CHAPTER 4

Education for a Flourishing Life

One of the more striking features of Western schooling in the last fifty years is the increasing focus of schools on preparing people to contribute to the national economy, often reducing the attention given to other educational aims. Many educational thinkers demonize the former as "training" and valorize the latter as "education." In this chapter Harry Brighouse takes a different tack. Although he expresses concern for the increasing attention to the economic ends of schooling, he does not voice outright opposition to the connection between economics and schooling. Acknowledging that people do need to earn a living and that economic stability is a worthy national goal, he goes on to ask whether these are *sufficient* ends for schooling.

Brighouse's answer is, in effect, that the economic agenda is necessary, but not sufficient. He draws on income studies to show that economic prosperity affects people's well-being—but only to a certain threshold. After that level, money has no significant impact on people's happiness. Indeed, happiness research itself points to other important factors, including family relationships, community and friends, personal freedom, and personal values. While distinguishing between happiness and human flourishing, Brighouse draws out both the educational and schooling implications for taking human happiness seriously. In particular, he shows how significant relationships with other people are essential for a happy—and flourishing—life, as well as how schools can help children learn some of the requisite knowledge, attitudes, and dispositions.

Harry Brighouse grew up in the United Kingdom, but has spent most of his adult life in the United States. He is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He is author of *School Choice and Social Justice* (Oxford University Press, 2000), *On Education* (Routledge 2006), and, with Adam Swift, of *Family Values* (Princeton, forthcoming). He is co-director, with Michael McPherson, of the Spencer Foundation's Initiative for Philosophy in Educational Policy and Practice.

Education for a Flourishing Life[1]

HARRY BRIGHOUSE

Since the end of the Cold War a new consensus seems to have emerged among Western governments that education provides the key to growth and competitiveness. The idea is that since labor is a major factor of production, better labor will be more productive, and what makes for better labor is education and training. Just as a better screwdriver enables you to be more productive (if your job involves screwdrivers), so more skilled workers makes the economy more productive. A pamphlet produced by the British Labour Party just before it won the 1997 election expresses the idea well: "If we are to face the challenge of creating a high tech, high added value and high wage economy, we can only do so by skilling our people."[2] The central purpose of public involvement in education is to drive the economy forward, by "skilling" future workers.

I disagree. Economic stability is important, and economic growth is sometimes important. But they are only important insofar as they promote full human flourishing. The economic standard of living should matter to governments only because it provides opportunities for citizens to lead flourishing lives in multiple dimensions. The relationship between standard of living and quality of life is complex at best.

Consider the evidence from studies that track what psychologists call "subjective well-being" over time. These find that, within developed economies, there has been no increase in average subjective well-being once growth gets beyond a certain point. Between 1972 and 1991 real gross domestic product (GDP) per capita grew in the United States, at a more or less steady rate, by 39%. The percentage of poll respondents reporting themselves as "very happy" barely increased at all during the same period, and the kinks in that curve bear no relationship to the steady rise in the growth curve.[3] In Japan GNP per capita grew steadily from 1960 to 1987 by a total of 300%; the average reported level of well-being as reported by respondents to surveys changed barely at all year to year, hovering around 6 (out of 10).[4] Robert Frank summarizes the evidence as follows:

> One of the central findings in the large scientific literature on subjective well being is that once income levels surpass a minimal absolute threshold, average satisfaction levels within a given country tend to be highly stable over time, even in the face of significant economic growth.[5]

It is not that wealth has *no* bearing on well being. In fact in both the United Kingdom and the United States, the proportions of people describing themselves as "very happy" or "happy" rise, consistently, with material growth, until about the mid-1950s. But after that there is no gain.

The well-being/income studies, similarly, find that once annual income exceeds a certain level, levels of subjective well being are unaffected by income. In the United States, for example, subjective well-being grows with income up to a (quite high) annual household income of about $200,000 a year, and after that it stops. And we cannot increase subjective well-being just by raising everyone's incomes to at least $200,000, because the evidence strongly suggests that as long as the economic pie is big enough (as it is in the rich countries of the world today) one's relative place in the distribution of the existing pie matters a great deal more for one's level of subjective well-being than one's *absolute* level of material well-being. Only once one has achieved a very high place in the distribution, and the material security and control over one's work and social environment that accompanies that, does the relative effect disappear.

If quality of life is the reason that economic stability and growth matter, and growth does not systematically improve quality of life, then education should be guided not solely or primarily by economic considerations, but directly by the value of human flourishing. It should aim to improve children's prospects for leading flourishing lives. In this chapter I want to elucidate this claim, explaining what is meant by human flourishing and pointing to some specific ways in which schooling does or could promote it.

What Promotes Flourishing?

We have a good deal of evidence about what makes people happy and what does not make them happy. We also know that children have certain tendencies that make it very difficult for their families, even if they are well-willed and good judges of their children's interests, to fully prepare them for a flourishing life. Finally, we know that in our society there are certain quite specific barriers to living a happy and flourishing life which many of our children will have to negotiate, and that we cannot anticipate accurately which children will encounter, or be particularly vulnerable to, which barriers.

Summarizing the now extensive research, Richard Layard enumerates the central factors influencing our levels of happiness as the "Big

Seven": Financial Situation, Family Relationships, Work, Community and Friends, Health, Personal Freedom, and Personal Values.[6] We know that people are made happy neither by materialism nor by the wealth that materialism brings. Poverty makes people unhappy, and considerably restricts their ability to flourish, even when poverty is conceived as a relative rather than as an absolute concept. The low status and stress that accompany relative poverty, and the lack of control over one's conditions of life, diminish people's ability to flourish. But once people have achieved a reasonable level of financial security, additional income and wealth do not make them happier, especially if premised on the need to spend more hours at work and away from family and friends. The income from remunerated labor helps people to have more control over their lives, and more security, to some extent, but it does not help much beyond a certain point. We also know that people are happier when they are connected in social networks. Close connections to and successful relations with family and friends correlate closely with reports of subjective well-being. Being able to spend time with and relate intimately to other people is a tremendously important precondition of flourishing for most of us.

Another important source of flourishing is the exercise of skills which are difficult to master. Those people who are lucky enough to have interesting jobs which suit their personalities and talents derive a great deal of flourishing from the exercise of those talents. But it is also common for people to enjoy activities in which they do not, by any absolute criteria, excel, but which make the appropriate demands on them; sometimes at work, and frequently outside of their jobs. Someone may find writing doggerel a challenge and find great satisfaction in producing ditties that just make his children, or his friends, laugh; or might enjoy playing cricket as well as he can on a weekend team, not just for the companionship, but also for the sense of stretching his limited capacities. For many people, although it is important for them to be employed, or at least not to be involuntarily unemployed, it is in their leisure time that they will find the meaning in their life.

The above evidence concerns *happiness*; it tells us within broad outlines what factors contribute to people having happy rather than unhappy lives. Happiness and flourishing are not, however, identical. We often think of someone as flourishing when they accomplish something of value, even if we do not think that they are, personally, happy. An artist might be thought of as flourishing if she succeeds in producing great art, despite unhappiness in her personal life, and we might think that even if we think that the unhappiness produces the greatness.

Conversely, if we believe that someone's happiness is simply the result of artificial stimulants, or is conditioned on ignorance about what is really happening around them, we do not usually think of them as flourishing; think, for example, of someone who is happy only because she does not know that her "friends" secretly despise her. Flourishing is a richer property than happiness, sensitive to many more features of a person's life than just her inner states. Flourishing involves people making meaning, making sense, of important aspects of their lives and the totality of their life. Any theory of flourishing is, furthermore, inevitably controversial: some readers will even disagree with me that happiness and flourishing are not the same thing, while others will think of flourishing in a variety of religious terms, and others still in terms of the exercise of particular capacities or virtues.

How much of a problem is this? We have no direct evidence concerning what makes people flourish, both because flourishing is controversial, and because on any particular (controversial) theory, it will be hard to observe the causes of flourishing directly. It is interesting, though, that Layard's "big seven" factors in happiness correspond closely to elements in numerous religious and philosophical accounts of flourishing. They also allow for a great deal of diversity in the ways that people achieve happiness: acknowledging that people achieve flourishing through their engagement in friendship and family life, for example, leaves open numerous kinds of friendship and forms of family. I think, therefore, that it is fair to assume that the evidence of what makes people happy in the real world is related to what makes them flourish.[7]

Impediments to Flourishing

How can the evidence about what makes people happy guide education? If we concentrate on the importance of friendship and family life, for example, we renew a very old conversation: Socrates, for one, argues consistently for the role of human relationships in a flourishing life. Learning how to create and maintain significant relationships with others in many contemporary Western societies, however, is increasingly complicated by the instability of family life itself. Almost 50% of marriages end in divorce, and a very high proportion of those divorces occur while children are still in the home. This means that most children who themselves marry will be in a relationship in which one partner has parents who are not married to each other. Furthermore, most divorced parents remarry, or re-enter a relevantly marriage-like relationship. So, as adults managing their own lives, they will have to engage with at least

three, rather than the previously normal two, parental households. The time, energy, and emotional demands on a remarried parent are greater than those on an un-divorced parent; the child of a remarried parent is not only negotiating with more households, but has more competition for the attention and interest of her parent.[8] All of this is compounded by dramatically increased geographic mobility, which weakens the connections among adults within families. Parents, adult children, and adult siblings are less ready courses of mutual support and care when they live at great geographic distances from one another, so that even intact families are frequently less connected to one another in adulthood than was an expectation even 30 years ago.

This weakening of the bonds between kin is accompanied by the intrusion of values that undermine the family unit itself. A striking phenomenon of modern society is the increased power of commercial influences over public and private culture. Television has become a pervasive influence, and in the United States television's content is almost entirely driven by commercial imperatives. In the U.S. marketers spent approximately $15 *billion* trying to reach children alone in 2004.[9] In the United Kingdom commercialism is less pervasive, but still incredibly powerful, especially since the rise of cable and satellite provision, so that the public service broadcast networks are under heavy pressure to compete for audiences with commercial channels. The striking feature of commercialism in cultures is that not only are the values that commercial interests promote not good values, but in addition, the people *promoting* these values do not believe them to be good. Consider Juliet Schor's encounter with the marketing industry:

> Children are being exposed to plenty of glamour, fashion, style, irony, and popular music, that is, sex. Even the family-friendly Disney Channel is full of sexually suggestive outfits and dancing. One Radio Disney employee explained to me that the company keeps a careful watch on the lyrics, but is hands-off with the other stuff. . . . Emma Gilding of Ogilvy and Mather recounted an experience she had during an in-home videotaping. The little girl was doing a Britney Spears imitation, with flirting and sexual grinding. Asked by Gilding what she wanted to be when she grew up, the three year old answered, "a sexy shirt girl". . . . Mary Prescott [an industry professional] who is more deeply immersed [than other interviewees] in the world of tweening, confessed that "I am doing the most horrible thing in the world. We are targeting kids too young with too many inappropriate things. . . . It's not worth the almighty buck."[10]

The measure of a marketing strategy's success is the sale of a product. Contrast this with the political, religious, and intellectual

movements that shaped the public cultures of the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the Victorian age. Proponents of values generally believed that the values they propounded were good, not only for themselves but for others. Of course, in many cases, they were wrong, and no doubt hypocrisy was not uncommon. But the cultural environment most of us inhabit now is one in which the most powerful forces attempting to shape the culture are driven by the desire to make large profits. In the United States, in particular, the spaces that are commercial-free are increasingly those which are largely uninhabited. It is hard to attend a public event, and almost impossible to attend a charitable event, which is not plastered in commercial, profit-seeking messages. These messages are designed, always, to target the acquisitiveness latent in most of us; and yet there is ample evidence that many of the things we acquire do not make us happy, or help us flourish, and also that fostering our acquisitive traits makes us unhappy.[11]

Schools Promoting Flourishing

What can and should the education system do in response to the above observations, in pursuit of its obligation to prepare children to live flourishing lives?

The Formal Curriculum

Think first about the academic curriculum. It's tempting to divide it up into the "vocational" on the one hand and the "life-preparing" on the other. We have the traditional academic curriculum—English, mathematics, languages, science, etc.—which prepares children for success in the labor market. Then we have subjects like health and social education, alcohol and drug programs, parenting, religious education, and social studies, and these subjects prepare children for life. And, perhaps, there are some subjects like art, music, cooking, and physical education which are in a grey area.

Why shouldn't we conceive of the curriculum as divided up in this way? Consider this: many of the traditional academic subjects themselves present opportunities that are relevant to the child's long-term flourishing and are not merely preparation for the world of work. Some children come to a lifelong love of Jane Austen or Shakespeare or Rimbaud outside the school gates, but most of us who develop those enthusiasms do so only because we have studied these (or similar) authors in a classroom environment in which we have been manipulated

or straightforwardly coerced to put in the effort it takes to read and appreciate their work. Children who are raised in a monolingual home within a society where their home language predominates cannot usually learn a second language unless they are forced to—usually by their school. Some children will love the language they learn and some will deploy it in their paid work; but for many more it will be the gateway to learning about and engaging with a culture other than that of their own society or subculture. More technical subjects such as mathematics and the sciences are perhaps even more rarely encountered outside the school in ways that facilitate lasting enthusiasm. But for some children an enthusiasm for some aspect of mathematics, physics, or biology infuses their lives just as much as an enthusiasm for literature or music infects the lives of others.

This is the insight that underlies many justifications of the standard academic curriculum as promoting liberal education. The idea is that children have an interest—entirely independent of whatever interest they have in being equipped with job-related skills—in being acquainted with the greatest cultural goods that our civilization has produced, goods that can help them lead fully flourishing human lives in multiple dimensions, not just economic. However, many defenses of the traditional school curriculum concentrate on Western culture, a focus that today seems somewhat quaint.

Non-Western societies have produced great cultural goods and there would be every reason to acquaint Western children with some of these even if Western societies were not now, as they are, populated in significant part by people who see their cultural roots as belonging partly in non-Western societies.

The case for cultural diversity in education does not depend on the understanding that our society is diverse; it is only strengthened by that fact. English, for example, is not only learning to read and write well enough to get and keep a job; it is accessing the insights of powerful literary artists who help us understand ourselves and others. Novelists like James Baldwin, Toni Morrison, Gustav Flaubert, Thomas Hardy, and Fyodor Dostoevsky provide crucial insights into the human condition. For myself, it was the school-approved "children's authors" of my youth—such as Geoffrey Trease, John Rowe Townsend, Peter Dickinson, and Penelope Lively—who taught me about social class and social injustice, friendship across the sexes, and the importance of place. Similarly, history, mathematics, and the sciences are great cultural achievements, and there are good "life"-related reasons for including them in the curriculum.

Is the call for education for flourishing absurdly utopian in an environment in which business interests dominate the political debate and in which advantaged parents, who exercise a good deal of political voice, are deeply concerned with gaining competitive advantage for their children? There are, in fact, stirrings in surprising places. In the United Kingdom, for example, Anthony Seldon, the Master of Wellington College, a respected and elite private school, recently introduced "skills for well being" classes for all 14–16-year-olds, a curriculum devised in response to the most up-to-date happiness research.[12] The Wellington College website announces the curriculum thusly:

> The approach is founded on the principle of studying lives that go particularly well, and then using that knowledge to develop and apply strategies and skills that promote all-round progress in a person's psychological, physical and social life. Importantly, the curriculum takes a rounded approach to the subject of life development. . . .
>
> Special programmes in other schools have tended to target "youngsters at risk," or children rather than teenagers, or specific maladies such as depression rather than life in general, so the great majority of interventions have been remedial, trying to get youngsters from below average up to average. Our curriculum is aimed at helping everyone to make progress, no matter what the individual's starting point.
>
> The lesson themes are structured around a student's relationship with life, including:
>
> - The relationship between mind and body
> - The relationship between their conscious and subconscious
> - The relationships with people around them
> - The relationship with their past, present, future and fantasy lives
> - The relationship with the natural world[13]

The emphasis on personal relationships here is striking—a central lesson from the happiness research, which is congruent with the teachings of most major religions, is that emotional integrity and the ability to establish and maintain close personal relationships are key contributors to happiness. The "touchy-feely" sound of this insight exposes educators who want to act on it to risk of ridicule, yet the imprimatur of an eminent educationalist in the elite private sector has reduced that risk considerably. A recent report by a think tank led by a former right-wing leader of the Conservative Party has strongly endorsed experimentation with the approach.[14] This has, in turn, enabled Labour Party ministers

to increase funding for the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning program in state schools. At the time of writing the Minister for Children, Families, and Schools in the U.K. has announced a thorough review of the school curriculum, including a study of the effect of advertisements on children, as well as the mental health of children. Most schools, and most governments, have *some* political space within which to experiment, and with committed leadership and competent execution there is no reason why this space should not grow.

Of, course, a natural worry about incorporating life-skills issues into the formal curriculum is that teachers will sometimes inappropriately bring their own biases and experiences into the classroom. Few people worry about bias in cooking classes, but in others, such as when the issues being taught about concern marriage and family life, sex education, or alcohol-and-drug-related education, this concern might be quite serious. I accept that it is impossible to ensure that teachers will always succeed in treating their own biases with appropriate skepticism and distance. But I don't see why it is more serious here than in English, or in religious education or social studies.

The Informal Curriculum

The formal curriculum is only part of school life. All schools have informal or extra-curricular activities. Given that we force children to attend school for a very substantial part of their waking lives, we have an obligation to make school a congenial environment, in which they can, among other things, enjoy themselves in the moment. A substantial part of the motivation for providing extra-curricular activities should be to enable children to enjoy themselves. But school managers also recognize that for many children extra-curricular activities present opportunities to encounter, sample, and make judgments about activities that they otherwise would never know much about. Most of the children in the debating club probably participate in it because they enjoy disputation. But many of the children who act or sing in the school play or choir, or who participate in the 16th Century Music group, Free Tibet Club, or Young Gardeners Club probably participate initially out of curiosity, or out of having been infected by the enthusiasm of a teacher or a friend. At least as much as the formal curriculum, the experiences in the informal curriculum can give rise to lasting enthusiasms and long-term goals.[15]

Is there a rule of thumb for what kinds of extra-curricular activities to make available in a school? Obviously, the expertise and enthusiasm of the teachers will be a substantial consideration, and rightly so: it is

hard for someone overseeing an activity to present it meaningfully to participants if that person believes it not, fundamentally, to be worthwhile. But three considerations are worth bearing in mind. Children vary enormously in their basic constitutions and in the kinds of activity they will find to be rewarding. Second, numerous activities are readily available outside the school. So when the school replicates those activities it is at best wasting an opportunity to broaden the perspective of some of its students, and at worst reinforcing the impression that those activities are the only ones available. Third, sometimes the school is the only location for a particular opportunity, because only the school adopts that role. For example, it is quite unlikely that if U.S. high schools withdrew from organizing American football that activity would be unavailable outside the school; compare this with the debating club.

The Hidden Curriculum

What, finally, about the ethos of the school? Every school has a hidden curriculum, sometimes so hidden that the school officials themselves do not discern it. The ethos of a school is this hidden curriculum; it is constituted by the interaction between a combination of factors, including the self-conception, and diversity, of the teachers; the composition of the student body; the school mission statement; the curriculum and extra-curriculum; the physical appearance of the school; the choices managers make about what kinds of activities to single out for praise and illumination; etc. The ethos affects not only how smoothly the school works from day to day, but also how children interpret their experience in the school. So school leaders in U.S. high schools, for example, will often decide to shorten an academic school day in order to facilitate, or in some cases force, the whole school to attend a pep rally for the football team, thus giving special endorsement to the activities involved. Teachers adopt teaching personas, and in that capacity they will make decisions about how much of their interest in and awareness of commercial popular culture to reveal to the children, and also, how many and which of their own non-mainstream interests to reveal, and how. A school ethos which strongly identifies with mainstream popular culture, and, for example, places special emphasis on prowess in mainstream professional sports, thereby tilts the experience of the children toward the interests that they would be likely to encounter and become enthusiastic about outside the school anyway. But a school with an ethos that is not exactly counter-cultural, but perhaps extra-popular-cultural, would deliberately valorize numerous different kinds of activity not

readily promoted outside the school, on the principle that in doing so it would be widening the array of realistic opportunities for leisure-enhancing pursuits for children.

Even something as simple as the length of breaks for meals, the kinds of meals available, and the seating arrangements comprise part of the ethos of a school. I'm struck by the contrast between my children's lunch experiences and my own as a student. My own primary school (in the 1970s) had 90 minutes for lunch, enough time for a 45-minute lunch sitting and 45 minutes of playtime. We were served a lunch that we had no choice about, reflecting the idea that choosing every component of what we would eat was not fundamentally important. We sat in prescribed places, in age-diverse and sex-diverse groups, pressing us to make relationships outside our comfort zone, and establishing a presumption that the older children took responsibility for the younger children. None of us were aware that we were being taught, but we were learning lessons about the place of food in social life and social intercourse.

Contrast this with the lessons learned in my own daughter's school, where the lunch break lasts 40 minutes, with only 20 minutes in which to eat, and fast food only is served, cafeteria-style. Many 7-year-olds cannot eat a reasonable lunch in that time, because they are excited about talking to their friends, and many eat slowly anyway; so teachers spend the afternoons trying to teach distracted, hungry children, whose state is not due to lack of food but to lack of time. A prohibition on talking to one's friends helped to get more food consumed, but at the cost of displacing the chatter into the classroom. Again, the children are not aware that they are learning, but the lessons are clear. We choose our food and whom to sit with. We eat fast, rather than with appreciation. Food is just a punctuation of the hard working day, not an occasion for socializing and relaxation. That you eat, and eat quickly, seems to matter more than what you eat. The contrasting arrangements evince different attitudes toward eating and socializing, as well as encouraging self-segregation among the children.

Think now about the stance of the school toward commercial culture. Of course, there is no doubt that the culture of the school has to be sufficiently connected to the culture of the rest of the child's environment so that the child can recognize and relate to it. But an ethos that embraces commercial culture risks jeopardizing the children's prospects for flourishing. Consider the standard practice of middle school libraries subscribing to *Teen People* and *Seventeen Magazine*. These magazines promote celebrity worship and materialistic

aspirations, neither of which anyone argues will benefit the children, and the latter of which we know to be harmful. I am not arguing that no librarian should subscribe to those magazines, but that no librarian should do so unthinkingly, just responding to demand. A school with a healthy ethos directed toward lifelong flourishing will be one in which such decisions are taken thoughtfully and with regard to the effect of such subscriptions on the children, and on the way that the life of the school goes (do the values promoted by the magazine, for example, run counter to the values that underpin the school's dress code?).

Or consider a more personal story. Shortly after my elder daughter started attending the local elementary school, she brought home a free glossy magazine called *Sports Illustrated for Kids*. It consisted of 32 pages of full-color pictures of contemporary American sporting heroes, with a little text on each page about how brave, hardworking, and admirable these characters were. The personality on the front cover, and to whom more space was devoted than any other, was Kobe Bryant, a basketball player who was *at that time* facing a very public indictment on a rape charge. His defense, before the case collapsed, was that the sexual intercourse, which took place in a hotel room with a woman he said he did not know, was consensual. This behavior contradicted the very carefully crafted public image he had previously projected of himself as a faithful family man. I took the infraction to be the result of a teacher being given free materials and having insufficient time to scrutinize them. But the point is that the publishers of *Sports Illustrated for Kids* and the teacher who gave the magazine to her students are complicit in promoting a certain set of values. The ethos of the school influences what choices are made, and an ethos which regards corporate-sponsored "free" materials with suspicion is one in which the teacher would have presumed against distributing the glossy magazine without scrutiny.

Important as the academic offerings and the extra-curricular activities are, the ethos of the school lies at the center of school life. The ethos is not a matter of the mission statement, but of the shared understandings among the responsible adults in the school of the values and purposes of their institution. What may seem like fairly trivial and "administrative" decisions about the life of the school do contribute to the ethos of the school which, in turn, affects its ability to live up to its values and fulfill its purposes—the central purpose being to promote the long-term prospects for the flourishing of the children in its charge.

Conclusion

Schools face a good deal of pressure to conform the children they teach to the needs of the economy. Businesses want good workers, markets want enthusiastic consumers, parents want their children to be economically competitive. It is inevitable that these forces will have some influence. But understanding that the ultimate goal of education must be to facilitate the flourishing of the children in their care and understanding the available science about what this takes can help policymakers, administrators, and teachers to resist these forces to some extent, and to promote an ethos, adopt a curriculum, and manage the day-to-day pace of school life better, to serve the children under their care.

NOTES

1. I'm grateful to David Coulter for valuable editorial comments; my thoughts about flourishing in general were developed in part after conversations with Christine Sypnowich about her in-progress book *Equality Renewed*, and I'm grateful to her for that stimulus.

2. Labour Party, *The Skills Revolution* (1996), quoted in Alison Wolf, *Does Education Matter?* (London: Penguin, 2002), 13.

3. Robert Frank, *Luxury Fever* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 72.

4. Ibid., 73.

5. Ibid., 72.

6. Richard Layard, *Happiness* (London: Penguin, 2005), 62–70.

7. This is obvious to songwriters and comedians, if philosophers have a hard time with it; as Ken Dodd says, "When you go to measuring a man's success, don't count money, count happiness."

8. See Linda Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage* (New York: Broadway Books, 2001).

9. Juliet Schor, *Born to Buy: The Commercialized Child and the New Consumer Culture* (New York: Scribner, 2004), 21.

10. Ibid., 57.

11. See Tim Kasser, *The High Price of Materialism* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002), for summaries of the evidence.

12. For a brief description see Wellington College's website at http://www.wellingtoncollege.org.uk/page.aspx?id=31.

13. http://www.wellington-college.berks.sch.uk/page.aspx?id=595.

14. See *Breakthrough Britain* (London: Centre for Social Justice, 2007).

15. If, that is, the experiences are not poisoned by response to the perverse incentives built into the college admissions process, as in the United States where colleges put considerable weight on demonstrating that one is a high-level participant in extracurricular activities.