

Chapter 4

Teacher Drones

Teaching is a noble profession. Perhaps the most important thing a culture does is pass down knowledge from one generation to the next. As society needs the talents of the next generation to build on the advances of the generation before, the teaching profession performs a vital task, as the gatekeeper to higher learning and qualifications. There are very many wonderful teachers who delight and excel in promoting learning and understanding. But it is also teachers who fail, so frequently, to recognise and foster ability and it is also they who look the other way, as the mediocre drones scurry through the door. I think that this failing is due to two broad factors:

- (a) a yawning gulf between privileged schools and the rest;
- (b) lazy reliance on IQ tests, together with class preference in the state sector schools.

All demographers cited in Wikipedia (under point 5 Social Class); Dennis Gilbert, William Thompson & Joseph Hickey and Leonard Beeghley, note that the ruling class are commonly educated in Ivy League universities. I thought you had to be bright to get a place in the Ivy League universities, so do all the children of the rich have a high IQ, or is there another factor at play? Boris Johnson, Mayor of London, would have you believe it was the former but the disjunction between IQ tests and intelligence was hilariously demonstrated by Boris himself, when he scored an own goal. Boris was raving at the annual Margaret Thatcher lecture at the Centre for Policy Studies in London, when he made some very revealing comments. I can only think that he said what he did because when he looked out at the sea of familiar faces, he thought he was at a Bilderberg coven and that it was all in confidence. In a speech which advocated inequality and upheld Gordon Geckos', 'greed is god' ethos, Boris advanced a eugenics position based upon IQ. Scarily he said IQ determines both a person's economic place and spiritual value. The funny part came when Boris subsequently appeared on a radio show where an IQ test was sprung on him. He

failed all three questions. It is tempting to say that this shows that Boris is spiritually challenged and that he had just failed the entrance exam to his own master race. This is not the case. Boris is actually borderline competent. He had just got hammered by his handlers for talking out of line and then put on the spot by a savvy journalist. What this means is that IQ tests are context and particularly stress dependant. If you didn't have breakfast, are not feeling well or are under pressure, you don't do so well. Socio economic pressure counts for quite a few IQ points. Andy Thomas, modest and insightful winner of BBC One's 2013 'Britain's Brightest', attributed his success in winning the contest to his amateur acting, saying:

Acting teaches you to stay focused. I think there were probably much cleverer people in the competition, who couldn't deal with the pressure.

In his Margaret Thatcher speech, Boris Johnson also called for the reintroduction of scholarships for working-class kids. It must be given to Boris that he saw the conflict of interest in Tories' dismembering grammar schools, while sending their own children to exclusive establishments. What Boris himself is saying is that in the rigid caste system which is England, they have got to the point where even talented working-class children no longer get in. They don't get in for two reasons. Firstly, education for upper and middle class kids provides drones with an overwhelming advantage in gaining qualifications as upper and middle-class schools are both quantitatively and qualitatively so much better than normal schools. Secondly, that without subsidizing places in grammar schools, even talented working-class children can miss out on higher education, as in their normal schools they are taught by incompetent drones who are even incapable of teaching the talented.

In regard to the quantity of upper and middle-class teaching, their schools start kids very young. It is from the English upper-class education system that

the prep schools derive. Young keeps getting younger, with hothouse day care centres and preschools pitching to the parents who either want to fast track their kids or suspect some remedial attention is needed. Plus there are tutors on tap to help the drones with their cheat sheets. So right from the beginning drones are getting more of the lift that they need to enable them to perform as if they were competent. In saying that, it may seem as if I am coming back to Boris Johnson's eugenic IQ determinism and it may be that borderline competent brains think alike. But I am not saying that a mediocre student cannot be improved by education, just that the pre-selection of kids for intensive schooling on an income basis, over-represents the mediocre when it comes to grades, as they learn how to 'do school', from an early age. It may even be that this baby prep school phenomenon has a retrograde effect on the non-drone pupils. These institutions are staffed by preschool teachers who commence literacy and numeracy-based learning at a far earlier age than was the norm previously. The way infants are involved in such tasks is to portray them as games. There is a saying that, 'play ends where games begin'. Play is open ended, and to varying degrees may involve self initiated creativity and inventiveness. Games are rule-based activities which by their very nature set metes and bounds. There is an assumption that increased linguistic and numeric tuition at a young age is necessarily a better thing. In the absence of any conflicts it may be, but it does not seem to have been considered that such channeling of infants could screen out creativity and inventiveness. If this is the case and I suspect it is, then we are going backwards.

Early learning or more accurately early training, directly impacts on educational ordering, as kids who are being prepped with tests become familiarized with how school works. Once a kid is in front, the educational culling processes tend to keep them in front as it is the kids at the rear who get written of. Being in a pole position enables drone kids to learn IQ tests and

appear brighter than they really are. Because of the blinkering engendered by the myth that intelligence determines status, it has only recently been demonstrated in a new paper published in the journal *Learning and Individual Differences* (2014), that the more you do IQ tests the better at them you get. Scott Barry Kaufman, a person who was graded with a low IQ but fought this classification and became an assistant professor of psychology, wrote in his "Ungifted: Intelligence Redefined" that:

Alan and Nadeen Kaufman looked at IQ test scores from a dozen children who were tested on three different contemporary IQ tests. The first thing to note is that those exposed to greater opportunities for learning (higher SES, based on parents' education) tended to score higher on IQ tests than those from lower-SES backgrounds.

Scott Barry Kaufman went on to say:

Various school factors significantly influence IQ scores, such as quality of instruction, enriching classes and afterschool activities, entering school late, intermittent attendance, length of schooling, and summer vacations.

Scott Barry Kaufman is of the view that the above factors "influence genuine brain maturation" and he is undoubtedly correct in this, but there are also clearly advantages and disadvantages which relate to family income. Scott Barry Kaufman is a testament to the human spirit and an indomitable will to prove a flawed system wrong. Andy Thomas, winner of 2013 Britain's Brightest, the BBC One show, is clearly in the Scott Kaufman camp rather than the Boris Johnson camp, when he says:

More than anything it shows the potential that is within all of us. Lots of people could have done this if they dared to try. We all have the capability to do extraordinary things.

Andy is no doubt right but there is a direct relationship with income here. The further down you start, the harder it is to swim to the surface. While the mediocre spawn of the rich are coached, competent working class kids are discouraged. In regard to US incomes Wikipedia provides:

William Thompson and Joseph Hickey[citation needed] see common incomes for the upper class as those exceeding \$500,000 with upper middle class incomes ranging from the high 5-figures to most commonly in excess of \$100,000. They claim the lower middle class ranges from \$35,000 to \$75,000; \$16,000 to \$30,000 for the working class and less than \$2,000 for the lower class.

Clearly a child is more likely to get swimming lessons if their family income is over \$500,000 than if it is around \$20,000 per annum. Still worse if you are in the underclass with parents getting less than \$2,000 pa and/or one of the over 1,000,000 homeless children in America. Even a Scott Barry Kaufman or an Andy Thomas would find it hard to swim to the surface from that sort of start.

Although I think that the form over substance paradigm in our society is a major cause of missing the obvious, there is another more political aspect, and that is the pseudo scientific claims of the IQ determinists. Dann Simonsen a Danish skeptic, had a lot of fun with Danish IQ determinist Helmuth Nyborg in his article; How intelligent is the average IQ test designer? In this article Dann says:

When the exercises in an IQ test are hardly distinguishable from exercises in schools and are also the kind of exercises that you almost automatically must get better at solving when you learn to master the disciplines taught at school, it is no wonder that extended school attendance leads to a higher "IQ score" and that the lack of schooling leads to a score at the level of the mentally retarded. This is a fact that the IQ theorists do not really like: They

are not only very well aware of the fact that you can easily improve your faculties for solving IQ tests and thus gain a higher score, it is also common knowledge to them that the average population in industrial countries with regular schooling, as already mentioned, has become no less than 30 percent better at filling out IQ tests in the course of the 20th century.

Dann Simonsen writes that the reason why the IQ determinists try to explain away the inconvenient truth that IQ tests are influenced by education is because:

Since they have an axe to grind, he and his colleagues would like to forbid the “IQ” to be as unstable and easily influenced by education as it actually is: They want to present the societal hierarchization of one generation after the other as the outcome of the natural qualifications of each individual.

In other words: The existence of underpaid road sweepers and surgeons in millionaire mansions, long-term unemployed receiving cash benefits and ministers of science and education with various extra earnings is proof that IQ is at work. Without the difference in IQ we would all belong to the same class. But the differences are an irreparable fact of nature and therefore necessitate the hierarchy of professions.

Dann Simonsen goes on to refer to a quote by Helmuth Nyborg, who happens to be a professor in Århus University. Commenting on a change in the behaviour of students since the 1960s Nyborg said:

“The department (of psychology) now has students who are a little more well-behaved. They approach us with a more polite and patient attitude. They used to go for us in a much more direct way.”

Dann Simonsen then says

“He thinks that it can be attributed to the entry requirements to psychology being higher. This year a grade average of 9.6 was required, but it used to be as much as 9.8.” [Dann asks the question] What is the connection between grade average and politeness?

The connection between grade average and politeness is the rise of the drones. What is being demonstrated here is that preferential drone education is shifting the student mix towards those well trained and mediocre students whose best chance of passing consists in their well-honed ability to brown nose their teachers.

In regard to the quality of upper and middle-class education, the resources available to the wealthy are worlds apart from that provided to the poor. I went to what was arguably the second best grammar school in my town. I had a friend who had been adopted out and went to live with a family in the school zone of the best grammar school in the town. Incidentally that school zone actually went around the poor suburb I grew up in, to service middle class kids in an adjacent wealthy suburb. Comparing notes with my friend, his school was vastly better resourced than mine. Their gym teacher was a national gymnast, we had a front row forward. They had trampolines, I had never seen a trampoline. They had lingua-phones for French, we had a petulant poofter. Beyond the opulent facilities and educational aids that money buys, the most important factor in drone advancement is the quality of teachers and the explicit teaching of learning methodologies. In researching the current American debate about the systemic failure of American education, I recently read that one bad teacher can stop a child’s development for good. Exclusive schools don’t have one bad teacher. They pay for the very best.

The first thing that good teachers teach is how to learn and how to navigate the system. Michael Woodley, one of the co-authors of the paper on learnt IQ

referred to above, in a Daily Telegraph interview on the paper said “*You were probably taught in school, for instance, to guess on multiple choice tests.*” I have always railed against the fact that kids are not taught techniques and methodologies for learning. It has only recently dawned on me that it is only the working-class kids who are not taught these fundamental skills. Michael Woodley’s comment reveals that at the school he went to kids were taught a methodology to address multiple-choice questions. I certainly was not and indeed no one in my school was. I know this because I, an arts student, placed unnaturally well in the one science subject I had to take, because as my luck would have it, that year’s exam was completely multiple-choice. I had worked out my own methodology for multiple-choice questions, thus trumping most of the science students. They were not happy.

So the mediocre from higher income families get a qualitative and quantitative leg up. Beyond this there is just plain malarkey. In my time grammar schools were allowed a quota of accreditations to university, the quota was based on performance in matriculation exams. My friend who attended the best grammar school in my town was of the opinion that the school accredited those the school doubted would pass the exam and had its brightest students sit the exam, to keep their quota up. He did not say this at the time but I think that this was essentially a mechanism to get middle-class drone children up the ladder and into university.

Exclusive education provides most middle and upper-class students, no matter how mediocre, with qualifications. The great triumph of the academic mafia is that no one gets a look in at a decent job these days without paying the man his student fees. This means that once the drone has its piece of paper, it's got its foot in the door. Which door is another question. Drones from more affluent and better connected families will have work waiting. The bottom end drones will have their piece of paper and not much else. Many will swarm into

government bureaucracy, the natural habitat of the drone, others will struggle in professions their family history has placed them in. For the most mediocre of the drones there is one safe haven, the schools from which they have just come and where they fitted in so very well. Recall that the fundamental problem for the drone is that it is required to be something more than it is, and so is always out of its depth. What is frightful about being out of one's depth is that one is adrift in the unknown. Drones, deficient in practical ability and fearful of being found out as mediocre, seek the safe and familiar. This means that drones are attracted back to the educational world, as it is known territory. Schools' rule-based environment suits them to a T. They understand that schools' core curriculum is conformity and subservience, as these were the subjects they excelled in and which gave them an academic advantage over students with more integrity. They know that they owe and they will dutifully repay the debt and inflict these crippling values on the unsuspecting little children they will rule over, indeed they could do nothing else, as they don't have the talent.

Teacher drones separate out, according to their status and qualifications, to schools and universities. Truly mediocre drones flock to primary schools as they feel at ease with children and can be king of the kids. This is because their level of competency is not that far above the children they are instructing. As drones are little more than children themselves they have their favourites who get their attention and the rest have to struggle for it. If they are tested by a smart kid, they are big enough and ugly enough to crush any contender. In this safe and secure environment drones are rarely contradicted and they do not have to meet the challenge of having to cope with other adults on a daily basis. Occasionally they have to deal with parents but parents are careful around teachers, as they know any criticism of the teacher will be paid out on their child. A long time ago a friend of mine was a student teacher who practised at my old primary school, about ten years after I had left. She was appalled. For

one thing not one of the teachers even spoke to her in the staff room. More disconcertingly she told me that in the class she was assigned to, the teacher had the class divided into three. One third were her favourites whom she taught. Another third she did not like and ignored. The rest got some attention now and then. Taking this piece by piece, why would any teacher be so rude as to completely ignore a student teacher who had come to their school to learn teaching? This violates the norms of hospitality, their professional obligation to assist the novice and besides she was a stunningly beautiful young woman. Two explanations come to mind. Firstly, they were pre-empting any criticism by creating a social hierarchy in which she was at the bottom, and so disempowered; secondly, they didn't have the social skills to interact with anybody over 11. Beyond the childlike picking of friends and enemies and the abrogation of this teacher's duty to instruct her pupils I suspect there is another drone factor. My school was on the border between a poor working class suburb and a higher end middle-class suburb. So the school was made up of poor working class and wealthy middle class kids. Teachers are generally middle-class and they don't like slumming it. Working class kids are poorly dressed, snotty little things that don't have handkerchiefs, they tend to be grubbier and are generally more work, as they don't get much help at home. I should know as I was one of them. Naturally middle-class teachers gravitate to middle-class kids, as this is the familiar. They neither like nor understand working class kids and they have no great desire to do so. Now I know of teachers, who work in the poorer parts of town, who take bags of sandwiches each day to feed the kids who don't have lunches. But they are the minority. Middle class aspiring drones have social expectations to meet. Having to work in crappy schools with crappy kids brings them down, as they see themselves being stuck in a low status situation. Mediocre drones who are trying to claw their way up the social hierarchy can be mean and ugly. Kids watch out.

Perhaps rightfully such drones feel that their service to their class, that is their sabotage of working class contenders and the denaturing of creativity and the natural inquisitiveness of children, goes unsung and that the vital part they play in the drone order of things is not sufficiently recognised and rewarded.

The result of teacher drone's insidious warfare against creativity is often open revolt and of course teachers blame the kids. I don't buy this. At one time I was the media spokesman for one of my sons' school, which was an alternative high school. The school was getting a battering, partially because it had not adjusted to the change in its students and partially as anything alternative is hated by conservatives. At one stage I got chewed up by a conservative journalist during a radio interview. I later got a support call from a high school teacher. She told me that she had just left a working class high school where she had been driven out because she got on with the kids. Her sin was to show up the other teachers and so deprive them of being able to blame the students for the lack of educational outcomes. She was an older woman who she had come to teaching late, after being a farmer's wife. Her attitude was that the kids were not that different from her frisky farm animals and that they just needed to be cut a bit of slack. This brought the wrath of the headmaster down on her, in particular for the heinous crime of letting two boys play chess in her English class.

The other feature that attracts drones to schools is that no practical ability to function in the real world is needed. Drones are completely deficient in such practical ability as their entire focus has been directed towards trying to keep up at school. This inability does not disadvantage them in teaching as incredibly the teaching profession has normalised the absurd situation that children are taught by teachers who have never had to function in the real world and are completely devoid of any ability to do so. It is the absence of such competency which means that the teacher drone is the norm. As schools are systemically geared towards servicing the pursuit of qualifications for the minority it is

actually a self replicating closed circuit system. As the majority will not partake of this feast what little education they get is a mere by-product.

Well so much for primary and secondary teachers but surely University lecturers cannot be drones, after all these are intelligent people. Unfortunately drones infest even higher education. I am not saying that universities are staffed only by fools but the problem is that the higher up you go, the more that is expected of you, and some simply cannot deliver on all the fronts they are supposed to. The bizarre thing about universities is that teaching is not their primary focus. Universities have become businesses which sell degrees or more accurately sub-prime student loan sharks for unscrupulous banksters who cruelly take advantage of those scrabbling for work. University fees are based on ranking. University ranking is not based on teaching ability but on the number of academic publications staff churn out. The pressure is on lecturers to claw their way up the academic hierarchy by writing articles, so they de-prioritise teaching and tend to reward docile students who question less, as drones do not distract academics from the task of getting something published. Prolific academic writers are assured of university lectureships as they bump up the ranking. Many prolific writers are dreadful teachers, as they are fixated on their speciality and are so self-absorbed they do not understand that students need a different level of knowledge to their rarified realm. This makes them drone teachers as they lack the ability to impart knowledge. What happens in their classes is that a handful of talented students get it and do well. There is then a huge gap with the next and largest cohort scraping through by rote and regurgitation. This group comprises of both the competent, who are not being adequately taught and the mediocre who only know rote and regurgitation. As the marking is usually bell curved this gap is not apparent but what is happening is that the competent and mediocre are being lumped together by a drone teacher. Good teachers, such as my contract law lecturer referred to below,

teach the whole class, building knowledge incrementally and logically, but also posing the sort of questions which enable the talented to shine. He also marked well. He didn't bell curve so if you weren't up to scratch, you got failed.

The other side of it is that it is hard to be multitalented at this level. My contract law lecturer once said to me that he did not publish much as he did not have that many novel ideas to communicate. He was an honest man. Other academics are less honest and perhaps more desperate. The way these academics publish is often to rewrite what has already been done. They get away with this by disguising their lack of originality with semantics and obtuse writing styles. My favourite example of this phenomenon comes from Melbourne in the early 70's. A grant was offered by Community Aid Abroad for a research project on how best Australia could help the Third World. The winning entry was such a veritable triumph of semantics that the project was funded. In fact the semantics were so tortuous it was quite difficult to know what the essay actually meant. The thing was that when it was all boiled down to basics, what the essay advocated as the best way Australia could assist the Third World, was to have a revolution. The funding was used to set up the Light, Powder and Construction Company, light was to see what was going on, powder to blow it up, and construction thereafter. What they actually did was set up a media room which hosted alternative Melbourne publications, such as the Digger. Marvellously cheeky pranks such as the Light, Powder and Construction Company, show drone semantics up for what they are, a mockery. Certainly complex subjects require deep thought and not everything can be explained with three letter words. But with these Scholastics we come back to simple drone identification and the question of what have they produced. We find that all these drones have done is amused themselves playing anagrams at the taxpayer's expense. They have taught nothing but games, added nothing to the sum total of knowledge but smugness and have accomplished only

irrelevancy. In doing so, they have created the conditions for the technocrats to do away with them altogether. No problems with that but the danger is that out with the dishwater will go the baby and universities risk being reduced to no more than service centres for business.

What this all means is that Universities are failing to inculcate the ethical values necessary for a free society, such as was a prerequisite for Pythagoras, who understood that knowledge is power and should not be entrusted to the unethical. Beyond this Universities are also failing in their core function to properly qualify. While on a flight to Christchurch some years ago I was seated next to a gentleman with whom I got chatting. This gentleman said he was returning home from a Fonterra board meeting and that he was involved in the personnel department of that company. He did not strike me as being insane so I assume what he said was true. He said that his organisation, one of the largest companies in New Zealand, no longer relied on university qualifications. He said that they simply could no longer trust such qualifications as being an accurate measure of ability. Indeed he related an instance from his own experience as a student, during which he had been encouraged by other students to do a paper in German literature, as you got an A. He said that he liked German literature but that he liked engineering more, so he did an engineering paper and didn't get the A. Interestingly he said his real problem was that the people he wanted to employ didn't want to work as much as the firm wanted them to. These competent persons wanted more free time, rather than more money.

A broad factor which militates towards the selection of drones in academic positions is gender bias. The large-scale engagement of women in work began during World War II and was a significant advantage to the Allies over the socially conservative Nazis. This example was not lost on the ruling class strategists and after the war a long, clever and multifaceted propaganda campaign was conducted to draft women into the workforce. The selling of wage slavery as

feminist liberation must be one of the advertising industry's greatest successes. Women, exultant at their '*Arbeit Macht Frei*' liberation, were just happy to be let in. This enormous con enabled employers to virtually double productivity or halve real income, whichever way you look at it. Whereas in the past the average wage supported a couple and three children, try getting a mortgage today on one average income, you'll get laughed out of the bank.

In addition to an increased rate of economic exploitation, women have been a prime target in the rollout of commodity culture. As exemplified in Adam Curtis' *Century of the Self* the tobacco industry realized that conservative social mores prohibited women from smoking and they were losing half the market. The industry employed the original 'hidden persuader' Freud's nephew Edward Bernays who staged a brilliantly deceitful stunt which linked women smoking with women's liberation. Bernays hired a gaggle of pretty debutantes and had them take part in New York's Easter parade. At a given signal they all ostentatiously lit up a cigarette. Using his media contacts Bernays had told journalists that this was a suffragette protest, which was going to light up cigarettes as 'freedom torches', a term redolent of the Statute of Liberty's torch. The stunt got widespread publicity and is not only credited with popularizing women smoking but also served as a model of modern economic propaganda.

Women are preferred in the workplace as they are cheaper and are generally more docile. The latter employer friendly attribute is partially natural and partially taught. Schools are as much socialization as they are education. Girls do better at school as they tend to be more malleable. Boys tend to be less tractable. As education is the carrot for socialization, girls do better than boys. As stated below by Professor Flynn, "*boys hate school*". This is because schools are more structured around feminine principles, than they promote masculine principles. Passivity is the norm, activity is minimised. Conformity is the rule, individualism is outlawed. Obedience is better than loyalty. As such schools are unbalanced and

tend to emasculate males. This feature is exacerbated by the wholesale removal of male role models out of teaching and early education³¹ in particular by the sexual abuse industry, a largely female enterprise. The lie that these propagandists are so concerned about children is amply demonstrated by their indifference to the mega death of children on this planet, which is the great moral failure of our time. This hypocrisy can only be resolved by factoring one of the following:

- (a) Racism, these people are fine with coloured kids dying in droves;
- (b) Sex is a fate worse than death, an oldie but a goodie;
- (c) It's a turf war and all about jobs for the girls.

The preferment of females throughout the school system is a substantial driver of the academic qualification of drones as it is not talent based selection. This putsch has been so successful that Professor James Flynn, the man who the 'Flynn Effect' is named after, is the only academic who has dared to lift the veil on this phenomenon and break the silence imposed by the new orthodoxy. In an interview with New Scientist Professor Flynn said:

A girl with an IQ of 100 thinks of herself as university material and has the marks. A boy with the same IQ hates school and doesn't have the marks. So you're much more likely to find girls below 110 in university than boys. But even so, females do better than males at university.

What Flynn's analysis is clearly showing is that throughout the system, academic achievement is not tied to intelligence but is linked to gender bias. In one of my history papers I got an A. After the exam my lecturer said I'd done well but not as well as young Tom, as he was "something special". Young Tom was an unassuming lad who was exceptionally bright. I ran into Tom some

³¹ The Jesuits' said give me a child till the age of 7 and I will give you the eunuch, this truism is not lost an ideologues of all ilk.

years later and asked what he was doing. Tom told me he was doing some surfing and was on the dole. I asked why he wasn't doing post grad and he told me that he had applied to do a masters degree but hadn't been accepted by the female Head of Department. Tom did have some major disqualifications. He was shy, working class and male, in a time when the agenda was jobs for the girls. Not only Tom missed out. Society missed out on real talent and has to make do with a second rate drone replacement.