Discussion following a lecture at the School of Education, Cambridge.

Q. If so-called societies only value their members for their skills in hunting or building or farming, how are they different from our society?

A. These skills are necessary for survival, but these societies also value their members for their powers to sing or paint or dance.

Q. Do you mean that not any other society except this one does those things?

A. No, no. I said that the societies which model themselves on our pattern, whether Russia, Italy or Britain, tend to produce similar structures, both in the parent society and in the education system.

Q. But don't you suppose that that structure is an inherent part of any society, any large society? It seems to me that what you are most concerned with is restrictions on social mobility, with which I would agree, but I don't see that you are going to change, you are going to directly affect mobility by attempting radically to dis-order the order of society which exists.

A. When I referred to mobility I referred to it as a commonly desired attribute of this society. I do not refer to it as a necessarily desirable feature of other societies. It was this society which claimed to be demoractic, to assert that mobility was desirable. We claim to be a meritocracy, to give any position to any child which has the talent.

Q. But I don't understand what you mean by democracy.

A. It can be seen in the assumptions that lie behind the actions of the Creator - if I may use a poetic concept - in giving us all one head, one stomach, two arms and two legs. That is a basic democratic equipment. We are all the same in that basic, material sense. What we do with that is very different. For some children we magnify their sensitivity; we enlarge their capacity to think, to communicate in a variety of media. For some children we ensure not only that they can use a spade but that they can also play a Bach Prelude. So that, on the basis of a common pattern of equipment, society makes widely different models. Those at the upper end of the social spectrum have been provided with a much wider range of behaviour than those at the lower end.

Q. But they still have one head, two arms, two legs. They are still basically democratic in the sense you described.

A. Oh, no. No man can drive more than one car at a time, so to have two is stupid when many people at the lower end have no car at all - assuming that motor cars are to be desired.

Q. I agree with you, but that doesn't alter the fact that they both have one head, two arms, two legs and one stomach, which is what you described as democracy. I don't see that it affects it. Property - the ownership of property - doesn't actually affect democracy.

A. Well, let us take Neville Butler's figures. He is Professor of Medicine in the University of Bristol. He made a study of children born in one week, some 70 or 80,000, and showed that the chance of a young mother and her baby at the lower end of the social spectrum developing disease or dying is at least three times greater than it is at the upper end.

Q. What has that to do with democracy?

A. It has to do with the concept of society which, as a result of evolution, has to care for its members. Man cannot survive if the members of a group do not care for one another. That was the whole point of my discussion of the evolution of the human brain and the 'abandonment' of the weaponry and localised adaptations of the lower animals. Democracy implies care and concern for all members of the group, but the kind of behaviour which results in higher rates of death or illness among the poor than among the rich does not suggest that we have the same care for those at the upper end.

Q. No, sir! It means that one kind of woman with a child is more likely to get or communicate a disease than another. That's all you can say.

A. Now you are using a phrase I don't understand - 'one kind of woman'. Are there different kinds of women?

Q. Will you repeat the words that accompany that graph illustrating Neville Butler's findings?

A. Yes. At the lower end of the social scale, in the unskilled and semi-skilled area of occupations, young pregnant mothers are at least three times more likely to contract various illnesses, and their babies are likely to contract various illnesses, and to die than women of the same age at the upper end of the social scale.

Q. I'm perfectly ready to agree with you, but we have had a succession of lecturers and generally their arguments have been emotional. I have yet to hear a reasonable and rational and logical argument to support their views.

A. Well, obviously I cannot present in an hour the whole of Butler and Ross's findings on the hazards of childhood in terms of medical care in our society. If you want that evidence all I can do is to invite you to read it. But if you say that because I quote that evidence then I am being emotional, then there are clearly very great differences in our assumptions and our language.

Q. I want to know what your conclusion is.

A. My conclusion is that although we call ourselves a democratic society our behaviour is not in consonance with that description.

Q(2) Aren't you being over simple in drawing that relationship, in the sense that the fact that a mother at the lower end of the scale is more vulnerable to illness may be due to her attitude to medicine and her attitude to the doctor and whether she takes the prescribed dose?

A. But don't you see that, in turn, corresponds to the degree of education which they have had and their susceptibility to listen to advice of that kind - that these two things correlate?

Q. Yes, but it may also correlate with their actual basic ability.

A. You are suggesting that they have a basic ability which is distinct from their educational attainment?

Q. I think they have <u>some</u> basic ability.

A. Here we have a fundamental difference of view. I do not accept that, apart from brain damage or genetic defect, there is a difference in 'basic ability'.

Q. I refer to potential ability.

A. Potential refers to the basic material structures upon which society acts.

Q. You say that environment determines ...

A. No. I don't enter into absurd arguments which polarise genetic as against environmental. Any child who is not genetically well-endowed can have the best environment in the world but he will not become intelligent. He may, on the other hand, be genetically 'perfect' but if he is not well educated he will not benefit from his endowment. If you put a highly equipped child into a cupboard and keep him alive but do not educate him, he will emerge a moron. Intelligence arises when a healthy body receives the best and most appropriate stimulus. If someone can show that women at the lower end of the social scale have a poorly structured nervous system which renders them incapable of learning ...

Q. You are taking education to start at the time of birth. Alice Helm in <u>Intelligence and Personality</u> reckons that the age from eighteen months to three years is the most vital, and yet nursery education comes after three years.

A. I would say that the period from birth - in fact before birth - is vital because, clearly, the diet of the mother ...

Q. But now you are talking from a different view than education!

A. Yes. I thought I had made the point that teachers delude themselves in thinking that they can change the world. Much of what happens to the child before he comes to school may be fundamental in blocking or retarding what he can take from the educational system.

Q(3) Then it appears to be a vicious spiral!

A. Maybe, but we can help it to change to a virtuous spiral by changing the nature of society so far as lies in our power. Change the society; change the nature of the relationships in work; change the levels of social reward for work; change the forms of participation in social control of those who now have no say; change the purposes of work from profit to need.

Q. How?

Q(4) But you can't do that through the education system!

A. I think we are in the process of trying. We did try to establish the Welfare State. It is, of course, a poor caricature of what a loving society would be, but in many respects it is much better than what went before. To the extent that the miners and the engineers and the others make the conditions of their work more tolerable; to the extent that the men at Merriden make decisions about their work that extend beyond the manipulation of tools at a branch; to the extent that they make financial decisions or decisions about whether or not to make Japanese bikes here; to the extent that they have to decide about publicity, distribution and management; to that extent linguistic skills are demanded by their work and they become more fully human in that work. So if we make the work of society fuller for all, and not simply relegate purely mechanistic functions to certain people while preserving the intellectual and creative fun- ctions for others, we will then begin to make a more humane society. I am not convinced that we will alter the structure of society by simply altering the schools. When the parent society becomes more democratic then the schools themselves will respond and, in turn, sustain a democratic society by producing people oriented to democratic modes of work and relationships. No society exists which does not, through its education system - including the family - perpetuate that society.

Q. But all societies have the same fundamental structure. You said that Marxist society has the same type of relationship as we have.

A. No. Not all societies have the same type of relationship. Russia has not yet moved away from capitalist forms of organisation and capitalist forms of relationship. It has a kind of class structure where levels of pay as between the upper and lower strata of society differ by a factor of twelve or fifteen times. It is a form of state capitalism. We live in western Europe and are familiar with societies such as France, Germany and Italy - all capitalist states - but if you read the work of the anthropologists about groups and societies in Central India or Africa or South America you will see very different types of society. Malinowski's studies of the Trobriand Islanders, corrupted as they have since become by American capitalism, showed a quality of society quite different from ours where the capacities and the range of individuality of its members were wider; where there were no qualitative differences between the skills or the sensitivities displayed by different members.

Q. But were they civilised, in the sense that there were some skills which could only be exercised by a few people at the top?

A. Apparently not.

Q. But was it not just a general level of skill, much lower than ours?

A. Some were better potters or fishermen or dancers than others ...

Q. But if you have a society like ours today it is ludicrous to assume that someone, without a certain level of education, without, even, a certain kind of historical background from birth, is going to be able to take the type of education which society run in this way demands.

A. But this is surely not the point. No one is saying that some people may not become far more skilful as a potter or an engineer. What seems to me to contradict the essential nature of humanity is that somebody should have a style of life which is twenty times more luxurious than that of another person, when both do work that is essential to the organic unity of the whole community.

Q. What you are saying is that no one should be rewarded more than others no matter how responsible their job, just because their natural endowment gives them an advantage.

A. Precisely!

Q(5) You referred to 'social expectations'. Can I ask you where these social expectations come from?

A. Social expectations normally come from the family in which the child grows. A child who grows up in a barrister's family obviously hears much more talk about a barrister's work, about its importance, its relationships with other work, and the style of life which accrues from having that level of salary, and so on. The child is therefore naturally attuned, if not to that precise form of occupation, at least to something comparable. He might become a doctor, an architect or a politician, but the style of lie is manifestly different from that of an unskilled manual worker who does not, on the whole, talk about his

work to the same extent as a barrister or a teacher. So expectation is built into the child, partly by his own family, partly by other families and the children with whom he plays and associates. Barristers' children rarely play with dustmen's children.

Q. What can we do about that in schools then?

A. Well, it is a bit late. Primary socialisation has taken place before the child comes to school.

Q(6) If you believe that education is so powerless, why do you go on?

A. I often wonder!

Q(7) This society claims to be a democratic society and it also claims to be a free society. What are your views on the question of parental choice in education?

A. There should be no parental choice. I said this in a letter to The Times in reply to one of St John Stevas' curious pronouncements. I simply said, "Given parental choice, 'good' parents, i.e. well educated parents, would choose 'good' schools for their children who would, in turn, and as a result of their good education, grow up to be 'good' parents. But this would mean that of necessity the 'bad' or stupid or ill-educated parents would be left with the bad schools. How does St John Stevas propose that we get out of this vicious circle? If, on the other hand, all parents <u>had</u> to send their children to the nearest school, then the good parents would raise hell with people like St John Stevas until those bad schools were made good."

Q(1) Do you mean that the good parents will demand the schools which they term good, and the good schools are those they would send their children to if they had not been compelled to send them to the nearest school?

A. Yes. The good schools are, for parents at the upper end of the social and occupational spectrum, the schools designated as Public, Direct Grant, Grammar or Progressive - such as Dartington Hall.

Q. It seems you are equating intelligence with linguistic ability and humanity with intelligence; and you are saying that the Public and Direct Grant schools achieve a higher level of linguistic ability than do the lower class schools, and that, therefore, the higher class schools achieve more success in actually creating humanity.

A. For the purposes of this society, yes. We were talking in the context of this society.

Q. Well, then, you are not using 'humanity' in the general sense.

A. Not in the fullest general sense, no. In the broadest sense the schools at the upper end of the spectrum are restrictive of certain kinds of activity classified as human ...

Q. And if that group of people can and do control the form of society as it is and tend to perpetuate it, and if they represent the highest intelligence, why is it not right that they should continue to perpetuate this kind of society?

A. Because the forms of intelligence they develop and operate are too restricted, too narrow socially.

Q. You propose and then you qualify! You say the highest intelligence and then you say it is not the highest intelligence because it is too narrow. You say, this is humanity and then you say, ah, but it is not really humanity because ...

A. Yes, but intelligence is not really a defined term in the sense that it has strict limits - unless you mean it to cover all forms of human activity. What I am saying is that our society demands certain forms of linguistic skill which are seen to operate throughout the social spectrum. The mother-tongue, for example, operates throughout that spectrum, though with different modes and at different levels as Bernstein has demonstrated. There are certain forms of skill which operate at the upper end which do not operate at the lower end. The skills which we associate with high levels of academic work in language, in physics, in the manipulation of forms of control over institutions - Parliament, the courts, the banks, business corporations - the skills effective in securing the maintenance of power and wealth at the upper end of the spectrum; these skills are not developed at the lower end.

I am maintaining that in a democratic society the kinds of skill developed in schools at the upper end of the social spectrum should also be developed at the lower end.

Q. Fine! But I would say that the way to do that is to move the kind of teaching which is current at the highest end of the scale into the middle. You are suggesting that you should take the characteristics of schools in the middle and move them up to the top.

A. I would share the resources across the board. Under conditions of extreme urgency, as in war, we, in fact, do that.

Q. Are you suggesting that the style of teaching which we see in the traditional Public schools is not superior to that with which we are being prepared to teach in Comprehensive schools?

A. But it is being used for a limited social purpose!

Q. And what is that?

A. The maintenance of power! Linguistic skills are developed in those schools, not to extend the human capacity of the individual to relate to all other human beings in sensitive ways, but to perpetuate a society in which power and wealth remain with the upper classes. Bernstein's other line of research - the examination, in the paper entitled 'On the classification and framing of educational knowlege' of the thesis that "How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control", makes this point very clearly.

Q. But there is nothing remarkable about this; it is a feature of all societies. Societies are self-sustaining organisms. That is how that structure occurs.

Q(8) It may be a feature of society as it is now, but not necessarily a feature one has to accept! You do not have to sit there on your backside and say, "It is like that so we have to accept it." You must be prepared to do something about it.

Q. Oh, fine! I am sitting here in this lecture with you; I am not sitting in the Master's Lodge of one of the colleges. I am just as emotionally engaged by what I see to be the injustices of our society as everyone else is. All I am asking for is something other than emotional argument. You can get agreement very easily if you say, "This is terrible!". We all agree it is terrible, but what are you going to do about it?

Q(9) What can teachers do about it? That is, perhaps the question we would all like to know.

A. You can, first of all, make your relationships with children depend less on force. Now I am not suggesting that everyone here is likely to enter a classroom and wield a cane, but an awful lot of teachers still do just that. So start by removing fear and use rational argument. Too many of our schools unhappily rely on force and on punishment to maintain order and control.

Secondly we should ensure that our institutions, our schools, colleges and universities, are run more democratically; that, for example, the students in our schools and colleges of education should, together with the staff, decide the best ways in which education should be taught. That teachers in schools should have regard, more often and more fully, to the capacities and wishes of their students. Good teachers already do that, but they are a tiny minority. If we are a democratic society then we train our young by practising democratic modes of relationship.

Thirdly we should operate at the level of our professional relationships to ensure that the teaching profession works for a greater equality in the distribution of the available resources through all our schools. There are very many ways in which we as teachers can start to change.

Q(10) And how do you ensure that parents send their children to the nearest school? It seems to me to be important that children of all classes do meet in school.

A. That is an excellent thing about the real village school - a true comprehensive. But so long as the social rewards for work at the upper end of the occupational spectrum so greatly exceed the rewards at the lower end there is strong resistance to change in those who benefit most by the present system.

Q(12) You seem to be going against what you said before when you said that it was too late, by the time children entered school, to change the system. Now you seem to say that you can alter it within the classroom and the school.

A. As an individual, if you hope for change in the school and the classroom without reference to your colleagues you will not get far. You <u>have</u> to work with them and the more you do the more effective will be what you set out to do. No single person could have transformed the behaviour of the children in Risinghill School as it was transformed. We made our decisions and our policy collectively. The children saw this and realised quickly that they could not play off one member of staff or one group against another.

Q. But the headmaster, because he has most power and influence, is in the best position to bring about change. If he makes a policy for change it will be likely to be more successful.

A. Only if he can carry his staff with him. I have come across many heads who believed themselves to be progressive and forced their ideas on an unwilling staff. That is just as bad as a reactionary head doing

likewise. The policy must be democratic and reached democratically. Time and time again I had to accept compromise at Risinghill because I failed to convince the staff to adopt the policy I suggested. For example, when we had decided that we could do without corporal punishment I went on to suggest that we might abandon the concept of punishment entirely, but this made them uneasy; they wanted to retain lines, detention and so on. I accepted that and then we found that within two years or so punishment had begun to die naturally because we were finding that argument had more lasting effects.

Q(12) Where will the State come into all this? I take it that in your ideal system the State will be all-powerful. I would have thought that you would have learned from your experience at Risinghill that the more power the local authority has the less opportunity there will be for experimentation and for progressive ideas to be implemented.

A. That presupposes a situation that is true at the moment, viz. that there is a fundamental division between the State and ourselves, the citizens. But, to the extent that in our different areas of work, engineers in their factories, miners in their pits, teachers in their schools, we establish democratic relationships, to that extent will we compel the State to reflect our views - we will take power from the State and so compel to cease to operate as an instrument of repression for all but the tiny minority who wield power. Our present society is run, not by one man one vote but by a group of powerful vested interests. The press and the media in general reflect their wishes rather than ours, and because the mass of the people have no voice in the media, except at the trivial level of voting for sports personalities or sex symbols, the views of the wealthy and the powerful are dinned into the rest without respite. No radi- cal alternative is presented with equal force or in an equally pervasive manner.

Radical change will not happen tomorrow. I am trying to outline the relationship between an education system and its parent society and to suggest - that is all I can do - ways in which we might begin to start that change. No State can be other than repressive. If I am to have a label it is 'pragmatic anarchist', but I find myself in congenial company with John Dewey, Herbert Read and A.S. Neill.

Q(13) On what basis do you assert that the difference between man and the animals is man's use of language? Might the difference not be in the matter of creativity or in morals, might it not be man's need for religion? Man can create an infinite number of sentences; might it not be more a matter of his creativity? Might it not be a matter of his appreciation of morality; his ability to make moral judgements? Unless you can get rid of these considerations the view of man that you present rests on shaky foundations.

A. These are, in my view, aspects of the complex being we call man. Man's vulnerability as an individual and his dependance on both the human group and his physical environment, is another aspect of religion. When Christ said, "Love thy neighbour as thyself", he was saying, in modern terms, "Un- less you have democratic, loving relationships in your society, you will perish". That is a religious concept; it is a human concept; it is a political concept.

Q(1) That's a very humanistic form of religion. What about the more mystical aspects of religion?

A. I cannot know, nobody can know whether you or I love God - even if we could agree on what we mean by 'God'. We can know whether we love our neighbour. What we choose to beleive in our own private world is entirely up to us as individuals.

Q(13) In every society there has appeared religion, not only in the moral sense but in the mystical, transcendental sense. Creativity, appreciation of the arts also seem to me to differentiate man from the animals. Unless you can explain that then the view of man you present is very limited.

A. But I did define art - painting, music, dance, all forms of art - as imagination made public, made available to others through linguistic skills.

Q. On what basis?

A. On the basis that all those forms of art use symbols which are, in essence, similar to the symbols used in language - they convey thought, feeling - they communicate with others (and sometimes with the artist himself as a dialogue, an internal dialogue) to the extent that the listener or the observer or the participant shares the meanings attributed to the symbols.

Q. But may it not be that they are creative in the same way as language is creative? Might it not be, not that they use symbols but that they are creative?

A. But that is essential to the concept of language. Creativity and language are part of the same concept; art and creativity are inseparable; art is a medium through which people communicate; language is a medium for communication. Most of us have only language as our creative medium. A few of us are lucky enough to have been educated in a number of media - language, music, painting, dance ...

Q(14) I cannot understand the equation between intelligence and linguistic skills.

A. Intelligence, as used technically, is simply a measure of the depth and width of linguistic skill. All

intelligence tests are couched in linguistic modes of one kind or another - language, shapes, colours, patterns - which have to be manipulated or interpreted from certain assigned meanings. All tests are symbols to express meaning in terms of shapes, colours, patterns, words, relationships and so on.

Q. But surely man has to be taught to express himself linguistically?

A. Exactly! That is why the concept of inherited intelligence - except in the special sense used by Donald Hebb when he speaks of Intelligence A (the physical apparatus through which man communicates) - is a nonsense. No baby inherits the knowledge that this is black and that white - he has to be taught those names in association with the relevant objects. No baby inherits the language to express the sensa- tion he feels when he touches iron or cotton wool - he has to be taught it.

Q. Are you saying that a person cannot be described as intelligent until he is in a position to exploit his knowledge?

A. Of course! That is why Prof. Vernon made the mistake of saying, for example, that the Australian aborigine is less intelligent than the Australian white. If so many whites die in the outback where the aborigine normally lives, then they must be less intelligent, i.e. less knowledgeable and less skilled in what is required to survive there. The ability to survive is surely the ultimate intelligence test. Prof. Vernon also categorises West Indian children as less intelligent than British children. But what has happened is that the aborigine and the West Indian have learnt a different set of skills appropriate to their environment. Put them into the environment of the Stock Exchange and, of course, they will fail, until they have learnt the appropriate skills. Move the stockbroker into the outback and he will fail by aboriginal standards. The concept of a universally valid intelligence test is untenable.

Q. So you say that intelligence can only be defined in terms of a given cultural context?

A. Yes.

Q(15) How do you account for differences if intelligence is measured in very similar circumstances and by similar criteria, between people brought up in the same environment? You may get two brothers brought up in the same way and in the identically same environment who display wide differences in intelligence.

A. Sigmund Freud showed clearly that in the question of intellectual achievement the emotional background can be very important, either in sustaining or in lowering the expression of intellectual capacity. Take a very simple but obvious example of a mother with a pair of young twins. The twins are, so far as the mother is concerned, lying upstairs fast asleep when a thunderstorm starts. Being herself nervous of thunder, she rushes upstairs and finds one twin asleep and the other awake but showing no sign of distress. Her own state of mind causes her to pick up the wakeful twin, reassure it, walk up and down murmuring to it until the storm has abated. How can she avoid communicating her own nervousness to that twin? The next morning these twins are not the same, even if they were before. One has had a new experience that associates for him a thunderstorm with a nervous mother.

The human brain some 100,000,000,000 cells or so - is so complex that variations in the immediate situation here and now cause differences which affect wider and wider regions of allied or comparable areas of experience as the person grows older. One twin listening to the story of the Three Little Pigs while sickening for measles will obviously not absorb the story with the same attention as the twin who is quite well. The same event can cause two people to react in widely different ways to the same stimulus - as we have experienced here this evening - because of the differences already established in their knowledge, values and emotional state. People do not love their children in exactly the same way, though most claim to do so. We cannot make statements - and certainly not 'scientific' statements - about children from 'identical' environments simply because the staggering complexity of the human brain, even in babies, renders our reactions to any stimulus idiosyncratic.

Q(14) Cambridge psychologists have shown that in very early life - within the first few days - there are innate differences in children.

A. Differences, certainly, but not necessarily innate, except in so far as the differences are differences in physical structures - hair colouration, skin texture, disposition of body fat and so on. Already there is much evidence that the environment of the womb can cause different reactions on the part of the baby. Luria's statement that the baby is born conditioned to its mother's voice is an example of this, since conditioning is a form of learning.

Q(16) Why is not that an innate difference?

A. Because it is a difference that is acquired <u>after</u> the conjunction of the genetic patterns from mother and father has already taken place. 'Innate' is that which is already part of the genetic structure and which

may or may not, according to the environmental conditions in the womb, be allowed to develop. Babies conceived by parents who were fully healthy at the time of conception may nevertheless be born impaired if the mother is undernourished during pregnancy or smokes to excess during that time.

Q(1) I am surprised at the inconsistency between your statement about democracy and your refusal to allow parents to choose the schools for their children; would you explain that?

A. If access to all careers were equally available to all children and if the rewards for the work done in all careers were the same, then there would be no objection to people choosing what they wanted to do. But at the moment access to different types of school results in different rates of access to different jobs in our society and, therefore, to different levels of wealth and privilege - that is the central objection. Selection for different types of school is, in effect, social selection - that, surely, is the clear message of all educational research from 1950 onwards so we are not surprised that such research has been stopped by Conservative governments.

Q. How much freedom are you going to allow the individual?

A. I cannot make such decisions! The democratic processes of the society will decide that, as, to some extent, already happens.

Q. But 'democratic' means that the individual should be free to choose. You are qualifying it now.

A. Yes. 'Democratic' does not mean that every whim must be satisfied irrespective of the consequences to others. No individual should be free to sell heroin to young people. That's licentious.

Q. Sir, you are being emotional!

A. I am simply taking a rather obvious example to illustrate the abstraction you have flung at me. Certain forms of activity in the business of this country are undemocratic and we have made laws against, for example, the monopolistic control of certain goods and services, though few lawyers would agree that we have succeeded in eliminating monopolistic practices altogether. During the war a fellow tank officer designed an oil filter that would have prolonged the life of lubricating oil several times and saved the lives of many merchant seamen killed by enemy action while transporting it. The design of the filter was bought up by an international oil corporation and never heard of again.

Q. The effects of heroin are well known. If you were to say to me, "Nobody in our society should be free to sell cotton wool," then you would be affecting the complete freedom of the individual.

A. But in an interdependent society no one has complete freedom of action if his acts limit the freedom of others in that society. That is why we differentiate between freedom and licence. Access to a Public school is significant because it makes available to that child a range of occupations that is not available to the child lower down the scale.

Q. The child of rich parents will always have privileges and will always have more choice. That is a matter of fact. The Duke of Westminster's son will still be the Duke of Westminster's son whether he is educated or not.

A. Not in a society which does not have dukes! Nor in a society which does not afford special privileges or prestige to dukes. Remember John Dewey's statement, it is worth pondering. He said, "What the best and wisest parent wants for his child, that must society want for all its children. Anything less is ignoble: acted upon it will destroy our democracy."

(End of discussion)