The Tyranny or Freedom of Culture? Or Culture, Choice or Control?

The Philosophy Cafe Meet Up, Brisbane, Australia

Sunday, 13 September 2020

Dr Neville Buch, MPHA (Qld)

Introduction

We take a different tack in our discussion from the previous essays I have composed. Instead of an essay, I have provided a book chapter, entitled, "Cultural and Captivity", to be read. The reading is far better than what I can currently compose, as the heart of the topic to be discussed. It is from Amartya Sen's *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (2006, Allen Lane). The reason for the choice is rather serendipitous. I do not have the time to compose the essay I had intended, and by chance I had taken to reading the book on a Sunday afternoon, and thus to find the solution to my time constraint problem. The chapter said well what I have thought that needed to be said and discussed. The reason for my time constraint was an 10,000 essay I am currently composing for a University of Birmingham conference on "Worship and Megachurch". My point for that paper is there are common themes which were developed by the well-known historian Richard Hofstadter as the history of American culture, and the megachurch problem is sourced in that history. The de-ideological business model of the megachurch had rejected theological intellectualism as 'worldly', and thus, became trapped in the fashion cycle of culture.

As alluded to in the introductory description of the Meet-Up on this topic, "That's When I Reach For My Revolver" by Moby, or the 'Mission of Burma', provided a very pessimistic view of cultural captivity:

Once I had my heroes

Once I had my dreams

But all of that is changed now

The truth begins again

The truth is not that comfortable, no

Mother taught us patience

The virtues of restraint

Father taught us boundaries

The knowledge we must go

I'm trying to protect my unity

That's when I reach for my revolver

Amartya Sen provides a positive view with losing anything of the realism in our predicament. We can choose to resist violence while also resist the captivity of culture. Sen's solution is education. It is not a perfect solution, and education are not without its problems. It too must avoid cultural captivity.

In the end it may be impossible, in the least, to avoid the cultural filter (free at least of the chain). Most of what follow from Sen's chapter six is non-controversial until he discusses the topic in relation to education. There will be disagreement, but Sen does raise a legitimate problem. The federation of faith-based schools have, in my educationalist historian judgement, proven more capable in reasoning and choice for their respective curriculum than what Sen feared in the year 2006. His concern, though, is right, and Sen's point should be seen more in promoting the value of nonsectarian and nonparochial school education.

******

Amartya Sen (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*, Allen Lane, pp. 103-119 [Chapter Six]

CULTURE AND CAPTIVITY
Amartya Sen

The world has come to the conclusion—more defiantly than
should have been needed—that culture matters. The world
is obviously right—culture does matter. However, the real question
is: "How does culture matter?" The confining of culture into
stark and separated boxes of civilizations or of religious identities,
discussed in the last two chapters, takes too narrow a view of cultural
attributes. Other cultural generalizations, for example,
about national, ethnic, or racial groups, can also present astonishingly
limited and bleak understandings of the characteristics of
the human beings involved. When a hazy perception of culture is
combined with fatalism about the dominating power of culture,
we are, in effect, asked to be imaginary slaves of an illusory force.
And yet simple cultural generalizations have great effectiveness
in fixing our way of thinking. The fact that such generalizations
abound in popular convictions and in informal communication is [end of page 103]
easily recognized. Not only are the implicit and twisted beliefs frequently
the subject matter of racist jokes and ethnic slurs, they
sometimes surface as grand theories. When there is an accidental
correlation between cultural prejudice and social observation
(no matter how casual), a theory is born, and it may refuse to die
even after the chance correlation has vanished without a trace.
Consider the labored jokes against the Irish (such crudities as
"How many Irishmen do you need to change a lightbulb?"), which
have had some currency in England for a long time, and which are
similar to equally silly jokes about the Poles in America. These crudities

had the superficial appearance of fitting well with the

depressing predicament of the Irish economy, when the Irish

economy was doing quite badly. But when the Irish economy

started growing astonishingly rapidly—indeed in recent years

faster than any other European economy (Ireland is now richer in

per capita income than nearly every country in Europe)—the cultural

stereotyping and its allegedly profound economic and social

relevance were not junked as sheer and unmitigated rubbish.

Theories have lives of their own, quite defiantly of the phenomenal

world that can actually be observed.

Imagined Truths and Real Policies

Such theories are, often enough, not just harmless fun. For example,

cultural prejudice did play a role in the treatment Ireland

received from the British government, and had a part even in the

nonprevention of the famines of the 1840s. Among the influences

that had an effect on London's treatment of Irish economic problems,

cultural alienation did count. While poverty in Britain was

typically attributed to economic change and fluctuations, Irish [end of page 104]

poverty was widely viewed in England (as Richard Ned Lebow, the

political analyst, has argued) as being caused by laziness, indifference,

and ineptitude, so that "Britain's mission" was not seen

as one "to alleviate Irish distress but to civilize her people and to

lead them to feel and act like human beings."

The search for cultural causes of Ireland's economic predicament

extends far back, at least to the sixteenth century, well

reflected in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, published in

1590. The art of blaming the victims, plentifully present in *The*

Faerie Queene itself, was put to effective use during the famines
of the 1840s, and new elements were added to the old narrative.
For example, the Irish taste for potatoes was added to the list of
calamities which the natives had, in the English view, brought on
themselves. Charles Edward Trevelyan, the head of the Treasury
during the famines, expressed his belief that London had done all
that could be done for Ireland, even though the famine killed rampantly
(in fact, the mortality rate was higher in the Irish famines
than in any other recorded famine anywhere in the world).
Trevelyan also proposed a rather remarkable cultural exegesis
of Ireland's manifest hunger by linking it with the allegedly limited
horizons of Irish culture (in contrast with putting any blame
on British governance): "There is scarcely a woman of the peasant
class in the West of Ireland whose culinary art exceeds the
boiling of a potato."' The remark can be seen as an encouraging
departure from the English hesitation about making international
criticism of culinary art elsewhere (the French, the Italian, and
the Chinese may be next). But the oddity of that cultural explanation
of Irish hunger certainly merits a place in the annals of
eccentric anthropology.

The connection between cultural bigotry and political tyranny
can be very close. The asymmetry of power between the ruler and
the ruled, which generates a heightened sense of identity contrast, [end of page 105]
can be combined with cultural prejudice in explaining away failures
of governance and public policy. Winston Churchill made the
famous remark that the Bengal famine of 1943, which occurred
just before India's independence from Britain in 1947 (it would
also prove to be the last famine in India in the century, since
famines disappeared with the Raj), was caused by the tendency

of people there to "breed like rabbits." The explication belongs to the general tradition of finding explanations of disasters not in bad administration, but in the culture of the subjects, and this habit of thought had some real influence in crucially delaying famine relief in the Bengal famine, which killed between two and three million people. Churchill rounded things up by expressing his frustration that the job of governing India was made so difficult by the fact that the Indians were "the beastliest people in the world, next to the Germans." Cultural theories evidently have their uses.

Korea and Ghana

Cultural explanations of economic underdevelopment have recently been given much ground. Consider, for example, the following argument from the influential and engaging book jointly edited by Lawrence Harrison and Samuel Huntington called Culture Matters; it occurs in Huntington's introductory essay, called "Cultures Count," in that volume:

In the early 1990s, I happened to come across economic data on Ghana and South Korea in the early 1960s, and I was astonished to see how similar their economies were then. . . . Thirty years later, South Korea had become an industrial giant with the four-[end of page 106] teenth largest economy in the world, multinational corporations, major exports of automobiles, electronic equipment, and other

sophisticated manufactures, and per capita income approximately

that of Greece. Moreover it was on its way to the consolidation

of democratic institutions. No such changes had

occurred in Ghana, whose per capita income was now about onefifteenth

that of South Korea's. How could this extraordinary difference

in development be explained? Undoubtedly, many

factors played a role, but it seemed to me that culture had to be

a large part of the explanation. South Koreans valued thrift,

investment, hard work, education, organization, and discipline.

Ghanians had different values. In short, cultures count.

There may well be something of interest in this way-out comparison

(perhaps even a quarter-truth torn out of context), but the

contrast does call for probing examination. As used in the explanation

just cited, the causal story is extremely deceptive. There

were many important differences—other than their cultural predispositions—

between Ghana and Korea in the 1960s.

First, the class structures in the two countries were quite different,

with a much bigger—and proactive role for the business

classes in South Korea. Second, the politics were very different

too, with the government in South Korea willing and eager to play

a prime-moving role in initiating business-centered economic

development in a way that was not true in Ghana. Third, the close

relationship between the Korean economy and Japan, on the one

hand, and the United States, on the other, made a big difference,

at least in the early stages of Korean economic expansion.

Fourth—and perhaps most important—by the 1960s South

Korea had acquired a much higher literacy rate and a much

more expanded school system than Ghana had. Korean progress

in school education had been largely brought about in the post- [end of page 107]

Second World War period, mainly through resolute public policy,

and it could not be seen just as a reflection of culture

(except in the general sense in which culture is seen to include

everything happening in a country). On the basis of the slender

scrutiny that backed Huntington's conclusion, it is hard to justify

either the cultural triumphalism in favor of Korean culture

or the radical pessimism about Ghana's future to which Huntington

is led through his reliance on cultural determinism.

This is not to suggest that cultural factors are irrelevant to

the process of development. But they do not work in isolation

from social, political, and economic influences. Nor are they

immutable. If cultural issues are taken into account, among others,

in a fuller accounting of societal change, they can greatly

help to broaden our understanding of the world, including the

process of development and the nature of our identity. While it

is not particularly illuminating, nor especially helpful, to throw

up one's hands in disapproval when faced with allegedly fixed

cultural priorities ("Ghanians had different values," as Huntington

puts it), it is useful to examine how values and behavior can

respond to social change, for example, through the influence of

schools and colleges. Let me refer again to South Korea, which

was a much more literate and more educated society than

Ghana in the 1960s (when the two economies appeared rather

similar to Huntington). The contrast, as has already been mentioned,

was substantially the result of public policies pursued in

South Korea in the post—Second World War period. But the

postwar public policies on education were also influenced by

antecedent cultural features. Once we dissociate culture from

the illusion of destiny, it can help to provide a better understanding

of social change when placed together with other influences

and interactive social processes.

In a two-way relationship, just as education influences culture, [end of page 108]

so can antecedent culture have an effect on educational policies.

It is, for example, remarkable that nearly every country in the

world with a powerful presence of Buddhist tradition has tended

to embrace widespread schooling and literacy with some eagerness.

This applies not only to Japan and Korea, but also to China,

Thailand, Sri Lanka, and even to the otherwise retrograde Burma

(Myanmar). The focus on enlightenment in Buddhism (the word

"Buddha" itself means "enlightened") and the priority given to

reading texts, rather than leaving it to the priests, can help to

encourage educational expansion. Seen in a broader framework,

there is probably something here to investigate and learn from.

It is, however, important also to see the interactive nature of

the process in which contact with other countries and the knowledge

of their experiences can make a big practical difference.

There is every evidence that when Korea decided to move briskly

forward in expanding school education at the end of the Second

World War, it was influenced not just by its cultural interest in

education, but also by a new understanding of the role and significance

of education, based on the experiences of Japan and the

West, including the United States.

Japanese Experience and Public Policy

There is a similar story, earlier on, of international interaction
and national response in Japan's own history of educational
development. When Japan emerged from its self-imposed isolation
from the world (lasting since the seventeenth century, under
the Tokugawa regime), it already had a relatively well-developed
school system, and in this achievement Japan's traditional interest
in education had played a significant part. Indeed, at the time [end of page 109]
of the Meiji restoration in 1868, Japan had a higher rate of liter-
acy than Europe. And yet the rate of literacy in Japan was still
low (as it obviously was in Europe too), and perhaps most impor-
tantly, the Japanese education system was quite out of touch
with advances in science and technical knowledge in the indus-
trializing West.

When, in 1852, Commodore Matthew Perry chugged into
Edo Bay, puffing black smoke from the newly designed
steamship, the Japanese were not only impressed—and somewhat
terrified—and driven to accept diplomatic and trade relations
with the United States, but they also had to reexamine and
reassess their intellectual isolation from the world. This con-
tributed to the political process that led to the Meiji restoration,
and along with that came a determination to change the face of
Japanese education. In the so-called Charter Oath, proclaimed in
1868, there is a firm declaration on the need to "seek knowledge
widely throughout the world."

The Fundamental Code of Education issued three years later,
in 1872, put the new educational determination in unequivocal
terms:

There shall, in the future, be no community with an illiterate

family, nor a family with an illiterate person.

Kido Takayoshi, one of the most influential leaders of that period, put the basic issue with great clarity:

Our people are no different from the Americans or Europeans of

today; it is all a matter of education or lack of education.

That was the challenge- Japan took on with determination in the, late nineteenth century. [end of page 110]

Between 1906 and 1911, education consumed as much as 43 percent of the budgets of the towns and villages for Japan as a whole. By 1906, the recruiting army officers found that, in contrast with the late nineteenth century, there was hardly any new recruit who was not already literate. By 1910, Japan had, it is generally acknowledged, universal attendance in primary schools. By 1913, even though Japan was still economically very poor and underdeveloped, it had become one of the largest producers of books in the world, publishing more books than Britain and indeed more than twice as many as the United States. Indeed, Japan's entire experience of economic development was, to a great extent, driven by human-capability formation, which included the role of education and training, and this was promoted both by public policy and by a supportive cultural climate (interacting with each

other). The dynamics of associative relations are extraordinarily

important in understanding how Japan laid the foundations of its

spectacular economic and social development.

To carry the story further, Japan was not only a learner but

also a great teacher. Development efforts of countries in East

and Southeast Asia were profoundly influenced by Japan's experience

in expanding education and its manifest success in transforming

society and the economy. The so-called East Asian

miracle was, to no small extent, an achievement inspired by the

Japanese experience.

Paying attention to cultural interrelations, within a broad

framework, can be a useful way of advancing our understanding

of development and change. It would differ both from neglecting

culture altogether (as some narrowly economic models do) and

from the privileging of culture as an independent and stationary

force, with an immutable presence and irresistible impact (as

some cultural theorists seem to prefer). The illusion of cultural

destiny is not only misleading, it can also be significantly debili [end of page 111]

tating, since it can generate a sense of fatalism and resignation

among people who are unfavorably placed.

Culture in a Broad Framework

There can be little doubt that our cultural background can have

quite a major influence on our behavior and thinking. Also, the

quality of life we enjoy cannot but be influenced by our cultural

background. It certainly can also influence our sense of identity

and our perception of affiliation with groups of which we see ourselves

as members. The skepticism I have been expressing here is

not about the recognition of the basic importance of culture in

human perception and behavior. It is about the way culture is

sometimes seen, rather arbitrarily, as the central, inexorable, and

entirely independent determinant of societal predicaments.

Our cultural identities can be extremely important, but they

do not stand starkly alone and aloof from other influences on our

understanding and priorities. There are a number of qualifications

that have to be made while acknowledging the influence of culture

on human lives and actions. First, important as culture is, it

is not uniquely significant in determining our lives and identities.

Other things, such as class, race, gender, profession, politics, also

matter, and can matter powerfully.

Second, culture is not a homogeneous attribute—there can be

great variations even within the same general cultural milieu. For

example, contemporary Iran has both conservative ayatollahs and

radical dissidents, just as America has room both for born-again

Christians and for ardent nonbelievers (among a great many other

schools of thought and behavior). Cultural determinists often

underestimate the extent of heterogeneity within what is taken to [end of page 112]

be "one" culture. Discordant voices are often "internal," rather

than coming from the outside. Also, depending on the particular

aspect of culture we decide to concentrate on (for example,

whether we focus on religion, or on literature, or on music), we

can get quite a varying picture of the internal and external relations

involved.

Third, culture does not sit still. The brief recollection of the

educational transformation of Japan and Korea, with profound cultural

implications, illustrated the importance of change, linked—

as it often is—with public discussion and policy. Any presumption

of stationariness—explicit or implicit—can be disastrously deceptive.

The temptation toward using cultural determinism often

takes the hopeless form of trying to moor the cultural anchor on

a rapidly moving boat.

Fourth, culture interacts with other determinants of social

perception and action. For example, economic globalization

brings in not only more trade, but also more global music and cinema.

Culture cannot be seen as an isolated force independent of

other influences. The presumption of insularity often implicitly

invoked—can be deeply delusive.

Finally, we have to distinguish between the idea of cultural liberty,

which focuses on our freedom either to preserve or to change

our priorities (on the basis of greater knowledge or further reflection,

or, for that matter, on the basis of our assessment of changing

customs and fashions), and that of valuing cultural

conservation, which has become a big issue in the rhetoric of

multiculturalism (often providing support for the continuation of

traditional lifestyles by new immigrants in the West). There is

undoubtedly a strong case for including cultural freedom among

t he human capabilities people have reason to value, but there is

a need also for a probing examination of the exact relation

between cultural liberty and the priorities of multiculturalism. [end of page 113]

Multiculturalism and Cultural Freedom

In recent years, multiculturalism has gained much ground as an

important value, or more accurately as a powerful slogan (since

its underlying values are not altogether clear). The simultaneous

flourishing of different cultures within the same country or region

can be seen to be of importance on its own, but very often multiculturalism

is advocated on the ground that this is what cultural

freedom demands. That claim has to be scrutinized further.

The importance of cultural freedom has to be distinguished

from the celebration of every form of cultural inheritance, irrespective

of whether the persons involved would choose those

particular practices given the opportunity of critical scrutiny and

an adequate knowledge of other options and of the choices that

actually exist. Even though there has been much discussion in

recent years about the important and extensive role of cultural

factors in social living and human development, the focus has

often tended to be, explicitly or by implication, on the need for

cultural conservation (for example, continued adherence to the

conservative lifestyles of people whose geographical move to

Europe or America is not always matched by cultural adaptation).

Cultural freedom may include, among other priorities, the

liberty to question the automatic endorsement of past traditions,

when people—particularly young people—see a reason for

changing their ways of living.

If freedom of human decision is important, then the results of

a reasoned exercise of that freedom have to be valued, rather than

being negated by an imposed precedence of unquestioned conservation.

The critical link includes our ability to consider alternative

options, to understand what choices are involved, and then

to decide what we have reason to want. [end of page 114]

It must, of course, be recognized that cultural liberty could be

hampered when a society does not allow a particular community

to pursue some traditional lifestyle that members of that community

would freely choose to follow. Indeed, social suppression

of particular lifestyles—of gays, of immigrants, of specific religious groups—is common in many countries in the world. The insistence that gays or lesbians live like heterosexuals, or stay inside closets, is not only a demand for uniformity, it is also a denial of the freedom of choice. If diversity is not allowed, then many choices would be rendered unviable. The allowing of diversity can indeed be important for cultural freedom.

Cultural diversity may be enhanced if individuals are allowed and encouraged to live as they would value living (instead of being restrained by ongoing tradition). For example, the freedom to pursue ethnically diverse lifestyles, for example, in food habits or in music, can make a society more culturally diverse precisely as a result of the exercise of cultural liberty. In this case, the importance of cultural diversity—instrumental as it is—will follow directly from the value of cultural liberty, since the former will be a consequence of the latter.

Diversity can also play a positive role in enhancing the freedom even of those who are not directly involved. For example, a culturally diverse society can bring benefits to others in the form of the ample variety of experiences which they are, as a consequence, in a position to enjoy. To illustrate, it can plausibly be argued that the rich tradition of African-American music—with its African lineage and American evolution—has not only helped to enhance the cultural freedom and self-respect of African-Americans, it has also expanded the cultural options of all people (African-American or not) and enriched the cultural landscape of America, and indeed the world.

Nevertheless, if our focus is on freedom (including cultural [end of 115] freedom), the significance of cultural diversity cannot be unconditional

and must vary contingently with its causal connections
with human freedom and its role in helping people to take their
own decisions. In fact, the relation between cultural liberty and
cultural diversity need not be uniformly positive. For example, the
simplest way of having cultural diversity may, in some circumstances,
be a total continuation of all the preexisting culture practices
that *happen* to be present at a point in time (for example,
new immigrants may be induced to continue their old, fixed ways
and mores, and discouraged—directly or indirectly—from changing
their behavior pattern at all). Does this suggest that for the sake
of cultural diversity we should support *cultural conservatism* and
ask people to stick to their own cultural background and not try
to consider moving to other lifestyles even if they find good reasons
to do so? The undermining of choice that this would involve
would immediately deliver us to an antifreedom position, which
would look for ways and means of blocking the choice of a
changed living mode that many people may wish to have.
For example, young women from conservative immigrant families
in the West might be kept on a short leash by the elders for
fear that they would emulate the freer lifestyle of the majority
community. Diversity will then be achieved at the cost of cultural
liberty. If what is ultimately important is cultural freedom, then
the valuing of cultural diversity must take a contingent and conditional
form. The merit of diversity must thus depend on precisely
how that diversity is brought about and sustained.
Indeed, to plead for cultural diversity on the ground that this
is what the different groups of people have inherited is clearly not
an argument based on cultural liberty (even though the case is
sometimes presented as if it were a "profreedom" argument).

Being born in a particular culture is obviously not an exercise of

cultural liberty, and the preservat ion of something with which a [end of page 116]

person is stamped, simply because of birth, can hardly be, in

itself, an exercise of freedom. Nothing can be justified in the name

of freedom without actually giving people an opportunity for the

exercise of that freedom, or at least without carefully assessing

how an opportunity of choice would be exercised if it were available.

Just as social suppression can be a denial of cultural freedom,

the violation of freedom can also come from the tyranny of

conformism that may make it difficult for members of a community

to opt for other styles of living.

Schools, Reasoning, and Faith

Unfreedom can result also from a lack of knowledge and understanding

of other cultures and of alternative lifestyles. To illustrate

the main issue that is involved here, even an admirer (as this writer

is) of the cultural freedoms that modern Britain has, by and large,

succeeded in giving to people of different backgrounds and origins

who are resident in that country can well have considerable

misgivings about the official move in the United Kingdom toward

extension of state-supported faith-based schools (as was briefly

mentioned in the first chapter).

Rather than reducing existing state-financed faith-based

schools, actually adding others to them—Muslim schools, Hindu

schools, and Sikh schools to preexisting Christian ones—can

have the effect of reducing the role of reasoning which the children

may have the opportunity to cultivate and use. And this is

happening at a time when there is a great need for broadening the

horizon of understanding of other people and other groups, and

when the ability to undertake reasoned decision-making is of particular

importance. The limitations imposed on the children are [end of page 117]

especially acute when the new religious schools give children

rather little opportunity to cultivate reasoned choice in determining

the priorities of their lives. Also, they often fail to alert students

to the need to decide for themselves how the various components

of their identities (related respectively to nationality, language, literature,

religion, ethnicity, cultural history, scientific interests,

etc.) should receive attention.

This is not to suggest that the problems of bias (and the deliberate

fostering of a blinkered vision) in these new faith-based

British schools are anything as extreme as in, say, the fundamentalist

madrasas in Pakistan, which have become a part of the

breeding ground for intolerance and violence—and often for terrorism—

in that strained part of the world. But the opportunity of

cultivating reason and the recognition of the need for scrutinized

choice can still be far less in these new faith-based schools, even

in Britain, than in the more mixed and less sequestered places of

learning in that country. The actual opportunities are often rather

less than even in traditional religious schools—particularly in

those Christian schools which have had a long tradition of having

a broad curriculum, along with tolerating considerable skepticism

about religious education itself (though these older schools too

can be made considerably less restrictive than they already are).

The move toward faith-based schools in Britain reflects also a

particular vision of Britain as "a federation of communities,"

rather than as a collectivity of human beings living in Britain, with

diverse differences, of which religious and community-based distinctions

constitute only one part (along with differences in language,

literature, politics, class, gender, location, and other

characteristics). It is unfair to children who have not yet had

much opportunity of reasoning and choice to be put into rigid

boxes guided by one specific criterion of categorization, and to be

told: "That is your identity and this is all you are going to get." [end of page 118]

In the annual lecture for 2001 at the British Academy which

I had the privilege of giving (it was called "Other People"), I presented

the argument that this "federational" approach has a great

many problems, and in particular tends to reduce the development

of human capabilities of British children from immigrant families

in a significant way. Since then the incidents of suicide bombing

in London (in July 2005), carried out by British-born but

deeply alienated young men, have added another dimension to the

question of self-perception and its cultivation in Britain. However,

I would argue that the basic limitation of the federationist

approach goes well beyond any possible connection with terrorism.

There is an important need not only to discuss the relevance

of our common humanity a subject on which schools can play

(and have often played in the past) a critical role. There is, in addition,

the important recognition that human identities can take

many distinct forms and that people have to use reasoning to

decide on how to see themselves, and what significance they

should attach to having been born a member of a particular community.

I shall have the opportunity to return to this issue in the

last two chapters of the book.

The importance of nonsectarian and nonparochial school education

that expands, rather than reduces, the reach of reasoning

(including critical scrutiny) would be hard to exaggerate. Shakespeare

gave voice to the concern that "some are born great, some

achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." In

the schooling of children, it is necessary to make sure that smallness

is not "thrust upon" the young, whose lives lie ahead of them.

Much is at stake here.

[end of chapter six]