

versity retains its savour. I shall return to this point later. Here I wish to express a growing doubt about the validity of the distinction between "General" and "Special" education as it is currently drawn. The doubt, I think, goes to the root of the matter. On the one hand I see men and women who have succeeded in drawing the means of fullness of life out of the seeming technicalities of vocational training. Such people find water-springs in a dry ground. Or, like Saul in Israel, they set out on the humble task of seeking the strayed donkeys and find a kingdom. For one, the building of motor cars, for another the management of a schooner, for another the cultivation of a farm, yes, even the management of a household may become the gateway of emancipation into a satisfying life.

On the other hand, I see men and women of alleged "liberal" learning whose only capacity seems to be to go on accumulating more and more of the same sort: walking museums, whose contents rattle more and more drily and harshly as life goes on.

Which of these has had the "liberal" training? Please do not misunderstand me. My point is not to decry so-called "General" education: anything but that! It is rather to emphasize the view that a course of education is to be judged by its product rather than by the content of its programme. That is liberal which produces the liberal and special which produces the special. And the difference is quite as much a matter of spirit and atmosphere as of formal content on paper.

I think we have here *the* crucial educational issue for a modern democratic community where each must discharge his proper skilful task, and all must share in, and contribute to, the common cultural life. We have not really faced the issue yet, largely because we have been obsessed by a formal distinction between the liberal and the vocational, which is largely traditional, and exists today very much on paper.

Let me illustrate by a direct question: What percentage of the young people of our universities—yes—even in our high schools—are there, in the last resort, for any other than a vocational motive? Insistently, in season and out of season, we have linked formal education with *success*. That has been our real faith, our real working philosophy. Some of us have gone so far as to work out laboriously and in true modern fashion the comparative cash value of various levels of education; public schools in hundreds, high school in thousands, and university in tens of thousands of dollars. And our young people have responded. Why should they not, to a faith which their elders hold so fervently? No wonder that, in their secret hearts, many of them look upon our fine "inspirational talks" about the value of education in itself as just so much insincere bunk.

The Nemesis for all this may be already at the door. I shall be immensely relieved if the next few years do not bring a violent popular reaction against the whole of our elaborate provision for formal education in school and university as a huge fraud. Unfair, no doubt, but it will be one more charge of the younger generation against the older that the latter has held out promises which it cannot fulfil. The donkey has made the painful journey and there are no carrots at the end of it. It is a little late in the day now to turn and rebuke the donkey for worldliness and to assure him that he has his reward in a much more spiritual and lasting sustenance than carrots.

Clearly it is the philosophy that is wrong, particularly wrong in the insincere guise of idealism behind which it hides the true grossness of its inspiration. In truth, where our effort should have been to liberalise the vocational we have succeeded only in vocationalising the liberal, and have fouled the feeding trough of culture in the process.

The fundamental revision of values that is called for will have to extend