Love's place in school education

John White

Abstract

This paper is about the place that love of the activities they engage in has in a student's school education. After examining what it is to love an activity, the discussion turns to its place in school education as it might be. Given the role of human flourishing in the school's overall aims, the paper looks first at how this is related to love. It then argues that one task of the school should be to reveal to students the many forms of activities they may choose to love and to encourage them in the choices they make. A final section contrasts this account with a snapshot of the place of love in the work-oriented schools that we have today, and makes some final suggestions about possibilities, at a time when paid work is about to get harder to find, for pursuing activities that one loves.

Keywords: love; education; personal flourishing; compulsory curriculum; artisanal economy

Introduction

In 1974, Ray Elliott published an article called 'Education, Love of One's Subject, and the Love of Truth' (Elliott, 1974). In it he gives a perceptive account of how one comes to love a subject and what loving it does and does not involve. His focus is on the kind of love that someone has who later deepens their understanding of their subject throughout their university years and 'eventually becomes a scholar and teacher' of it (p136).

He says that just as in personal love 'the lover is expected to care for his *sic* beloved, protecting her from harm and bringing about her welfare', so:

> ... especially in times of change and confusion, the scholar who loves his subject recognizes an obligation to think about the nature of his subject, and to do what he can to ensure that his subject develops in the manner which is best for it, according to his conception of what its nature is; either that its present sound state should be preserved or its present imperfect state improved. (p137.)

Elliott points out that, just as in personal love, the scholar has sometimes to put the wellbeing of what they love above their own, not allowing their subject, for instance, to 'become a sort of gymnastic apparatus which he *sic* uses for displays of virtuosity' (p136).

Elliott says much more about this kind of love, not least with the humanities in mind. In the present paper, I want to widen the focus. Only a few school students become scholars and teachers of history, philosophy, science or another academic subject. My

 DOI: 10.3898/FORUM.2021.63.1.17

own concern is with *all* children. What place does love of the activities *they* engage in have in their school education, and what place should it have?

In his paper, drawing parallels with how one person begins to fall in love with another, Elliott says something of the foothills in which future scholars begin their ascent to the love of their subject. He writes of how 'a child at school finds a subject attractive, takes delight in it, and begins to look forward to the lessons in which it is taught' (p135). He says that, 'It becomes "his subject". During its lessons time passes with a strange swiftness. He believes it to be "better" than other subjects, and is prepared to give up other pleasures because absorption in his subject pleases him still more'. Elliott goes on to describe how the student comes to realise in time that enthusiastic interest is not enough in itself, since there are standards to be met and often something like drudgery to be faced. As he goes on, however, the student finds a fulfilment in trying to meet these demands. 'He has become devoted to its discipline'.

Some of what Elliott says here may not apply where children do not go on to become scholars in a subject. For one thing, not all views about school education see it in terms of studying *subjects*. I will use instead the wider term 'activities', and will be looking at the place of love in these in schools and in education more generally, taking this to embrace upbringing in the home as well as school learning.

Another issue is that it is as yet open how far along Elliott's ascent we should expect *every* child to climb. Should this go as far as the devotion he mentions at the end, or should we be satisfied if they finish their school education loving some or all of their activities to a lesser degree? Should we assume, indeed, that love should have *any* place in their schooling?

In this paper I make a case that it *should* have a place in every child's school education. Most of the paper gradually builds up my positive account of this, while its final section looks critically at love's role in a currently influential approach to schooling in the UK and elsewhere.

Loving an activity

What is it for a child to love an activity? Rather than looking immediately at activities taking place in school, I will widen the focus again to include as well those found outside it. Imagine a six-year-old girl who is keen on gymnastics. In her garden or in outings to parks she is endlessly doing cartwheels, back flips, and back-bend kick-overs.

She loves doing these things, we might say. This is more than enjoying them. I enjoy eating raspberries from my garden, and in everyday speech I might well say I love doing this, just as I love drinking the occasional glass of wine. Loving an activity in a more interesting sense goes beyond enjoyment.

The little gymnast does not merely find pleasure in what she is doing. She wants to do

her back flips properly, is anxious to improve when she can't quite get things right. She can do her back-bend kick-overs most of the time, and then only slowly and awkwardly. She will practise and practise until she can do them every time, smoothly and fast.

Following Frankfurt (2004, Chapter 1), she *cares* about what she is doing. It is *important* to her, in a way that eating raspberries is not. Not all caring is a form of love. I can care about the future stability of Europe, but its future stability is not something I love. My caring about it marks its importance for me, but it takes the form of extrinsic concerns about its effects on people's wellbeing in this continent and beyond. Love is a form of caring about something for its own sake. It is for intrinsic reasons that the little girl wants to do her gymnastics properly.

This is not to say that extrinsic considerations are absent. She is pleased to show people her latest moves and welcomes their praise and attention. This recognition may well be part of her motivation in going further. She has somewhere in mind her parents' and others' delight when she makes the next step forward. But this consideration must stay towards the back of her mind. If it becomes much more prominent, it may seem that what she really loves is attention, prowess at gym now just one way of getting this. What was an intrinsic delight may be becoming a means to something else.

This echoes Elliott's point about love of a subject deteriorating into display of virtuosity. He also writes about an opposite obstacle to it in the shape of excessive timidity, playing it safe (p137). Our young gymnast may be held back by self-doubt about her ability. Either way, her attention is *divided* between the demands of the activity and herself – the applause she will get, or her lack of what it takes. Loving an activity involves engaging *wholeheartedly* in it.

Elliott associates loving a subject, as we have seen, with time passing 'with a strange swiftness'. This is surely connected with wholeheartedness of engagement. Much of our life is spent in activity which lacks this dimension, activity impeded by all kinds of extrinsic factors: petty anxieties; thoughts about oneself and one's goals or the effect one is having on other people; concern about others; the news of the day; the state of the world. The notion of lacking impediment is part of what psychologists mean when they talk about 'flow'.

Wholehearted absorption in an activity, or 'flow', is not identical to loving it. Someone may become caught up in this way in a computer game, regretting afterwards the time he has spent on it and wishing he had been doing something more serious. Playing the game lacks the *importance* that an activity must have in one's life, as in the gymnastics example, if it is an object of love.

The little girl is well into the foothills. Steeper slopes lie ahead. She may or may not wish or be able to climb higher. Other delights may enter her life and drive this one out: she may cease to care about it; it may become unimportant to her. She may continue with her gymnastics but in a less wholehearted way, finding herself now lacking in

confidence perhaps, or too intent on impressing people. If she is unaffected by any of these, her love may deepen into devotion. In time she may develop an expertise in the activity, perhaps become a teacher of it. Her love will then increasingly take the form of the caring about the wellbeing of the object of one's love and protecting it from harm that Elliott mentions. But given that care can differ in degree, she can still love gymnastics even though she is unable or unwilling to reach its higher levels.

The place of love in school education as it might be

It is considerations like these that we need to keep in mind if we look more broadly at the place of love in every child's school education. I now turn to this.

First, I gradually construct a case about what its place should *ideally* be, and why. Then I look briefly at a contemporary approach to schooling in Britain and elsewhere that, in my view, falls short of this ideal. The discussion, especially, but not only, of the ideal situation, draws on work I have published elsewhere. These publications give fuller justifications of claims made in this paper whose soundness I will have to take for granted here (Reiss and White, 2013; White, 2007; 2011; 2014; 2016).

I also take for granted the role that a child's family can and should have in developing and encouraging her experience of loving – as in the example of the gymnast in her back garden. More fundamental than promoting love of activities is the role parents and carers play in children's learning to love those close to them: family members and friends. The school I am now about to describe will not only build on what families do but will interact with them in all kinds of ways to create a place where love can flourish.

The ideal account of love in school education has to begin with an account of what school education should involve. I begin from the claim, explored in Reiss and White (2013), that schools should aim at equipping all students to lead a flourishing personal life and to help others to do so too.[1] This presupposes a certain sort of society, one in which the conditions necessary for everyone to do these things are in place, e.g. material resources, time and suitable political arrangements. I am more than aware that these conditions are in fact often lacking.

A central notion in my account of schools' aims is personal flourishing (or personal wellbeing). I have argued in past writings (e.g. White, 2007; 2011) in favour of a view of personal wellbeing, indebted to Joseph Raz (1994, p3), that sees this as wholehearted engagement in intrinsically worthwhile activities and relationships. There is more to say, of course, on what the range of 'intrinsically worthwhile' pursuits might be (White, 2016, pp213-218). On the catholic interpretation that I favour, it would include such things as intimate relationships, aesthetic enjoyment of art or nature, the pursuit of understanding in different areas, physical activity, various practical pursuits of a vocational or non-vocational sort involving, for example, making things, and/or

cooperation in a common task.

How is love related to personal flourishing? First, given what I have said above about the connection between love, caring for the loved object and seeing it as important to one, it is hard to see what conception of a flourishing life there could be that lacked love. We have just seen that flourishing requires engaging in pursuits like those mentioned for their own sake. A life without love would be one in which nothing – neither persons nor activities – was important to one as an end in itself. It would at best be a life of engagement in activities and relationships instrumental to something else, and/or activities and relationships enjoyable in themselves but lacking any greater intrinsic importance to one than that.

A flourishing life is not only inconceivable without love: at its best, it must be largely *constituted* by forms of loving. Some rich people with servants in the eighteenth century may have been able to spend the whole of each day immersed wholeheartedly in a range of worthwhile delights: riding on their estates; being in amusing and intelligent company; listening to musicians; philanthropic business; intimate relationships. A picture of a flourishing life in a more democratic and more urban age like our own would have to make room, even for the more affluent, for unavoidable activities that many would find it hard to love, like commuting, dealing with companies, attending to household needs and problems. These apart, a flourishing life must be constituted by love as far as this is possible. One mark of how flourishing a life is is how large a part loving plays in it.

In saying that the flourishing life must be replete with love, I am not assuming, of course, that the depth of our care for the wellbeing of the beloved object must be the same from object to object. In a life in which love of one's partner, children, Beethoven's music, walking in the woods and half a dozen other types of love figure large, it may well be that the lover's devotion to her family goes deeper than her love of Beethoven or the natural world.

It is not the case that the more love there is in a life, the more flourishing it is, only that a flourishing life cannot be short on love. Flourishing is impossible without loving, but it is not the case that loving is impossible without flourishing. A woman might love a man for a long time, caring for him for his own sake and seeing him as an important part of her life, but their relationship may do nothing for her wellbeing. A striking – true – example is Yelena Radzueva in Svetlana Alexeivich's remarkable book *Second-hand Time* who abandons her husband and three children to give all her attention to, and then marry, a murderer in prison for life, whose face she had seen in a dream and with whom she had fallen in love (Alexeivich, 2016, pp643-669). He mistreats her to the extent that she believes that one day he will kill her: she says that she does not want to live and cannot take any more.

In this section I have sketched some of the wider ethical background needed to

show the place of love in an ideal school education. My first point was about the pivotal role of personal flourishing in its educational aims. I then looked briefly at conceptual relations between personal flourishing and love, claiming that although there can be love without flourishing, not only can there not be flourishing without love, but that a flourishing life is, at its best – given that flourishing is a matter of degree – largely built around forms of loving.

I now turn to the ideal school. If it is to have the twofold aim of equipping students A to lead a flourishing life themselves and B to help others to do so, it must prepare them for a life largely constituted by loves of various kinds. In a society like our own that prizes personal autonomy, aim A will leave it to each individual to choose which kinds to go for. Nearly everyone will have some place for intimate relationships, although the extent of these and the weight placed on them vis-à-vis other things will differ from individual to individual. Beyond this, the arts will be prominent in one person's life; closeness to nature or the pursuit of some practical skill in another's. Many people – and in the ideal world, but not sadly in our own, perhaps everyone – will love the paid work that they do, taking into account not only its specialised content but also the colleagues among whom they work and the ethos of their workplace.

A central task of our ideal school is to open up this world of manifold forms of love. This is partly so that, as autonomous persons, its students will make their own choices within it in the course of their lives. But it is also partly so that students can appreciate the significance of loving in *other* individuals' lives and the range of forms of loving open to them.

This is one requirement of aim B – to help others, too, to lead flourishing lives. How else is love connected with this other-directed aim? Included in the wider group of others are those whom one loves, or will love – friends, lovers, family members. The ideal school will help deepen in its students the understanding and dispositions necessary for such loves. Beyond this circle, the 'others' in question are, as individuals – *pace* some religious views – not objects of one's love, although there should be attachments of other sorts that bind one to them. I know no individuals in Middlesbrough or in Kinshasa and so have no personal loves in those cities. But I may still have a responsibility to help some of their citizens to flourish more adequately. Love may come into this if the paid work I do is designed to promote that end and if I love this work; but this would be love of a project beneficial to others, not personal love.

I return to what I have called a central task of the school – to reveal to students the manifold forms of love and where possible to nourish their growth. As part of this, the school will not neglect loves that are *already* developing in students – for their families, for instance, their religion, music, a football team, motor cars, singing. Whatever intrinsic value these activities may or may not have, the experience of loving them – and their importance in the students' lives as well as their intrinsic delights – may be fertile

ground for teachers to encourage these forms of love further, as well as planting seeds of other kinds of love.

I have already said that I favour catholicity in the range of intrinsically worthwhile activities that can form a part of a flourishing life, and that it is the school's task to reveal and encourage. They include, as I said, 'such things as intimate relationships, aesthetic enjoyment of art or nature, the pursuit of understanding in different areas, physical activity, various practical pursuits of a vocational or non-vocational sort involving, for example, making things and/or cooperation in a common task'.

Making students aware and giving them experience of these forms of love is *the central but not the whole* task of the ideal school. Realising its twofold aim also requires equipping students with the understanding and dispositions necessary for a decent life in a modern world. They need to be literate, numerate, have some grasp of science, the political community and wider world they live in, the world of paid employment and so on. Teachers of these matters rightly do not expect all learners to *love* activities like addition and subtraction, finding out about atomic structure or about industrial centres across the world: it is enough for them that all students be *interested* in such matters. But there is more to loving, as we have seen, than finding something interesting.

Why do I say that the revelation of possible objects of love, rather than promoting literacy, numeracy, basic scientific and geographical understanding etc., is a *central* task of the school? Some would say this gets things the wrong way round, as it gives what is essential less priority than other things. The answer is related to the distinction between flourishing and the necessary conditions for that flourishing – income, food, clean air, housing, an autonomy-supporting political community, etc. The importance of such things in one's life is that they facilitate what should be central to it, one's own and others' wellbeing. It is these, as we have seen, that are at the core of the school's aims. Literacy, numeracy etc., like income, food etc., are best seen as necessary conditions of a person's wellbeing – facilitators, not core elements.

Literacy, numeracy, basic science, political literacy, vocational awareness etc. are uncontroversially things that school students *have* to learn, i.e. part of the school's compulsory curriculum. To what extent should this compulsory curriculum be involved in the revelation of possible objects of love as well as in this 'basic' learning?

In general, there would seem to be a strong case for this. Children like our little gymnast may find themselves in the early stages of this or that kind of loving without the school's assistance. But no child could be exposed without the school's help to the *wide range* of possible loves mentioned above. Ensuring this means some compulsion. Our teachers of literacy, science, politics etc. have a hand in this kind of exposure, leading learners into the foothills of creative writing, reading literature, investigating the natural and social worlds, mathematical exploration, political involvement. It is part of their professional skill to know how to balance the demands of basic education

in their area, with its minimum requirement of interest, and the deeper demands of revealing something of what it is to love their field.

The revelatory aim is likely to require some compulsion in other areas besides these basics: personal relationships, for instance, love of nature or of visual art, architecture, music, making things and other practical activities, physical pursuits. If we put basic and non-basic areas together, as curriculum designers we face what may seem an obvious problem: the range of possible objects of love which students need to be acquainted with so as to make autonomous choices among them is so broad that it is hard to see how one could create time in any compulsory curriculum to cover them all.[2]

This only seems problematic, I suggest, if we think of the compulsory curriculum as made up of courses in maths, history and so on *taught over many years*. This clearly puts limits on the number of activities that it can include. One solution is to adopt a 'taster-option' model for a part – perhaps a large part? – of the curriculum. Fuller details are spelt out in Reiss and White (2013, pp18-19), but the basic idea is that students can be given short compulsory introductions to various kinds of possible objects of love (e.g. advanced maths), after which those who wish to climb further into the foothills of an activity can take it further as an option. Over their school life, students would be exposed to a large range of worthwhile activities on this 'taster-option' basis. The optional area includes not only taught classes, but also free time for students to read and pursue other valuable activities that do not always need a teacher, as well as whole-school and out-of-school activities, like work on school councils and in other policy-related activities, discussion groups, work in the community and other forms of work experience.

The shift towards this model also has implications for the *design* of the ideal school, as conventional classrooms are likely to be less dominant and spaces better suited to love-orientated education more so. A newly built Finnish school, the Saunalahti school in the city of Espoo, may be a helpful model.[3] It is a light, airy building with teaching spaces where children are allowed to sit where they want – even on sofas – and move around. Discussion and team projects are encouraged. The cafeteria, which incorporates a theatre, is also a learning space; the local community shares the school's facilities.

My sketch of the ideal school, I fully realise, is incomplete. More needs to be said about *priorities* among the loves that the school reveals and encourages. Personal love is always likely to be high among these, but what variation elsewhere can we expect across cultures? How close will a school in Middlesbrough be to one in Kinshasa? In a British context, should schools weight intellectual and aesthetic pursuits more highly than motor-cycle maintenance?

Love can go awry. Our young gymnast may have to give up her passion because a chronic ailment prevents her. A nine-year-old's enthusiasm for playing games on his Hudl – assuming this is unproblematic as a worthwhile activity – may become so all-consuming that he has no time for anything else – his interest in natural history,

even his old friendships. An older student finds that she has to struggle so painfully to keep up with her poetry-writing or interest in engineering that she decides to give up. What role does the school as well as the home have in picking up the pieces when love goes wrong? Part of learning to love activities or people is learning to understand the vicissitudes of love.

How well can the school hold on to its love-orientated aims if there are intensive pressures on it for students to get qualifications? This last question bears on the theme of the next section.

The place of love in school education as it often is

In this final section, and as a contrast, I look at love in schools as we now know them.

Over the last decades, test- and exam-centred school education has become increasingly dominant, not only in England and other UK jurisdictions, but across the globe. The key examinations are those in which success opens the way to a university education and the better-paid, often more intrinsically interesting, jobs and associated lifestyles that tend to go with this. Tests and exams at earlier ages are increasingly seen as subservient to these all-important end-of-school examinations. The trend in England (since the crucial period 1988-92) as in other places has been to include *every* school student in this kind of system.[4]

One consequence of these developments has been to narrow the curriculum so that priority is given to content most suited to examining and testing. Hence the dominance of easily gradable material and of knowledge-based curriculum subjects in which such material is more easily found than in areas more dependent on interpretation and personal judgment, like the arts, political studies, and personal and social education.

All this is familiar. The same is true of social trends associated with such an exam-oriented system. In the UK as elsewhere, more affluent families tend to do better than others in school examinations, and so in entry to university and more sought-after jobs.

What place has love in this kind of schooling? Success in tests and examinations does not depend on whether or how much students *love* what they are learning. It ignores motivation in favour of ability to answer questions. There is little incentive for teachers under pressure for good results to develop a love of what they are teaching.[5]

This does not imply that schools of this sort have *nothing* to do with enabling students to lead a flourishing life and, therefore, with opening the door to a range of possible objects of love within which they can make autonomous choices. Those successful in the exams-university-good jobs race may well find they have work they enjoy doing, an income that can support fulfilling personal relationships, as well as a comfortable home and sometimes costly leisure interests. All of these areas are possible objects of love.

For some among the successful – those in whom a desire to succeed inculcated at

school has become a lifelong master-motive – love may have been rare in their school classrooms but is a mainspring of their adult life.[6] Unlike the ideal school, their school has been more of an *instrument* in enabling their later loves than an institution centrally concerned with developing loves *now*.

This may not seem to matter as long as people can enjoy a love-impregnated life via one route or another. But the exam-centred approach is defective in more than one way. Joseph Fishkin's *Bottlenecks* (2014, pp77-8) has argued that it contributes to a narrowing of perspectives about what constitutes human flourishing, putting huge emphasis on life as a single race in which it is in one's interests to do as well as possible.

An equally serious objection is that those who do badly in exams, fail to go to university and end up with less desirable jobs or unemployment are often far more limited than the successful in the range of loves they can access. At the extreme, a schooling largely devoid of love is followed by a life where, if they are lucky, they find love in the sphere of intimate relationships, but in few other places. How far this is connected with the revolts of disadvantaged people against the established order that we have witnessed in the Brexit and both Trump elections in the UK and the USA I do not know. The question arises: what is the schooling of the non-successful *for*? Its purpose must be far from that of the ideal school with its central focus on love and wellbeing. I leave issues around equity that arise here for another occasion.

From a career point of view, too, we should not assume that our exam-dominated system always enables those who squeeze through the bottleneck to enjoy a range of loves to do with fulfilling work, a comfortable home etc., as mentioned above. Some highly paid work can be so dull – I know someone who gave up maritime law for this reason – or so stressful that those who do it may have a more fulfilling life doing something else. Again, if the work they find themselves in is 'off-shorable' – i.e. if it is not face-to-face like (being a doctor or teacher,) or tied to a certain site (like being an MP in the UK), but is digitally dependent (like radiology or some forms of accountancy) in such a way that skilled people in other countries can do it and often for much lower wages, some of our highfliers might find it hard to get employment despite their good qualifications (Crawford 2011, pp33-6). The problem is likely to get worse.

A solution increasingly supported at a time of increasing unemployment through automation, not least for certain low-skilled jobs (ONS, 2019), is reducing working hours so as to spread work around. A four-day week would allow a more relaxed life with more time for pursuits that one loves. Recent interest in 'the artisanal economy' may also point a way forward, given its basic idea that people can find fulfilment in practical work of service to others that they love for its intrinsic interest. Examples from a recent online post include: food-waste entrepreneur; sign painte; bicycle maker; pest controller; dementia coach; urban farmer; speciality food and beverage manufacturer.[7] More familiar jobs can also manifest the care, wholehearted involvement and importance

to one that belong to love. Hairdressing, gardening, making furniture, caring for the disabled, and making patios are non-routine occupations of this sort that can offer, among other things, endless opportunities for thought and judgment. It would not be surprising if more school students on the exam escalator abandoned it for something more dependable from a wellbeing perspective, even if seen as low status because of its 'manual' nature. Richard Sennett (2008) has written convincingly about craftsmanship as a source of personal fulfilment, and Matthew Crawford (2011) has followed his lead as a philosopher turned motorbike repairer.

Given the weight of vested interests in support of exam-dominated schooling, I am doubtful whether these various challenges will wholly weaken its sway. But I hope they may help swell the growing disquiet about the defects of the current system that we are now seeing everywhere.

In place of schools powered by the desire to succeed in 'life's race', I have argued in this paper[8] for schools devoted primarily to revealing to their students a plurality of types of loving so that they can make autonomous choices about which of them to pursue, and help others to do the same.

Notes

1. Although these two aims are of central importance, this is not to say that they are the only ones in this category. In our age of climate change, there is an increasingly strong case for priority to be given to equipping students to do what they can to prevent the destruction of all life on earth and of the physical environment that supports it.

2. While still in favour of a broad range of such options, I have abandoned the impossibly demanding view I held in White (1973) that autonomous choice requires acquaintance with *all possible* options. See Sardoc and White (2018).

3. See https://brightside.me/article/the-school-of-the-future-has-opened-in-finland-13755/

4. 1988 saw the arrival of both a common national examination at sixteen, the GCSE, and the national curriculum; in 1992, national league tables appeared comparing schools' examination achievements. See White, 2014, pp32-33.

5. A defender of exams-based education may well remind us that homes as well as schools have a role in upbringing, indeed – as I have acknowledged in the main text – a more basic one. If families make sure that children gain foothill experience of various kinds of loving, this gives schools more room to concentrate on qualifications. It is true that education in love begins in the home, and the more this is encouraged, the better for the child. But one problem is that few families have the money, knowledge, peace of mind and, not least, time to provide all that is needed in post-infant years. A second is the problem of a disconnect between

the regime of a family with an emphasis on intrinsic engagement and that of an instrumentally oriented school.

6. It is natural to say that it is *love of success* that has driven them on since their schooldays. We certainly talk in this way sometimes. But we employ an excessively thin sense of 'love' when we do. It may mean no more than *enjoyment*. We commonly talk, after all, of loving a traditional roast or a quiet evening at home: students may be urged to work hard by the thought of enjoyable experiences flowing from exam success, like basking in praise or relaxation. But love of success may be less than this: simply a desire to *possess,* where enjoyable experiences may be absent. In this case, love of academic success could be no more than wanting to get good marks: in this respect, it would be an item in the same category as a miser's love of money where his aim is only to accumulate more of it.

7. http://www.mnn.com/money/sustainable-business-practices/stories/11-surprising-artisanal-careers-are-taking

8. I am hugely grateful to Patricia White for having pointed out to me several problematic passages in the many earlier drafts of the paper.

References

Alexeivich, S. (2016) *Second-hand Time*. London: Fitzcarraldo.

Crawford, M. (2011) *The Case for Working with Your Hands – or why office work is bad for us and fixing things feels good.* London: Penguin.

Elliott, R.K. (1974) Education, Love of One's Subject, and the Love of Truth, *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 8.1, 135-153.

Fishkin, J. (2014) *Bottlenecks: a new theory of equal opportunity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frankfurt, H. (2004) *The Reasons of Love.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

ONS (2019) *Which occupations are at highest risk of being automated?* Office for National Statistics.

Raz, J. (1994) *Ethics in the Public Domain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reiss, M. & White, J. (2013) *An Aims-based Curriculum: the significance of human flourishing for schools*. London: Institute of Education Press.

Sardoc, M. & White, J. (2018) Education and the Adequacy of Options: An Interview with John White, *Theory and Research in Education* 16 (1).

Sennett, R. (2008) *The Craftsman*. London: Penguin.

White, J. (1973) *Towards a Compulsory Curriculum.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

White, J. (2007) Wellbeing and Education: Issues of Culture and Authority, *Journal of*

Philosophy of Education, 41(1), 17-28.

White, J. (2011) *Exploring Well-being in Schools*. London: Routledge.

White, J. (2014) *Who needs examinations?* London: Institute of Education Press.

White, J. (2016) Education, time-poverty and well-being, *Theory and Research in Education* 14:2, 213-225.

John White is Emeritus Professor of Philosophy of Education at UCL Institute of Education. He is interested in educational aims and how they map (or don't map) on to school curricula. Over 300 of his publications, most of them freely downloadable, are viewable at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/John_White53

john.white@ucl.ac.uk