VOC Can Serve the Community

the concept of charity-banking

The SU-VOC idea is that a national charity-bank movement could operate as a viable entity, and that certain technical services might be supplied through existing bodies, such as *Charities Aid Foundation*. This charity-bank movement could be controlled democratically by its donors and donor groups, or workplace trust equivalents. Charitable bodies which received monetary aid from SU-VOC would remain fully independent and free to appeal for other funds in whatever manner they decided.

Charity-banking could be regarded as a form of banking running parallel with commercial banking but differing from it in the following aspects:

one: money paid into a charity-bank account would be accepted as a gift from the donor to be used only for charitable purposes.

two: facilities would be provided for gifts to be made free of tax.

three: donors and groups of donors would have the right to distribute the full value of their gifts to their own chosen charities. Or, should they prefer, donors could leave distribution of all or part of their gifts to fund allocation committees whose members would include workplace trust representatives.

four: the costs of administration should be between five and ten percent. In some cases these costs could be largely met by monetary gifts from interested employers and other well-wishers. Skilled voluntary workers also could assist.

five: in place of the shareholders of commercial companies, donors and their proxies and delegates could be entitled to attend and vote at the separate general meetings of the sub-regional and other branches together forming the suggested multicentral federation of SU-VOC charity-bank³.

six: through the storage and appropriate use of charity-bank information on sources of giving and the use of gifts received, beyond that required for purely book-keeping purposes, greater public appreciation could be encouraged of the desirability of increased free-will giving of services and monetary aid.

Charity-banking could substantially increase giving of monetary aid by inviting workers to contribute to their workplace trust (or local trust equivalent) the income from one minute's basic pay per working day⁴.

³ For administrative simplicity and fairness the suggested basis for such voting could be one donor-vote for each £1 donated during the previous SU-VOC financial year. *The SU-VOC Application* pg. 14, paras. 12/32 - 39.

⁴ For administrative simplicity, and to permit periodic increases to be made without the need to obtain fresh authorisations from donors, the value of one minute's pay per working day could be calculated by employers by reference to average basic pay for a defined group of workers. The workers might be at the lower end of the salary-scale, e.g. local authority school caretakers. All donors within the employer's workforce, who were willing to, could contribute at the same rate for each payroll gift of one minute's pay. With that uniform basis for calculating the value of one minute's pay, some managers and employees might be willing to contribute several minutes.

Based on a five day forty hour week, a four weekly contribution of £2 would be equivalent to one minute's pay per working day from a contributor earning £240 a week. At suitable times, the value of one minute's pay could be recalculated. For example, if the average basic pay of the defined group of workers, referred to above, increased by five percent, the four weekly value of one minute's pay could be increased from £2 to £2.10.

If ten million employees, less than one half of the country's working population, made four weekly payroll gifts of £2, an annual figure of £250 million would be raised.

The following are possible appeal slogans:

"Just a Minute!"

"Surely YOU can spare a minute"

"Charity Begins at Work"

"The Charity that Gives YOU the Power to Decide"

"One of your essential freedoms is your power of voluntary giving. Give personally through SU-VOC. Every note a vote!"

Payroll gifts could be supplemented by corporate gifts from firms and shareholders, by interest accruing through the generosity of those able temporarily to spare the use of some money, and through legacies and other sources of giving. If, additionally, firms and other employers agreed to subscribe directly to SU-VOC on the basis of a fraction of one per cent of payroll costs, another new and really worthwhile charitable contribution would be developed at fairly insignificant cost to the contributors.

By freely giving towards charitable voluntary organisations through SU-VOC, all donors could be conscious both of helping to meet immediate needs and also of making a deliberate long term investment towards the development of a more mature and stable society.

the six SU-VOC bodies

It is envisaged that SU-VOC could consist of six separate but contiguously associated bodies. Each body could be formed to operate primarily in furtherance of the following special purposes:

SU-VOC confederation (the founder body formed by founder trustees): to be composed of influential groups and individuals, who would be able to contribute leadership and/or financial assistance to develop a fuller understanding of the existing and potential benefits to be derived through progressive realisation of the idea.

SU-VOC voluntary service agency: to promote recognition of the importance of voluntary service and of the distinction between such service and the giving of monetary aid. A federation of voluntary service agencies, or bureaux, also could assist in the provision of a special service to benefit “officially unemployed” voluntary workers.

SU-VOC charity-bank: to attract substantially increased free-will giving of monetary aid. Beyond payroll contributions from individual workers, additional giving could be found from companies and other donors through fuller recognition that because the voluntary sector benefits the community as a whole it thus also must benefit the constitutive parts of the community.

SU-VOC foundation: to develop within different local areas a federation of special capital funds. Each locally controlled branch fund could be used for a variety of charitable purposes and on a co-ordinate basis in the event of major disaster. With the agreement of the concerned trustees, local foundation branch funds could be administered with the assistance of *Charities Aid Foundation*.

SUV-OC top-economic development association: to be composed of representatives from charitable bodies, able to demonstrate the capacity of those member bodies to co-operate together to improve the quality of life within community boundaries. The association might constitute a suitable representative professional body, which could advise on the locality-relevant needs and wishes of the charitable voluntary sector. In the *Councils for Voluntary Service*, and their rural equivalents, and the *British Council of Churches* the nucleus of this body already largely exists.

SU-VOC fund allocation advisory service: to meet the need for independent local bodies to be formed to assist those donors and donor groups who prefer to leave to others the responsibility for gift distributions⁵.

⁵ page 7, suggests how this service might operate within a co-ordinated nationwide service.

The basis conceived for a multicentral federation agreement is that, in return for permission to use the SU-VOC name and logo (or their agreed equivalents), each democratically structured branch of the associated bodies could contract with the founder trustees: to federate and co-operate in accordance with the constitution; to offer donors through the charity-bank the choice of alternative facilities for the distribution of their gifts, either personal distributions by donors themselves to their own chosen charities or fund allocations on their behalf through responsible local committees; to respect the privacy and independent fundraising rights of all charities; to recognise the charity-bank to be the principal voting body, on account of it being democratically controlled by its donors and donor groups.

The practical operation of the principles underlying the multicentral concept of associated SU-VOC bodies, may be illustrated in the principles governing the distribution of electricity within the national grid system, with its framework of separate power stations geographically spread.

implementation

Implementation of the SU-VOC idea could occur through its approval and sponsorship by certain persons and the appointment by the sponsors of the *first* founder-trustees.

A suitable body could then be formed to examine *The SU-VOC Application* and to recommend possible profitable amendments, modifications and additions to the proposal and to the supporting memoranda. In the light of those recommendations, the detailed administrative forward planning and other preparatory work could be undertaken to achieve a suitably phased development of SU-VOC, under whatever name, on a national basis.

Socio-Governmental Considerations

the effect on morale and donors' directive rights

By stimulating increased free-will giving, implementation of the SU-VOC idea with donors' directive rights will enable additional human-concerned-services to be supplied which could not otherwise be made available.

Important and valuable though the provision of these human-concerned-services may be, both to the individual recipients and to the community as a whole, the provision of donors' directive rights can supply an additional and even more vitally essential service to the nation at large and to its constituent groups and individuals.

This further service will be supplied because, in the exercising of their directive rights, donors and donor-group representatives will become thereby more conscious of their own personal involvement and unique significance, and this in turn will affect their morale.

Lower members of governments and managements often fail to recognise the fact that if they lower the morale of people, they also reduce the energy that could be creatively at work.

Other things being equal, high morale means high survival probability. But morale is high only where there is personal conscious self-awareness of creative giving-power.

The SU-VOC idea with donors' directive rights is not a panacea for all social ills but, given the right backing and support, not only can it help to raise money; just as important, it can help to raise morale both locally and also further afield.

more response-able donors

The problem that faces democratic government is the tendency for individuals not to exercise their personal response-ability for social actions.

Democracy implies a non-division between the governed and the government. A true democratic government logically will support increased free-will giving with donors' directive rights because it means giving people a further opportunity to take part in the solution of their own living problems. It will thus cause a forward movement in social evolution towards more generally response-able behaviour.

The more sense of response-ability people have through their social projects, the less likely will be their desire to overthrow the existing social order, because they will feel that they themselves are an effective part of a real establishment which has been originated by them. The more people feel that this established social order lets people have a hand in the salvation of people, the more they will recognise that charity gifts and work fulfil a real human need as well as helping to solve some of the problems which face government.

In short, support for the SU-VOC movement, or its equivalent, using donors' directive rights, is a means whereby true government can profitably stave off possibilities of social upheaval.

charity as the essential mediator

In its community-wide effect, charity functions as the collective co-operative intelligence of members of society as a whole. This collective co-operative intelligence is the goodwill that lubricates, harmonises and makes workable the complex machinery of socio-governmental relations.

In its all-party-political and all religious and holistically ethical role the SU-VOC idea with donors' directive rights is a united way to assist local people to handle local affairs on a self-help basis. Thus concerned individuals render a whole-situation-improved quality of service.

We are all in the same universe, all in the same boat. Groups of self-help or mutual aid organisations are the key to the solution to many of our problems.

The state's function is to provide a rationale of relationships of individuals, to protect the individual against other individuals and to make interrelations easier and more accessible and productive. The individual's function is to investigate new possibilities of survival and development not easily investigated by the state as such. Group charitable work is a dynamic field of investigation and utilisation of possibilities not clearly seen or not possible of realisation either for the state or for the isolated individual.

In the face of recognised danger and in response to a challenge situation, the appropriate or right mental attitude means the assumption of success, creative positive thinking and individual self-determination.

Free-will giving to the charitable voluntary sector, which implies donors' directive rights, is productive of the right mental attitude, because it is personal self-determined ability to respond to the needs of a person or situation which motivates free-will giving.

There is today a dual danger to human society. One, of increasing impersonal bureaucratic interference in every aspect of our lives which, in time, could lead to excessive State domination and reduction of the free individual to the level of a mere state-cipher.

Two, of individual irresponsibility to, and non-co-operation with the community, with the possible breakdown of the social structure which everywhere throughout the world foreshadows itself. Both would result in diminution of creative productive activity in every field of human endeavour.

The charitable voluntary sector as a whole may be viewed as an essential mediator between the state and the individual with their corresponding opposed dangers. Charitable purposes thus imply group activities intelligently aimed at mutual aid, and the provision of finance by those who are able to give for those less fortunate who would benefit by receiving.

Michelangelo's famous saying, "Perfection is made of trifles but perfection is no trifle", is very applicable to the voluntary sector. An outsider, looking at a particular aspect of the voluntary sector's intricate mosaic of services, could call any particular aspect in isolation so small as to be trifling with the problems of society as a whole. However, if all this charitable activity is viewed in its total effect, the very opposite applies.

ethical considerations on donors' directive rights

All other considerations apart, the main reason why donors' directive rights are important is because the individual human being has his own generosity impulses. This generosity has to be felt personally by the donor, as the individual grows and develops his awareness of his creative generous impulses by exercising his own free-will giving capacity.

Human nature is two-sided. Man has a kind positive creative "good" side as well as an unkind negative destructive "bad" side. The side which is most manifest at any moment in time is largely a reflection of the individual's feelings and thoughts or attitudes to his own life-situation. A major determinant in this respect will be the state of the individual's own self-respect or inner morale, irrespective of the current social situation, discontent, vandalism and violence.

Affirming the person's good side, we know that in part at least every healthy human individual seeks whenever possible to develop his own life potential and those of his fellow humans, and that to this end everyone will welcome an appropriate procedure making this possible for him. "If only I knew the way to do good I would do it"

is the innermost central thought of every positively thinking normal human being.

All religious people have fundamentally the same idea - that we are all in the Noah's ark together in mutual interdependency.

The ground of SU-VOC depends on a common sub-structure with which everyone will agree. This basis quite simply is human charity. The SU-VOC idea is the united way of general human charity and this unites in one thing, recognition of the principle that giving and receiving are reciprocal actions which must benefit both parties.

Because giving and receiving are reciprocal actions, the receiver can by his conscious acceptance of a gift thereby become a giver. Whilst it is good to feel that one has the power to do a generous act, we are to remember that such an act cannot be done without there being an appreciative recipient of it and that really it is a psychological error to wish always not to be at the receiving end. This is because the receiver is giving to the giver the opportunity to exercise his generosity and thereby to complete the circle of goodwill generated by givers and receivers.

a policy question

In some charity-bank branch areas the need for donors' directive rights may not be fully recognised and a policy question could arise whether donors might be encouraged to allow the whole of their gifts to be distributed through the fund allocation advisory service. A number of arguments might be advanced to attempt to justify such a policy, but inherent in this policy would be a danger that the fund allocation advisory service might become an impersonal committee or in effect a hypothetical extension of a government department.

Arguments put forward for the withdrawal of donors' directive rights would in essence be those advanced by governments of all colours to justify the provision of public services financed by tax-money only.

The SU-VOC idea recognises that some state financed social services are essential, also that most, if not all, the present statutory social services originated from the pioneering initiative of individuals.

Thus it follows, it would be an error to attempt to shift the initiative in helping our fellow-men from the individual to some non-individual governing body.

Atrophy of individual initiatives and of individual creative generous impulses might arise from total dependence on the State. Individual initiative is needed, or the ship of State loses way. The electorate gets the government it deserves.

support for the idea

Willing and active support for the voluntary sector is a logical step for anyone who recognises the interdependence and interfunctionality of human beings within society, and the practical difficulties which would face any form of government which sought through its statutory sector to bestow on mankind all the required benefits.

Where there is a clearly defined objective, the means to its attainment is necessarily realisable. There is reward in recognising that the donor's confidence will grow proportionally with his belief in his own effectiveness, as the director of his own goodwill, and with this the assumption of his full conscious social self-response-ability.

At this stage, the SU-VOC idea is but a seed-idea. Whether this seed-idea is to develop and bear fruit will depend greatly upon the backing and support the idea receives from leaders in industry and commerce, including the trade unions.

Support from all sectors can be given to the SU-VOC idea, not only because it offers a valid ethical reason for giving services and monetary aid in furtherance of the necessarily developing role of the voluntary sector, but also because it points a way, through charity-giving, to further responsible human solidarity behaviour, and thus to a possible solution to some of the wider social problems of violence, drop-outs, general dissatisfaction and socio-political malaise.

This solution is that people shall become again conscience conscious, that they shall become more reflexively aware of their personal human significance.

The natural desire in people to belong to a beneficently ordered community is such that if they are given an opportunity and a methodology of showing their human solidarity then they will accept it.

They can show this through charity. Charity allows a man to lift himself up in his own image to a humane level of positive contribution to the human race.

Implementation of the SU-VOC idea would be a readily attainable real step towards the practical embodiment of ideal human interdependency and mutual aid, thoroughly acceptable to all responsible thinkers, and a new movement towards peaceful profitable socio-political development.

In implementing the SU-VOC idea the United Kingdom could make manifest its positive determination to take a leading position in a solution to the problem of general world unrest.

Appendix

Shared Giving and Workplace Trusts and Local Trusts

greatly increased payroll giving

In 2002, a report published by Charities Aid Foundation stated that only two percent of UK companies were providing payroll giving facilities to their staff, and that of the 6,400 companies contracted with the four *Give As You Earn* payroll giving agency-charities (including *United Way*) only 4,300 were active, with approximately just under two percent of employees making use of the payroll giving facility.

Most of the payroll giving services which are at present supplied to employers and their employees are what is known as the “*elective scheme*” previously termed the “*standard scheme*”. This scheme works well and it has scope to grow, but its results to date have not reached the levels earlier anticipated. This may be partly because the promotion of payroll giving is not locally focused on a whole-community-good basis, and as yet it appears to do comparatively little to foster team-spirit at the workplace. In consequence there is not the incentive there could be for employers and trade unions to promote it.

It is suggested that greatly increased payroll giving could be achieved within the UK through the development of *shared giving* and payroll giving to *workplace trusts and local trusts*.

It is envisaged these developments could be promoted on a co-ordinated united fundraising basis, and that they could be supplied in addition to and parallel with existing payroll giving schemes, including the so-called *elective* or *standard* payroll giving schemes.

how the schemes operate

With the *elective* scheme, at the time of authorising their employers to make payroll deductions, employee-contributors nominate the individual charities to receive their gifts. Employers send the tax-free payroll gifts in bulk to the clearing house office of an Inland Revenue appointed agency-charity. The agency-charity arranges (in most cases through the Bankers' Automated Clearing Service) to credit the gifts to the bank accounts of the different nominated recipient charities.

The recipient charities from the elective payroll giving scheme tend to be large well-known national charities which individual donors have heard of. Comparatively few local charities have so far received much benefit from payroll giving.

The United Trusts (or otherwise named) *workplace trusts and local trusts payroll giving scheme* can reduce the administration work and therefore the cost of the agency-charities' service because the employee-contributors do not nominate one or more individual charities to receive their gifts. Instead, they simply authorise their employers to make payroll deductions to be credited to a United Trusts administered workplace trust account in their employer's name. If the employer so decides, workplace trust accounts may relate to whichever branch, office, school, unit or department within which the employee-contributors happen currently to be working. Thus some employees will be contributors to more than one workplace trust during their period of employment.

A workplace trust account operates like a bank account which cannot be overdrawn. The workplace trusts' committees have their own charity-cheque-books and can distribute gifts for ANY chosen charitable purposes at any time. But they are asked to recognise the value to local communities of the work of local trusts. These may have more detailed knowledge, than individual workplace trusts, about local charities' needs and deeds within their local communities.

It is normal practice for a workplace trust committee to agree that the balances of gifts made during each tax-year, which have not been distributed by their workplace trust by the end of the calendar year, may be transferred for distribution to a democratically structured local trust for that workplace's area. Representatives of United Trusts administered workplace trusts may vote to elect the trustees of local trusts.

In comparison with the elective payroll giving scheme, workplace trust giving tends to be locally focused and to be more likely to have public relational value to the workplaces, and thus to the employers and involved trade unions. Workplace trust giving also tends to have a positive influence on workplace morale.

Workplace trusts and local trusts have at least some knowledge about their local community's needs, and national charities which supply local services are viewed in respect of those services as local charities. In consequence most gifts from workplace trusts and local trusts are distributed to local charities or, through umbrella charities, to local individuals in need⁶.

shared payroll giving

"Shared payroll giving" is a procedure whereby an individual local or national charity may agree to promote payroll giving to a certain workplace trust, on the understanding that the employees' committee for that workplace trust will agree to share the money raised with the charity which has promoted the giving to the trust. The charities participating in this type of joint fundraising are likely to find this can prove a successful and cost effective method of fundraising.

There are various ways in which shared payroll giving can operate, but it is usually calculated on an approximate fifty/fifty basis. The figures are approximate because it could be uneconomic for the workplace trust to calculate exact figures. Employers' associations and trade unions may be willing to assist in the recruitment of workplaces which are keen to promote shared giving.

⁶ *United Trusts in Merseyside's "People for People Funds Advisory Group* publishes detailed reports on the many grants made by it through umbrella charities to relieve individual cases of poverty and hardship.

Payroll giving by some employees to workplace trusts may be for as little as 50p a week, or less. If desired - and subject to the willingness and ability of an employer's payroll department to supply monthly schedules stating the amounts to be credited to each workplace trust account - each easily identifiable branch, office, school, department, unit or section can have its own workplace trust within the employer's own Group of Workplace Trusts.

The recruitment of donors may be made by the employees themselves, and a policy of seeking "small gifts from many donors" can achieve a high percentage participation. Not infrequently the majority of employees at a workplace agree to contribute to their workplace trust, and together may number more than ten times the total number of employees at that workplace making payroll gifts (through the elective scheme) to individually chosen charities.

small employers and the self-employed

The workplace trust charity-cheque-book account facility can enable the payroll giving scheme to be extended to small businesses on an economically viable basis. Until now payroll giving agency-charities have not found it economic to provide services for small businesses. It has been reported that 95% of the employers in the UK are thought to employ 20 or less staff, and that together they may employ approximately one third of the country's total working population.

Self-employed persons and professional workers not subject to PAYE also can all make tax-free gifts to their own workplace trust accounts. Where one individual only makes contributions, the account might be named a "personal WT account". Workplace trusts can receive and distribute for charitable purposes gifts from any source, including gift aid and corporate gifts.

administration costs

The workplace trusts and local trusts payroll giving scheme, together with shared giving, could operate economically without payroll giving agency-charities needing to make full use of their clearing house services for the distribution of gifts, and without the justifiable need for them to make high percentage administration charges for handling small amount gifts, e.g. a monthly gift of £1 could incur an agency-charity's minimum handling charge of 50p.

Because of reduced work, there could be large a reduction in the agency-charities' administration costs which are approximately 4%. The money saved (together with earned interest, which may amount to significant sums with workplace trust giving) could be used to finance the development of local services.

co-operation from employers

To facilitate low cost administration, and for other practical reasons, employers could be requested to agree to provide separate payroll deduction facilities and payments for workplace trust giving and for the elective scheme.

If employers are unable to arrange to provide separate payroll giving facilities and payments, for workplace trust giving and for the elective scheme, there are two not wholly satisfactory alternative procedures. The *elective scheme* can be used with all payroll gifts to workplace trusts being treated as gifts to nominated charities. With this arrangement the agency-charities full administration charges are made (their minimum charges may be uneconomic in the case of small amount giving) and employers may be requested by the agency-charities to advise upon the amounts to be credited to each workplace trust account where there is more than one workplace trust. Alternatively, the *workplace trust scheme* can be used. In this case arrangements need to be made by employers for individual employees, who so request, to be able **to exercise their legal right** to be able to distribute their payroll gifts to their chosen charities. In most cases, as yet, only a small percentage of contributors to workplace trusts also make gifts to individually nominated charities, but this situation may change.

For simplicity, and to reduce queries and the risk of possible errors, some employers find it beneficial to have one contract with an agency-charity, such as CAF, which specialises in receiving and distributing elective scheme gifts, and a second contract with a different agency-charity, such as United Way (which is connected to United Trusts) and which specialises in receiving and distributing workplace trusts and local trusts payroll giving scheme gifts.

Where employers have more than one workplace trust, they could be requested to provide schedules stating the amounts to be credited by the agency-charity to each workplace trust account.

The provision of these schedules would be unlikely to present a problem with computerised payroll departments, and some very large employers could have several hundred workplace trust accounts. Small minimum amount administration charges, say, £25 a year, might be made by agency-charities for each small workplace trust account where total annual giving amounts to less than £500.

The development of large-scale workplace trust giving could necessitate the opening of regional offices. The initial cost of establishing these offices could be financed in a number of ways, and the offices could supply a range of services. Some employers could be willing to contribute up to 10% of the value of their employees' workplace trusts' giving towards local administration and development costs, so that all the money contributed by employees to their workplace trusts could be distributed in full to recipient charities.

Glossary

of terms used in the booklets on metathinking top-economy,

Booklet One: An Introduction, has a larger glossary.

metacentre: the term *metacentre* is used to describe any centre of group activity which has passed through the phases of simple pre-state group isolation, and of monostate compelled group integration, into the phase of intelligent post-monostate-centre group activity, and in which there is consciousness of the necessity for the interrelation of multicentres for their own good.

meta-individual: a mature metathinking person who views the monostate system of government as out-moded and anachronistic, and who aims to develop individual inner authority and responsibility;

metasociety: that society which becomes metaconscious of the necessity, not merely of creating the pre-conditions of its own well-being and survival, but also of not destroying the pre-conditions of the survival and further development of future generations.

metastate: the self-stabilising large group which is thoroughly conscious that locality-relevant problems of sub-groups within it most effectively can be solved by the intelligences resident within those sub-groups.

metathinking top-economy: *metathinking* is thinking which is directed to the true holistic and individual development of all humanity; *top-economy* is the economy of specific areas and places in which socially-functioning-profit is distinguished from (but may include) bank-account-profit. The aim is whole-group good.

monostate government: implies unwieldy oligarchal control based on force-imposed unity.

multi-metacentralisation: implies *co-ordinative unity*, i.e., a coming to consciousness of the necessity for individual and small group responsibilities *within* the large group.

Booklets on Metathinking Top-economy

- Booklet One: An Introduction to Metathinking Top-economy
- Booklet Two: The Human Needs of the Community and Charity
- Booklet Three: The SU-VOC Idea
(Society of United Voluntary Organisation within Community)
- Booklet Four: Multi-metacentralisation, Socio-Governmental Parity
and Citizenship
- Booklet Five: Evolution of Intelligent Government, Governing Concepts
and Tempi of Developmental Change
- Booklet Six: Two-Way Multi-Metacentral Government and Britain's
Metathinking Leading Role
- Booklet Seven: Information within Metacentres and Personal Values

Further information about the works and related works of Eugene Halliday (including the booklets) is available from the Ishval website, <www.ishval.org.uk>