



CENTRE FOR CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES

The University of Birmingham, P.O. Box 363, Birmingham B15 2TT

Stencilled Occasional Paper

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY, EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS

by

CCCS EDUCATION GROUP

General Series: SP No. 52

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY, EDUCATION AND THE CRISIS

This paper is a revised version of an article with the same title which appeared in On Ideology (Working Papers in Cultural Studies 10 and Hutchinson, 1978).

The original article was written by Dan Finn, Neil Grant and Richard Johnson.

The following members of the C.C.C.S. Education Group helped in revising the text and especially in discussing the (new) conclusions.

Steve Baron
Kevin Brehony
Michael Green
Angela McRobbie
Henry Miller
Merilyn Moos

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies
University of Birmingham
P.O. Box 363
Birmingham B15 2TT
England.

© C.C.C.S. and authors.

PREFACE

This stencilled paper is a revised version of an article which first appeared in Working Papers in Cultural Studies No.10, On Ideology, 1977. Written in late 1976 the article was centrally concerned with explaining the genesis and constituents of what was then publicly conceived of, and defined, as a 'crisis' in education. We attempted to explain the political and ideological nature of that 'crisis', against explanations which, on the one hand simply identified the debates on education as a smokescreen for the massive cuts in educational expenditure, or on the other hand identified the 'crisis' as the political projection of a unitary and monolithic state apparatus simply responding to the 'needs' of capitalist production. That is to say, we took as our object ideologies about education - which we approached historically and politically.

Notwithstanding the errors and simplifications that this focus on ideology generated - which have been pointed to by many critics - we were concerned with the social and political effects of these ideologies. These effects can be identified in debates about education, which have through policies a real effect on the educational system itself, and which constitute an important part of more general political arguments.

At the moment the narrowly party political character of the issues has never been clearer. But education is political in a broader and more significant sense. Education often acts as a kind of metaphor of national destinies. It seems to be a particularly appropriate vehicle for taking about the future of society in general. It is no accident that those social forces which are intent on a major rightward shift of our society choose to lay such stress on education. And it is easy to see how this centrality arises: education does concern future workers and citizens (even if educators sometimes exaggerate their role in 'producing' them). The preparation of future workers and citizens necessarily involve some more or less explicit vision of the general social future. But that, in turn, is the very stuff of politics in the broadest and widest sense. So, contrary to what a narrow view of teacher professionalism would suggest, education is fully and properly a 'political' question. Hence the way it attracts the (professional) politicians like bees to the honey-pot, and hence the need, certain instincts notwithstanding, for teachers to think more politically too.

In the post-war period education falls into two distinct phases: the long period of expansion following the 1944 Act and continuing into the early 1970s; and the more recent shifts which mark the beginning of a massive, seemingly long term restructuring of the education system as we have known it. These moves have so far given rise to an all-out attempt by both major political parties - but particularly the Labour Party - to win the consent of people to this new educational order. It has involved the mounting of a huge media offensive, with leading members of the government, including Callaghan himself, calling into question the existing system and seeking publicly to re-define its aims, objectives and means.

We would argue that the present moves to re-structure the educational apparatus, initiated by the Great Debate, cannot be understood without an effective critique of social democratic ideology on education. For it was the Labour Party which presided over the era of massive educational expansion, and it is that same political formation which has slashed educational expenditure and is re-defining the nature and purposes of that schooling.

For these reasons we thought it important to make our analysis available in a relatively cheap and accessible format. We have also taken the opportunity to make a number of revisions to the text, not to answer the many accurate criticisms which have been made of it - particularly those pointing to the absence of any analysis of the relations between patriarchy and schooling - but to redress some other absences and inadequacies which have become apparent. Most notably we have expanded our discussion of the Right's ideological offensive, from the 'consensus' period of the 60s to the onslaught of the Black Papers.

It is important to stress that the stencilled paper has been produced as part of the collective work of the Education Group at the Centre. This work involves an analysis of post-war educational developments which will be published as the next issue of our journal. There we will be exploring other more fundamental processes and determinations of the educational 'crisis', in addition to the themes we discuss here.

Another major absence in this paper is the lack of any coherent analysis of changes in the nature and structure of the labour market, and of the capitalist labour process in the post-war period. For it is around understandings of these development and their political and economic relationship with schooling, that the major rationale for educational restructuring has come, both in the 60s and in the 70s. The currently developing crisis of youth unemployment, and the criticisms of schooling, have been paralleled by a massive expansion of work experience and training programmes orchestrated under the auspices of the Manpower Services Commission. These changing and contradictory 'demands' of industry for new forms of labour-power (with the correct habits, dispositions and work disciplines necessary in a 'crisis' ridden economy) and the new educational and training structures they call forth, will be at the heart of our analysis in the journal.

However, we still wish to stress the political importance of ideologies in the construction of the educational 'crisis', for the 'ideological' dimensions are often inadequately considered in relation to grass-roots political strategies. Since the late 1960s this has, it is true, begun to change: one very recent symptom is the increasing concern among politically aware teachers about the importance of sexism and racism as ideologies with a relation to education. Yet there is still a tendency, not least among left groups, to focus too exclusively on issues of resources and of organisational control - hence the salience for some groups of campaigns around 'the cuts'. The structure and purposes of the trade unions within which most politically active teachers work, favours the emphasis on combating the most obvious and immediate pressures. To raise broader questions, in a union context, often seems divisive or unlikely to win the maximum support. One of our arguments in this paper is that the issues should be raised much more often. In what follows we seek to clarify a few of the issues around ideological struggles, mainly through a critical account of the dominant ideologies of the educational region. We have also added, to our original account, a brief conclusion concerning some of the political implications of our analysis (see pp. 65-70)

INTRODUCTION

There is a challenge to us all in these days and a challenge in education is to examine its priorities and to secure as high efficiency as you can by the skilful use of the £6 billion of existing resources.

Let me repeat some of the fields that need study because they cause concern. There are the methods and aims of informal instruction. The strong case for the so-called core curriculum of basic knowledge. What is the proper way of monitoring the use of resources in order to maintain a proper national standard of performance? What is the role of the inspectorate in relation to national standards and their maintenance? And there is a need to improve relations between industry and education.

(James Callaghan, Ruskin College, October 1976)

The leading questions of Labour's Prime Minister marked a fundamental shift in the field of the debate about educational means and ends. They marked, at the "highest" political level, the end of the long post-war phase of educational expansion which had been largely promoted by Callaghan's own party. His speech, banal enough in content, was nonetheless a well prepared media event, delivered in an appropriate place, important more in the anticipation than in the speaking. Intended, then, to be a signal event - a public re-definition of educational objectives - the speech was also a response to more immediate events: the history of economic crisis and of cuts in public expenditure and, Callaghan's own real challenge, the polemical weight of the Tory critique of Labour's educational past. If we understand it correctly, Callaghan's speech crystallized many aspects of the current situation.

We

We wish in what follows, as a political-intellectual project, to contribute to an understanding of this conjuncture. We write especially for people, like ourselves, who work in an educational system under siege or who are blocked from entering it. For all of us the awareness of educational crisis is enforced by daily experience of insecurity or the loss of apparent autonomies. But our contribution is of a particular and limited kind: we take as our object ideologies about education; we approach them historically; we see them as having determinate (or "material") social bases and effects. It is important to say a little, at the outset, to characterize this approach.

There are two main ways of talking about ideology in relation to education. We can stress the actual cultural processes of schools and colleges. This would include all the formal work of school and all the avowed intentions of the more orthodox kinds of professional teachers: in other words what is meant to happen in schools. But it should also include the informal cultural level too - the 'hidden curriculum' (what pupils learn from teachers and others while they are learning) and the active, 'lived' cultural responses of the pupils themselves, their frequently ungovernable and contradictory behaviour. Together these form the immediate content of the grass-roots experience of schooling. But, on top of this, we must also consider the more public and 'visible' debates about education. Schools are plainly an issue in the media and a 'stake' in political disputes. Party politicians and the media build all kinds of arguments around them. Thus educational aims and objectives loom large (especially during the last few years) in attempts to construct political alliances, cultivate the consent of the governed and secure bases of power through publicity and the routines of formal democracy. So it happens that the actual workings of education are also re-presented both to the educational agents themselves (teachers, pupils and parents) and to that mysterious (but actually structured)

thing - 'the public'. We might sum all that up by saying: there are cultures of schools and ideologies of schooling.

Some useful things can be said about the ideological level in general. First, ideologies of schooling are constructed a long way from the processes they are meant to represent. There are some easily verified symptoms of this - apparent enough to media watchers who are also teachers. Characteristically, the media or the politicians fix on a particular example. They remove it from the very complicated context in which, in the real world, it is placed. They slot this example into some argument of their own. It becomes a cause célèbre: a Tyndale or a Tameside. It becomes a symptom of a deeper malaise. A quick look at the Daily Mail would refresh the mind, for the Mail with its stories of illiterate, disaffected and 'incompetent' teachers, pioneered the genre of 'schools as scandal' in the Right critique of educational developments in the 1960s. Despite the common protestation that 'education should be kept out of politics', the Mail's campaign was undoubtedly aided and fostered by Tory councillors and MPs. All this reminds us of another set of meanings of the term ideology: ideology as inadequate and 'partial' knowledge - 'partial' in both senses of that word.

Although representations like these are in part 'constructed', they do have very important effects. We must view them in relation to policies - to politically determined actions of an administrative kind which have the force of law or at least of authoritative direction. Policies in turn affect grass-roots resources and opportunities. As we will show, Labour's 'Great Debate' is an excellent example. It was at once a response to the Right critique, occupying some of the same ground, and a process of preparing the basis for policies which had, strategically, already been decided upon. One role of ideological work, then, is to prise open the limits of the politically possible. In the course of such work a whole field of thought may be transformed, and we have evidently lived through such a shift in the educational field since the early 1970s. Such shifts are not wholly ideological in character. They are also attempts to solve problems of economic structure. But they do require an ideological strategy, actively promoting new understandings, fixing them in people's minds, giving to the novel the status of the axiom.

This essay therefore is mainly concerned with what we have called the 'ideologies of schooling'. We will refer occasionally to our own understanding of primary educational processes mainly to highlight the inadequacies of ideologies about schools. Our position is best sketched where it is relevant, and where it enters our critique of other positions. But there are two main features which we see as essential to an adequate theory. First theory must grasp the relations between school and other sites of social relations. The most important of these can be specified: family, work and the formal political sphere. But these sites themselves will be inadequately grasped unless viewed in their relations within a particular social formation. These are some of the reasons why we choose to work within the Marxist problematic of reproduction while recognising that there are more or less adequate variants of it. This takes us to our second principal point. One of the weaknesses of some versions of this theory, Althusser's for instance, is that they appear to have little place for that capacity for resistance which may be exercised by children and teachers in schools, (Althusser 1971, Willis 1977).

Further features of our approach - a concern to define our object historically and relate it to a particular social base - are best introduced more concretely. The ideology of the education system which is our principal object has a particular history. It was constructed by particular agencies and produced by a particular social coalition. All of the elements in this coalition had their provenance in the years before the Second World War: two of the three, indeed, have a

considerably longer history. But it was only in the post-war world, and especially in the 1960s, that these combined elements acquired hegemony over educational policy as a whole. The educational crisis of the 1970s is, in part, a crisis of this formation and of the social coalition that underpinned it.

Each party in the alliance made its own contribution, but the effective nucleus was the Labour Party. The ideology of progress through education was a regional expression of what critics to the left of the party have dubbed "Labourism", and which we see as a variant of the general category "social democracy". As we show in more detail later, Labour's education programmes bear the stamp of the internal formation of the party and of its relations within British society. Its politicians and intellectuals have been the main bearers of these ideologies. Before the professionalisation of educational report and inquiry it was intellectuals of a Fabian or British Socialist persuasion who supplied the main source of the party's policies. The absence of a more than passive contribution from working-people is a matter which will concern us later.

The party, itself a complex social alliance, was joined by other agencies. These do not constitute, in any useful sense, organic classes or even fractions of classes; rather, specialised intellectuals of a particular tendency and the organised professional interests of the educational sphere. The emergence of a specialist, academic sociology of education was, in our view, one of the most significant developments in post-war education. The sociologists of education replaced or at least supplemented the intellectuals of an older kind. They worked in a more technical manner within an intellectual field which specified quite narrow problems. It was this alliance with sociological expertise which gave to Labour's post-war programme much of its tone and shape.

The third component in the alliance was the teaching profession itself, or, more specifically, the tendency to teacher professionalism. If the Labour Party supplied the general political-ideological context and the sociology of education specified some short and medium term objectives, teacher-educationalists supplied much of education's content. They supplied the obvious absence in the more politicised contributions. They cultivated "the secret garden of the curriculum".

In what follows we develop the sketch outlined above, considering each of the agencies in the post-war coalition in turn, examining their particular contributions. In Part IV we show how these elements were articulated in the policies and reports of the 1960s. Although it is impossible to divorce exposition from critique in earlier sections, we then show, in Part V, some of the intrinsic inadequacies of the social-democratic position. Finally we analyse the crisis itself from this perspective - as a crisis of social democratic ideology and as a splintering of its social base.

THE LABOUR PARTY

We do not intend, in this section, to recount the familiar history of the Labour Party, nor in detail its educational policies. The general history of the party has been much studied. (Pelling 1965, Nairn 1964, Coates 1975, McKibbin 1974, Howell 1976, Miliband 1972). There are useful accounts too of its contribution to State educational policies especially for the period up to 1951. (Barker 1972, Simon 1974). The aim is rather to examine, more "structurally", certain key features of the party which seem to have determined its educational stance. We are less concerned with shifts of policy than with their continuities - the pattern of emphases and absences which was the party's particular contribution to post-war educational ideologies. Our account is not intended to be "original" except in so far as it may render problematic a pattern of assumptions normally taken as self-evident. This pattern of assumptions was initially formed in the early years of the party and reinforced during its inter-war history. This is why, in this section of our paper, we choose to concentrate on the period before World War II.

The Parliamentary Route

One of the crucial determinants of Labourism has been the party's relationship to the working class. Despite appearances to the contrary and especially the post-war attempts of "democratic socialists" to "broaden the base" of the party's electoral support, it has remained dependent upon a working class vote and an historical alliance with trade unionism. The growth of its support from World War 1 to the early 1930s rested in part on the enfranchisement of new sections of the class and in part on a shift of popular allegiances away from the Liberal Party, the traditional, nineteenth-century focus of the politics of organised labour (McKibbin 1974 p.236-47). Even the post-war strategies of the party aimed at other class fractions have still retained the older identifications, and in the case of trade unionism has even developed them.

The second crucial determinant of the party's ideologies has been its acceptance of those concepts of legality and political-constitutional conventions which Miliband (1972) has termed "parliamentarism". These assumptions were materialised in British political practices long before the emergence of the Labour Party itself, though they were only completed or realised in the full, late achievement of universal adult suffrage and the emergence of the party as a "legitimate" representative of the working class. Notions like the sovereignty of parliament, and especially of the House of Commons, derive in fact from the days of a propertied parliamentary system, representative of different fractions of capital. Other elements - formal equality before the law for example - have a still longer history. The insertion of working-class politics into this structure also pre-dated the emergence of separate labour representation. The party's parliamentarism was pre-figured in the mid-nineteenth century alliance of radical popular liberalism with the bulk of organised labour. The formation of the Labour Party, however, consolidated this relationship rather than challenged it. As Miliband puts it, characteristically over-emphasising the enigma of Labour's leadership:

Of political parties claiming socialism to be their aim, the Labour Party has always been one of the most dogmatic - not about socialism, but about the parliamentary system. Empirical and flexible about all else, its leaders have always made devotion to that system their

fixed point of reference and the conditioning factor of their political behaviour. This is not simply to say that the Labour Party has never been a party of revolution: such parties have normally been quite willing to use the opportunities the parliamentary system offered as one means of furthering their aims. It is rather that the leaders of the Labour Party have always rejected any kind of political action (such as industrial action for political purposes) which fell, or which appeared to them to fall, outside the framework and conventions of the parliamentary system. The Labour Party has not only been a parliamentary party; it has been a party deeply imbued by parliamentarism. (1972 p13)

It is worth digging behind the term "parliamentarism" and considering what it entails. It involves, firstly, a belief in the neutrality or the potential neutrality of the State apparatus: there is nothing in this "machinery" which prevents it from being used for the benefit of all. It also involves a faith in legislative-administrative procedures as the main route to the solution of "social problems" or the equalisation of conditions. This in turn gives a primacy to formal political processes - basically the marshalling of a popular vote at elections as the means to a Labour hegemony. Accordingly less mediated forms of class power are regarded with distrust: at best they are an embarrassment to parliamentary proprieties, at worst they constitute a really undemocratic threat. The only clear exception to this inhibition are working-class actions which are held to be industrial. These are the proper concern of the party's alter ego - the trade union movement.

The force of this analysis may be seen if we review the party's relation to other tendencies in working-class politics in the period 1910-26. Throughout this period, forms of working-class politics arose that differed markedly from what became the dominant Labourist adaption: a trade unionism which united industrial action and political aims; rank and file movements, suspicious of officialdom and challenging the war-time State; the evolution of British communism and a tradition of industrial direct action and mass sympathy strikes. Without these legacies the General Strike would not have taken place; its defeat was one of the ways in which tendencies like these were educated out of the class's repertoire. This pattern cannot be explained here in full, but it is important to place the Labour Party within it. We may note that the party's policies were not directly related to these struggles, although they necessarily affected them. From 1910 the State increasingly intervened in major industrial conflicts, workers themselves demanded the State re-organisation of their industries, and the class as a whole was involved in bitter fights to defend existing wage levels and hours of work. In practice if not in theory, this opposition involved a repudiation of the economic policies that made wage-cutting "necessary". One role for a political party in these circumstances would have been to back and organise such demands, re-think economic orthodoxies and combine agitation with the (necessarily) political strike. Labour, rather, began the long haul to parliamentary respectability, avoiding "unconstitutional" action. Its marginality during the General Strike was only a signal instance of a general situation. All this was skilfully played upon by bourgeois politicians for short-term tactical advantage, the appeal to the "constitutional" against the "revolutionary" being the key

propaganda theme. There was no full hegemony in these years; rather there were successive crises and partial stabilisations heavily backed by force. The high points of conservative strategy were those periods of Labour minority government when it was permitted to "rule", but remained too weak, irresolute and baffled by underlying economic problems to pursue its own policies of reform with any force. In 1931 a section of the party's leadership was actually recruited to the side of a bourgeois coalition to help perform tasks which Conservatives could not have performed on their own. Hence for the Labour Party, the political debacle of the early 1930s, the loss of electoral support and the need for a major recuperation thereafter. The result, by the 1940s, was a form of Labourism more self-confident than at any time since 1918, but it is clear that the main long-term consequences of the inter-war years was an education into "legitimate" trade unionism and the necessities of the parliamentary road.

These relations, to the working class and to the State, underlay the party's educational stance. Educational tendencies within the class were neglected and a form of educational politics was constructed within the State. To grasp the particularity of this adaption, we need to compare it with other historical experiences and another way of thinking the role of a working-class party. It is useful to compare what Marx satirised as "parliamentary cretinism" with Gramsci's theory of "the new Machiavelli". The choice of Gramsci and the Italian Communist Party at a contemporaneous moment is especially apt since the relation of a party to its class was Gramsci's central problematic. It specified most of his major concerns: the role of the party itself, its relation to the State, the problem of the intellectuals and the master category 'hegemony'.

Parties, Politics and Education

According to Gramsci parties arise on the basis of particular social classes. He himself was especially concerned with the working-class parties of the era of the transition to monopoly capitalism and their appropriate strategies. Parties always control and direct their class, always have a "policing" function. Yet this function can be performed in different ways. In "regressive" modes of the relation, an external control of the class by the party is uppermost. The party's "educative" function is negative. Accepting existing definitions of legality, possessed of only a partial analysis of the place of its class within the social formation, pursuing immediate, limited reforms, the party acts to hold the class within the existing order. Gramsci's alternative was a working-class party whose role was positively educative. Such a party directs, educates and "civilises" its class, raising its activities to a new level of legality. It works within the grain of common-sense conceptions of the world held by worker or peasant but raises them to a higher power of critical self-awareness and coherence. It teaches the classes their place within the social formation and within "history" as a whole. It adopts "global" functions, beyond the "economic-corporate", embraces in its programmes the whole range of social issues and develops a particular vision of the future. Such a party forms a state within the state, a state in preparation. Since the state is an "ethical" as well as a coercive agency, the party must possess a "philosophy" of its own, capable of becoming the cement of a new social order. Such a philosophy should be rooted not only in Marxism ("the philosophy of praxis") but also in the conditions of existence of workers and peasants. It can only be developed

("developed" because not given in existing forms of Marxism) and propagated by "organic intellectuals" who share the conditions of existence of the popular classes. Their production and their articulation with other groups (notably with intellectuals of an older more "traditional" kind) are, pre-eminently, the work of the party. Such a party-class will already have developed an effective cultural and political control or "hegemony" over "civil society" especially over intermediate or subaltern classes before it acquires State power. The main aim of the party may be defined, indeed, as the construction of such a counter-hegemony or hegemony-from-below. This strategy is very different from the forms of class activity specified by economistic forms of Marxism, or the anarcho-syndicalism of early Italian trade unionism or the Fabianism of the English Labour Party. Many of the differences are summed up in Gramsci's common (and commonly misunderstood) duo: "economic-corporate" and "hegemonic". It is important to stress too Gramsci's distance from the common language of the revolutionary political left - "trade union consciousness" versus "revolutionary class consciousness" or the "reformist" party versus the revolutionary one. Gramsci was, of course, a revolutionary, but he had an unusually complete and subtle sense of what such a transformation required.

The value of his formulation for our purposes lies in his stress on "education" as a necessary aspect of political transformation. This use of "education" is of course a very expanded one. Education happens not only in schools but also through law and other State practices and through all those agencies of civil society - including the cultural apparatuses of different classes - which, in their different ways, cultivate consent. It happens, pre-eminently, in political parties of all classes. In this way Gramsci refuses the restricted notion of education which has actually been constructed around State schooling as part of the ideology of the region. (In some ways, indeed, his actual discussions of schooling are disappointing - see Gramsci 1971 pp.26-47.) Yet if we follow him in rejecting the identification education = school, or college or university, the expanded definition gives us a real analytical purchase on the "educational" strategies adopted by any party.

We can see, for instance, through this set of categories that the British Labour Party's educational object was not, and never has been, its own class, or classes. It is interesting to find Labour intellectuals, later in the tradition, actually disavowing what they regard as a 1920s 'continental' and Marxist model - the model of the PCI and early SPD (Crosland 1962 pp.210-11). As a national party (as opposed to an agglomerate of groups and tencenies) it never was an educational-agitational movement. It did not have a starting-point in some conception of socialist education. Nor did it set out from the cultural and educational resources of existing working-class communities. Its educational policies, like its general politics, were posited instead on a pre-existing machinery - in this case a structure of State schools and a particular distribution of formal "educational" opportunities. It was these that the party set out to reform. Thus the party began as and remained an educational provider for the popular classes, not an educational agency of and within them.

This displacement has been reproduced throughout the party's history and has had major consequences to which we shall return

in Part VI. We can understand it more concretely if we note the main absences and presences in the party's inter-war educational strategy. The major absence was the party's inability to connect, as an organised whole, with a revived tradition of collective working-class self-education which was a marked feature of the period 1880-1926. The major presence was the first full elaboration of a policy for state schooling in the shape of Secondary Schools for All, R. H. Tawney's book, published under the party's auspices in 1922.

The Labour Party and "Counter-Education"

According to some views of the British working class which threaten to become an orthodoxy, British working-class politics and culture were formed in an undyingly corporate mode and have never shifted out of it since. (Nairn 1964, Anderson 1964, Stedman Jones 1974 - but there is more than a hint of this interpretation in most "Marxist" accounts of the Labour Party and Trade Unionism). The formative moment has been variously identified: the defensive tendency of "Labour Representation" (a response of trade unionists to the employers' 1890s counter-offensive and the Taff Vale judgement); the "re-making" of the class under imperialist ideologies at the turn of the century, or even the original defeat of the "first" working class in the Chartist crisis of the early 1840s. One of the problems with such interpretations is that they overlook the "education" (in something like Gramsci's sense) that accompanies the trade union expansion and the formation of the Labour Party.

From the 1890s there was a marked revival of a radical or socialist educational and cultural politics. It resembled, in many ways, the radical counter-educational impulse of the early nineteenth-century in which the popular classes had developed their own conceptions of knowledge, their own educational forms and a critique of "provided" schooling (Johnson 1976). The late nineteenth-century upsurge had no single organisational focus, was organised by a plethora of groups to the left of Labour's ideological centre of gravity, but was massive and diffuse and is still under-recorded. It included the educational work of socialists who led the pre-war "new unionist" and "syndicalist" insurgencies. It included the Marxist study groups promoted by the Social Democratic Federation, the socialist league, the socialist Labour Party, the British Socialist Party and the early CPGB.

It included the tendency to a self-governing education for working-class adults represented by the Flebs League and the Labour Colleges and, finally, the more diffused, "brotherly" cultural politics of the Socialist Sunday Schools, Labour Churches, and Clarion Movement. We still lack as full and as integrated a picture of all this as we have for the Chartist-Owenite phase (but see E. P. Thompson 1960 and 1976; Simon 1974; P. Thompson 1967) though some features are clear enough. Once more a radical and socialist press was very important; once more critiques were launched of orthodox educational forms. Anti-imperialists and radicals and the Labour Colleges contested the liberal humanism of "university extension" and the Workers' Educational Association.

This process of education must have played a part in winning working people, "converting them" in the contemporary phrase from Liberal and Conservative allegiances. It certainly, in the early days supplied the leadership of trade unionism, and many later

labour stalwarts have recalled their early conversions. Without the whole movement it would be difficult to understand the Labour Party's greater sense of assurance immediately after the war and its break with the Liberal Party. Yet once fully formed on the political scene, the party's relation to a continuing education-agitational work was indirect and even, where rivals were involved, hostile. This followed the logic of the political adaption we have already examined but the party's educational inertia, outside moments of electoral mobilisation, also rested on the trade union alliance. Increasingly after 1918 it was the large trade unions, themselves increasingly bureaucratic and stabilised, that supplied the party with its local and national organisers. As McKibbin has shown (1974) the party increasingly depended on this alliance and modelled its organisation on the trade union pattern. The party rested, then, not upon an active ideological recruitment but upon a type of class support similar to the loyalties of a fully formed trade unionism. This essentially passive relationship to its class can be seen in the fate of its more agitational elements: the decline of the ILP, the subordination of the Daily Herald to party and union officialdom, the expulsion of the Labour Research Department, the suspicion of "socialist intellectuals" and their marginality in the party's organisation. Such a party was hardly adapted to the production of Gramsci's organic working-class intellectuals. Significantly, continued working-class education owed more to the Communist Party and to certain Trade Unions than it did to Labour.

All this is not to suggest that "independent" working-class education could have substituted for an educational provision through the State. Even if adapted to that purpose, the Labour Party would hardly have been wise to adopt a free-schooling strategy with schools under working-class control. Chartists and Owenites had explored that route almost a hundred years earlier. What had sustained them then, in the face of pitifully few material resources, had been an expectation of imminent political success. Within its own logic the Labour Party's emphasis on increasing opportunities within the State system was quite rational and a position already reached by later Chartists and popular Liberals. The gross unfairness of the system and the opposition of Conservatives, economising governments and many fractions of capital made the struggle necessary and compelling. Yet, as we shall see, the party's relation to the educational system was similar in form to its relation to Parliament. It accepted State Education in toto, including many of the ideologies of the region. This involved the disavowance of a whole number of relations essential to a successful socialist strategy. It divorced (as State Education itself does) the education of children from the education of adults. Any connection between the content of schooling and the conditions of existence of the popular classes disappeared. This made it impossible to draw on the "independent" tradition in order to wage struggles in the schools. But all these points, consequences of a fundamental orientation, will only really become clear at the end of this essay.

Secondary Schools for All

There are several reasons why Tawney's text is exemplary. First, Tawney himself was the most important "philosopher" of British Social Democracy in the inter-war period. Gaitskell called him "the Democratic Socialist par excellence", though he ought to have added that Tawney often found himself on an anti-Fabian end of what he

himself liked to call "British Socialism". He was the author of two socialist classics, The Acquisitive Society (1921) and Equality (1931). As an intellectual he was typical of his time and the movement he served. His most enduring intellectual work was in history and not "theory". His attitude to Marx, though occasionally appreciative of the latter's "genius", was more distant than his relation to Weber. He is properly placed by Raymond Williams in the English culture-and-society tradition (1968). An intellectual of a "traditional" kind, an idealist and a moralist, he was recruited to the side of labour as an external educator of it, first as a WEA tutor, then as a party adviser. Secondary Schools for All was also in itself a significant text. It was produced by a Labour Advisory Committee which Tawney himself seems to have dominated and, as one recent commentator has put it, is "a perfect illustration of the character of the Labour Party". It expressed sentiments that were to remain typical of its educational policy long after Tawney's direct influence had ceased. (Barker 1972 p.37).

Finally, it arose at a significant conjuncture. It was very much the product of the Labour Party's formative phase in the immediate post-war period. At the same time, it was written in the aftermath of a more widespread working-class mobilisation. As we have seen, this was manifested in part by independent educational movements, but it also took the form of demands for full educational rights by working-class organisations and the growth of popular pressure on existing secondary school places. There is no doubt that Tawney's document mediated and shaped this pressure from working-class organisations and a section of working-class parents.

We wish to stress five main features of the text: Tawney's critique of English education in terms of persistence of a Victorian inheritance; his identification of a progressive educational consensus opposed to this "fatal legacy"; the over-whelmingly mechanical nature of Tawney's solutions - his stress on the means of access to education or "the material scaffolding of policy, administration, organisation and finance"; the text's main absence - Tawney's inveterate lack of clarity on the content and purposes of secondary education; finally, the general character of Tawney's arguments on such things as selection compared with other positions within the Labour Party.

Tawney's analysis was phrased, characteristically, as a history. Education had developed along class lines in the nineteenth century, as a system of social apartheid. There were two separate sectors: elementary education was the training of "a special class", of workmen and servants; secondary education was the preserve of their masters. The systems ran parallel; no progression was possible between them, even for the individual child. The assumptions of this system - "the doctrines of 1870" - had been somewhat undermined since 1902. Despite the recent mangling of Fisher's inadequate proposals, some bridges had been built between the two systems. But the elementary/secondary division remained substantially intact: "exclusive" forms of selection, building bridges for the exceptionally able, were a compromise that served to perpetuate it. So too did piecemeal schemes like day continuation or the extension of education within the elementary system. For most children "elementary education" was all that could be expected; secondary education remained "an exceptional educational privilege".

The task then, was to secure "a living and organic connection" between elementary and secondary schooling, re-classifying them as successive, age-defined stages through which each child should go. Only thus would the illegitimate intrusion of "class" into "educational" matters be ended.

It is worth stressing at this point that though "class" is one of Tawney's key words, he uses it very loosely. In Secondary Schools for All it is most commonly used to denote assumptions and prejudices, especially where these are seen as archaic or other-wise irrelevant to the question in hand. Thus, though Tawney sometimes refers to "class stratification" in the sociological manner, his typical use is idealist and moralist. Class is an invariably pejorative term: "the vulgar irrelevances of class inequality and economic pressure", "the odious doctrine of class domination", "the vulgarities of the class system". Sometimes class is counterposed to "community", division against a social harmony: "Its (Labour's) policy is not for the advantage of any single class, but to develop the human resources of the whole community" (p.64, underlining supplied and cf section on "class" in Equality)

Against the residue of the class-bound doctrines of the past, Tawney discerned (and helped to marshal) an increasing movement of opposition. Sometimes this was presented as but another aspect of "community" - "our common sense and our humanity", a vehicle for values assumed to be agreed on, outside certain vested interests. But the supporters (and the opponents) of educational progress were also identified more precisely:

Both in the criticisms passed upon the present system and in proposals for improving it there are signs of a fundamental agreement which did not exist ten, or even five, years ago. In England it is not ungentlemanly to steal halfpennies from children, and industrial interests, it may be assumed, will oppose any reform which interferes with the supply of cheap juvenile labour. But among educationalists and teachers, economists and social workers, administrators and, not least, the parents themselves, there is not a wide diversity as to the main weaknesses of the existing system. (p.18)

Throughout the text, this dual identification is maintained: the progressive consensus includes on the one hand parents and the Labour Movement and on the other all those who are professionally concerned with the educational system: "Nearly all enlightened educationalists" (among whom Tawney manages to enlist the Times and the early intelligence testers); teachers and social administrators. The arguments of each are duly presented. Parents, having, with a Biblical vagueness, "tasted of the tree of Knowledge", will not now be fobbed off with "educational shoddy". The Labour Movement should fight class domination in the class room, just as it fights it in Parliament and the factory. Educationalists mostly favour major extensions of secondary education. Educational psychologists have revealed the random distribution of ability and argue that "a great deal of educable capacity misses education". Social inquiry has shown the disastrous results of educational neglect, especially for the adolescent. "Common sense" and "humanity" do indeed support reform.

We should note two main things about Tawney's progressive alliance. First, it prefigures in an oppositional form, precisely the type of dominant coalition we have discerned in the period since World War II. Especially significant is the way he treats the teachers. He spends a whole chapter on their position and prospects. Labour supports their legitimate demands including professional aims like the defence of the Burnhamscale, the search for secure tenure, the opposition to "secret reports" on practising teachers, and the strengthening of teacher autonomy. The uniting of the profession is seen as the natural corollary to breaking down barriers in school organisation. Tawney ends this section with a peroration that pointed significantly to future relations between Labour and the teachers:

The aim would be to make our educational system an organic unity, alive in every part, served by teachers united, self governing and free. (p.123, our emphasis)

Secondly, we should note the conspicuous absence of any industrial interests from the alliance. Industry indeed, especially the Federation of British Industries (the inter-war CBI) was the main butt of Tawney's satire. The progressive consensus was articulated against industry and those who were held to represent it in the government and the Conservative party. As we shall see, it is precisely Tawney's purpose to rescue the children from the clutches of employers, and to define an education against the demands of employment.

The actual proposals of Secondary Schools for All focus exclusively on questions of access. Such essential if mechanical matters are distinguished by Tawney from "imponderables of personality, spirit, and atmosphere" which are still more important but impossible to legislate for. His writing is similarly chock full of metaphors of access and exclusion, somewhat more homely than later clichés: secondary schools are "a landing without a staircase"; primary schools "a staircase without a landing"; education in general is a "cul-de-sac"; scholarship systems are "bridges", "frail hand-rails" or even "greasy poles". Primary schools are, again, "like a rope which the Indian juggler throws in the air to end in vacancy".

How, then, to end this segregation? The aim should be to secure the transfer of all (or most?) children from the primary to the secondary stages as part of a continuous full-time education to the age of 16. All the proposals flowed from this: regrading of all schools into secondary or primary; the abolition of secondary school fees; the increase of maintenance allowances; the increase of secondary school places. Despite his title, Tawney remained vague about the universality of secondary schooling. Sometimes he seemed to accept that only 75 per cent of children were likely to benefit, a figure drawn from some psychologists. Sometimes he presented this as an interim target to be achieved as an "instalment of reform", and then surpassed. We shall return to consider this ambivalence.

Most of the book was taken up in discussing the feasibility of these proposals. They were presented in a careful, pragmatic way, with a weight of argumentation and under the slogan "idealistic but not visionary". Yet the discussion of what the schools were to be for, of the content and purposes of the education was, by contrast, cursory and vague. Tawney's own assumptions on these matters have often to be inferred from his treatment of other themes. His direct attempts

at definition were formalistic, tautological and rather feeble:

Defined by the stage of life for which it provides, it is the education of the adolescent. Defined by its curriculum, it assumes that the preparatory work of developing the simpler processes of thought and expression has been accomplished, and that its pupils are ready to be introduced, at least in outline and by degrees, to the subjects which will interest them as adults, and an acquaintance with which may reasonably be expected from educated men and women. Defined by its purpose, its main aim is not to impart the specialised technique or trade of any particular trade or profession but to develop the faculties which, because they are an attribute of man, are not peculiar to any particular class or profession of men, and to build up the interests which, while they may become the basis of specialisation at a later stage, have a value extending beyond their utility for any particular vocation, because they are the condition of a rational and responsible life in society. (p.29)

At first sight this and other passages seem contentless, and in a sense they are. Their meaning is almost entirely negative. What is significant is what is denied. In particular Tawney opposes definitions of secondary education that are derived from the children's future employment. Labour must reject, he later writes, "the vulgar commercialism which conceives of the manufacture of efficient typists and mechanics as the primary object of adolescent education" (p.111), in other words the legacy of Central and Junior Technical Schools. The doctrine of the determinacy of occupation is "fundamentally vicious", robbing children of their chances for a fuller human development in the interests of producing "cannon fodder" for industry.

Tawney's anti-industrialism produces a particular tangle of arguments. On the one hand education is seen as a sphere whose autonomy from economic and social (ie. "class") considerations must be defended. This pushes him into defining certain criteria as purely "educational", so that, for instance, psychological notions of "natural development" are appealed to against considerations of economic utility. The "experts" of the region are also proportionately exalted along with "the progress of educational science". The tendency of this part of the argument is radically to separate the social formation and a principal means of its reproduction, an odd position for a socialist who seeks to change the world! On the other hand, education is seen as having some pertinent effects at a more than individual level. It does (if of the right kind) develop and improve the social order. Tawney is quite as capable as any economist of coining the ringing phrase about education and human capital:

It is possible for the personnel as well as the material equipment of industry to be under-capitalised, and a nation which has the courage to invest generously in its children "saves", in the strictest economic sense, more "capital" than the most parsimonious community which ever lived with its eyes on the Stock Exchange. (p.144)

In this sense, education is seen as increasing the productiveness of labour power "it adds to that particular type of productive power on which the ability to use all other natural advantages ... ultimately depends" (p.145). Yet these contradictions in Tawney's version of the relations of school to economy were never fully explored, neither by Tawney himself, or any other intellectual in the tradition he helped to found.

Tawney's failure to specify, positively, an educational content can be explained in a number of ways. He refused, on principle, to specify any precise curriculum in the interests of variety. He insisted on the importance of trusting teachers. It is also clear that he was heavily influenced by the developmental psychology of the period, hence the definition of secondary education as "adolescent education", appropriate to a stage in the child's maturation. But if "nature" in very general terms specified what should be learnt, there is little need to worry about what "society" (or class interests and experiences) might demand unless indeed it conflicts with "nature". The argument from nature seems to have been reinforced by one from "culture". For Tawney undoubtedly conceived of culture in a thoroughly Arnoldian manner: it was a potentially classless inheritance which schools (or the WEA) could bring to everybody. Unlike "utilitarian efficiency" it had an unproblematic content. Thus, in the last resort, he was quite happy to endorse the Board of Education's list of secondary school subjects without further comment. Finally, we should note the complementarity of all this to the notion of "rights" informing Tawney's whole position and that especially of more working-class egalitarians. What was claimed as a right was evidently what some privileged children already possessed. Secondary education after all, already existed; the problem was to generalise it.

But the consequences of this absence were very important. In this phase and thereafter, social democracy possessed no conception of the nature and purposes of education which could be said to be its own. It was reliant on the liberal humanism of sympathetic intellectuals like Tawney or on the educational professionals themselves or on altogether more subterranean social processes by which the real meaning of school was fixed. It lacked therefore the one really essential component; a conception of really useful knowledge to set against both capitalist utility and the attractive but impossible idea of a classless "culture".

It is important, finally, to set Secondary Schools for All within a wider context of Labour Party thinking on education. We may start by recalling the fact that Labourism in general is a complex of ideologies. As several commentators have noted, much of the character of the party itself can be understood in terms of a persistent duality. On the one hand Labour has embraced a broad ethical anti-capitalism, concerned, above all with social justice and egalitarianism, in temper. This tendency has been represented by the radical ILP-ish tendencies in the party and by more or less independent English intellectuals like Tawney, G. D. H. Cole or George Orwell. On the other hand, Labour's repertoire has included the tradition of Fabian social engineering, best understood as a drive for "national efficiency" and scarcely incompatible either with a corporate liberalism or a State capitalism. This dichotomy has certainly been visible in education and we shall analyse it in much more detail later in this essay. For the moment we may follow Rodney Barker

(1972) in noting the opposition between an educational egalitarianism and the more elitist or meritocratic emphasis of Sidney Webb and the early LCC.

Tawney was well aware of this opposition, wrote eloquently of the differences between "equality" and mere "equality of opportunity" and stigmatised the LCC's policies as inequalitarian. Yet his treatment of the crucial matter of selection was very curious. He identified two kinds: "exclusive selection" which was a way of building bridges which individual children might cross and "inclusive selection" that would almost amount to universal provision. (The 75 per cent target for children in secondary schools was presumably a case in point). The peculiarity of these formulations is that although they are clearly egalitarian in spirit, they fall short of explicitly advocating universal provision. The whole tendency of Tawney's argument and rhetoric and moral stance was egalitarian, yet at the level of practicalities even his work seems to illustrate the power of the categories of the intelligence testers and their construction of broad types of children. As Tawney's own acceptance, later, of tri-partitism suggests, even Social Democracy's leading "philosopher" did not quite escape the duality of Labour's educational thinking. It is perhaps a measure of his status, however, that the tensions and contradictions appear more honestly here than at other moments in the tradition.

Post War "Affluence" and Revisionism

Some fundamental features of the policies of the 1960s were already present in Secondary Schools for All. Post-war development was, in many ways, an elaboration, in radically changed conditions, of that basic stance towards the State and the educational system. The party's subsequent history constitutes a prolonged testing of the adequacy of social democratic politics. It is important to emphasise, however, if only in outline, the changes of context in the post-war period. If more powerful determinations are ignored, there is a risk of overestimating the contributions of teachers or educational "experts".

First, and most obviously, the war-time coalition, the victory of 1945, and the period of the third Labour Government, transformed the party's place on the political scene. In the inter-war years, despite the periods of minority government, it had been a party of opposition, subject to ridiculous charges of Bolshevism and identified with the poor and oppressed. Political success and governmental responsibility strengthened the liberal, "progressive" elements in the party, at the expense of its socialism. Labour made a contribution to the post-war consensual hegemony, accepting the "mixed economy" and building "the Welfare State". A fuller incorporation within the forms of the capitalist State and the achievements of many social democratic goals meant, among other things, that the tendency to identify working-class with "National Interests" was all the stronger.

War, recovery and the post-war boom also transformed the character of the "economic problems" with which the capitalist State had to deal, whichever party was in power. Keynesian solutions mitigated the main source of inter-war discontent - massive and structural unemployment. The problem pushed to the front was now that of "growth", or a rate of accumulation comparable to that of other capitalist economies and free from inflation or from monetary crises. Despite

the 1930s shift into monopoly, the War, and the long boom, British industry and perhaps the social formation as a whole, seemed to remain "archaic". Even Marxist commentators accepted this diagnosis in the mid-1960s. (Anderson 1964). Labour policy was increasingly framed by this analysis. What was needed was a massive social economic and educational "modernisation".

The whole cast of Labour's ideologies was similarly affected by the party's fortunes after 1951. The party helped to construct the post-war hegemony, but it was Macmillan's conservatism that completed the edifice and presided over it. In what has been called: "one of the few privileged phases of hegemony by consent in recent British history" (Hall 1975 pp. 21-22), that is 1951 to 1960, Conservative success, under the banners of "affluence", "dembourgeoisement" and "political consensus" precipitated Labour's "revisionism". The most significant Labour theorists of the 1950s, like Crosland, accepted much of the affluence myth and sought to provide political programmes acceptable in "present-day, as opposed to capitalist, society". (Crosland 1962). The programme that resulted has been very adequately summarised as "an attack on the ascriptive elements of British society which were presented as causes of economic inefficiency and offensive social distinctions". (Howell 1976 p. 193).

Finally, it is important to note that Labour's own legislation of the 1940s eroded much of the ground of its traditional ideologies. Working-class support in the inter-war period had depended in large part upon the very open and conspicuous exclusion of working people from anything like a full citizenship. The War, the removal of the "Old Gang", Labour's reforms and post-war prosperity undoubtedly produced a real amelioration in some of the more contingent and phenomenal aspects of class relations, giving a greater appearance of equality. In this sense "revisionism" was a sensible enough adaption, more convincing than anything the "left" could offer, and perfectly consistent with the party's fundamental reformism (Howell 1976). In so far as the old egalitarianism was to be retained, it had to take somewhat finer and more discriminating forms - either that, or the nature of class had to be grasped more completely.

These changes had three main effects on the party's educational thinking. First, they tended to change the balance of emphases within the social democratic repertoire. The assumption of economic responsibilities (or their prospect) together with the whole modernisation argument, laid an overwhelming emphasis on the economic reasons for educational expansion. Economic considerations, however, were not seen as in any way incompatible with educational goals. Crosland, while invoking Tawney's general argument, did not share his suspicion of industry. On the contrary, there was assumed to be a quite unproblematic harmony between the equalisation of educational opportunities and the necessities of "growth". The first was a necessary condition of the second.

Secondly, education had, by the later 1950s, assumed a very prominent place in the party's total strategy and it became, in its way, the success story of the years that followed. In general, "revisionism" presented Labour as a party of "social reform" and gave education a priority within that definition. Education did in fact become a site of policy innovations that spilled over into other fields, "positive discrimination" and "priority areas" for instance. Education was designated the key area of remaining class

inequalities, "the greater divisive influence" (Crosland 1962). Moreover there is no doubt of the substantial success, at an ideological level, of this part of the party's programme. From the early 1960s to the appearance of the first Black Papers and the new educational radicalisms, social democratic conceptions of education acquired an almost monopolistic dominance. In this sense, education provides an important exception to the conventional leftish account of Labour's fortunes from 1945 to 1965 - a descent from epic heights to bathos.

Finally, of course, post-war changes shifted the actual terrain of Labour's policies. Labour's initial programme of "secondary schooling for all" was pre-empted by the Butler Act of 1944. The major issue thereafter became the forms of secondary schooling, a battle fought out first within the party itself. It was in these conflicts and in the crystallisation of Labour Party solutions that the teachers and the sociologists were so important.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

In this part we shall examine the emergence of the sociology of education, its institutional location, and its characteristic intellectual paradigms. But at the same time we wish to stress that the sociology of education was a developing tradition of inquiry, with shifts of emphasis and method as well as limits and continuities. In this internal history, it is possible to distinguish two main phases, with a shift in the early 1960s. An awareness of this shift has structured our account. Though in both phases the intellectual paradigm was broadly "functionalist", the early functionalisms took a classically institutional form, dealt with problems at a "macro" level, and drew heavily on quantitative techniques. Latterly, sociologists drew on a functionalism of "norms" and "value systems" to explain more microscopic or local features of the educational system and its relation to "class". At the same time methods became more "qualitative". We have sought to sketch the main external determinations of this change.

But we are also concerned with the relation of the sociology of education to social democracy and to Labour Party policy. At almost every level, including the actual careers of individuals as both sociologists and advisers to Labour, the relation was, as we shall show, peculiarly close. Ideologically, too, there were both convergences and shared presuppositions and influences. The Fabian tradition, for instance, was a constituent in the actual formation of the sociology of education. Even so, the sociologists did make their own specific contribution to the post-war pattern, and it is this that persuades us to view the whole constellation Labour Party/Sociologists of Education as a coalition and not, simply, as a unity. Sociologists were not simply party advisers - the academic wing of the party. Often they were further from this role than the inter-war Labour intellectuals. They were also academics of a particular kind, appearing as the "experts" of the region, winning a wider currency and authority for their work outside the party. Their ideas came to be dominant within the educational apparatus. So far as the party was concerned it was through their work that further objectives were added to the inheritance of "secondary schools for all" and Labour's post-1944 goals were given precision. Although the fit with "revisionism" was very close indeed, the contribution

was nonetheless specific.

In what follows we deal first with sociology and the sociologists, then with their influences within the educational system and on Labour Party policy.

Developments

The sociology of education had its roots in the "political arithmetic" tradition of empiricist sociology, which had concerned itself directly with questions of poverty and social inequality. It was during the 1930s, following the establishment of a Department of Social Biology at the London School of Economics, that systematic efforts were made to investigate the part played by education in maintaining and perpetuating the class structure, and in promoting social mobility. It was in this context that the findings of mental testing, usually cited in support of a selective system, were turned to an opposite use. In 1935, Gray and Moshinsky, in their key article, "Ability and Opportunity in English Education", combined psychological and sociological techniques in a survey of the relationship between ability and attainment. They concluded that there was a "large reservoir of unutilised ability" (1936 p. 364).

The institutionalisation of this fact-finding project at the LSE, and its subsequent development after the 1944 Education Act, marked the birth of the sociology of education as a legitimate academic discipline. In terms of the problems that were initially addressed, the emergent sociology of education was greatly influenced by its antecedents in Fabian socialism and its links with government educational policy: on the one hand a concern with equal opportunities, and on the other a concern with problems generated by the gradual transition to a peace-time economy. In the case of the latter there was an imperative to increase productivity to meet the demands of the internal economy and also to re-establish links with external markets. At a time of full employment, the response to these "needs" involved two strategies: firstly, increasing the individual productivity of the labour force, and secondly, efficient utilisation of technological skills and developments. Crucially, the success of this strategy was seen to be largely dependent on increasing the supply of highly skilled technologists, and in this respect the education system was seen to be inadequate. Thus the primary focus of sociological research, particularly that sponsored by official and semi-official government agencies, was upon those handicaps which prevented a perfect relationship between measured ability, educational opportunity, and performance.

The sociology of education of the Halsey, Floud and Anderson era was directly concerned with the relationship between education, the economy and the social system. As Floud expresses it, they were "fascinated by the spectacle of educational institutions struggling to respond to the new purposes of an advanced industrial economy" (Floud 1961 p. 60). From this perspective - broadly structural functionalism - society is viewed as a system of interrelated parts each of which performs some function for the others and thus for the society as a whole. So, in these terms, it makes sense to talk about the "needs" of the economy, the "functions" of the educational system, and so on.

Characteristically demographic in approach, the sociology of education

attempted to analyse the influence on educational attainment of components such as the child's age and sex, the size of the family, and the parents' education and reading habits. They identified and documented the under-representation of working-class children in selective secondary and higher education; the gap in the attainments of children from different social backgrounds; and the widening of this gap as children progressed through the education system. As Halsey and Floud pointed out: "Widespread social amelioration since World War II has not removed persistent class inequalities in the distribution of ability and attainment" (1961 p. 7). An unselected reserve of educable talent was being wasted. Thus working-class failure in education was viewed as a wastage of "society's talent".

Parallel with this work were the investigations by other agencies into the validity of the selection mechanism itself. In 1957 research reports from the National Foundation for Educational Research and the British Psychological Association disputed the reliability of the eleven-plus as a predictor of educational capacity. These findings fuelled growing middle-class dissatisfaction with the selection process and the eleven-plus. Previously, they had been able to purchase a secondary education, but the abolition of fees, and the operation of the eleven-plus, prevented this. This position was exacerbated by the uneven grammar-school entrance rates in different authorities - varying from 10% to 45% of the total intake.

The impact both of the educational sociologists' findings and of the general discontent in relation to selective education was not confined to the Labour Party. The myth of "parity" between the different schools had been exploded, and by the early 1960s concern was again being expressed about the shortage of scientists and technologists, a concern which received added emphasis in the light of Britain's developing economic problems. In 1961 the Conservative Education Minister, Eccles, asked the Central Advisory Council to report on the "average and below average pupil" (Newsom CAC 1963). Macmillan also commissioned a special report on higher education, to consider how the system could be brought up to date (Robbins 1963). The Nuffield Foundation sponsored the first curriculum development projects concerning themselves particularly with science teaching, and in 1963 the Schools Council on Curriculum was established.

Thus, by the early 1960s the nature of the educational debate had already shifted fundamentally. Sir Edward Boyle, Eccles' successor, made the point:

After 1963 it was hardly controversial to say that you had massive evidence of the number of boys and girls who were being allowed to write themselves off below their true level of ability. I think 1963 was a watershed here, Newsom and Robbins both coming out in that year. It was those reports that really cemented the work that educational sociologists had done in previous years. (Kogan 1974 p. 91).

There were however further shifts in the early 1960s which provided a new context for the developing sociology of education. The dominant assumptions underlying the ideology of affluence were

systematically attacked on both theoretical and empirical levels. The rediscovery of poverty, growing industrial militancy and the appearance on the political arena of a series of social problems, previously submerged, contributed to a "rediscovery" of class. Within sociology this "rediscovery" focused on the community. Whilst it was accepted that working-class material standards had improved, it was argued that they still constituted distinct social groupings. Throughout sociology - from the Affluent Worker monographs to the poverty investigations - a re-engagement with the reality of class was initiated.

Within the sociology of education this shift was apparent in a move away from the "macro" concerns of the orthodoxy, to small-scale studies of educability - a move away from the "needs" of post-capitalist society to the "definitions" of the local community. This is epitomised, for example, in the work of Jackson and Marsden (1966) and the earlier work of Halsey and Floud (1961). Both studies are directly concerned with the relationship between working-class children and the grammar schools, but their methodological approaches to the problem are fundamentally distinct. Similarly, this shift in approach and emphasis paralleled a change in the structural position of the sociology of education. Like the other social sciences it was expanding with the institutional growth of higher education. Specifically, it was increasingly incorporated into teacher training colleges and university education departments, and this also had significant implications for the nature of the "problems" to which research was addressed.

Thus the changing theoretical frameworks and institutional basis meant that by the 1960s investigation no longer focused on the material handicaps traditionally underlying educational inequality. Research now attempted to identify social factors impinging on the intellectual developments of individuals, and also explored the social and cultural circumstances affecting working-class pupils' attainment at a given level of ability. The research attitude, that is the theoretical paradigm employed, had important implications for the way in which class was viewed. As one sociologist put it:

Given the kind of educational system and the kind of relationship between school and home which exists ... differential educability is linked to social class background. But social class is just a shorthand way of referring to a complex of factors which correlate with occupation. It describes the distribution or incidence of a phenomenon but does not explain its occurrence in any causal sense. (Sugarman 1966 p.287).

So the task was to explain the occurrence in a meaningful way, once more sociologists drew on the functionalist paradigm, but less overtly and crudely, assimilating the sophistications of the small-scale studies conducted by the social anthropologists.

From this perspective social behaviour is structured by norms, enforced by implicit or explicit sanctions which organise, in a regular and predictable fashion, the social life of individuals and the relationships they enter into. Thus, the analysis focuses on rules of conduct as mechanisms of social control, on the constellation of rules that govern particular forms of social grouping,

for example kinship; and on the effects which these norms have for the structure of social relationships in given areas of social life. The "meaningful" fabric which constitutes social life was therefore found, not in culture, but in institutions considered as regulative social relationships. This largely descriptive approach to social phenomena is given a certain dynamic by the use of the concept of function - the "adequate causal mechanism". Institutions are seen as functioning parts of a social whole such as the community, which serve to maintain it in a more or less stable condition. The logic of the approach then becomes circular, because in so far as these institutions continue to contribute to the maintenance of the social system, that is, if the system "works", then they are seen as functional for it. This approach, by definition, leads to a focus on the mechanisms of control that serve to ensure conformity to the prescribed normative order.

In practice this approach leads to a concentration on "normative" facts ("treat social facts as things") so social structure refers to relations between actual, empirically given, social phenomena. These relationships are either given in the facts as directly observed, or arrived at by simple abstraction from the facts. Thus social structure, when used in a functional analysis, refers to no more than the actual organisation of a social system - "you too could see it if you took the time".

To give a short example of how this approach is used, and how it actually obscures that which needs to be explained, we can look at those parts of J. Klein's survey Samples from English Culture, dealing with education and mental activity. Traditional working-class communities, for example the mining community studied by Henriques et al (1956) are seen to be inward-looking, with a social structure based largely on ascribed roles. These workers have short term rather than long-term goals, they do not discuss these rationally, and insist on a high degree of conformity. Klein describes this mental state as "cognitive poverty" - an intellectual stagnation precipitated by the conformist pressures of this type of community.

Apart from the obvious criticism that the level of educational experience is not considered in the original study, or by Klein, the implicit suggestion is that "cognitive poverty" arises inevitably from the conditions of working-class life. As she makes clear:

Even the most sympathetic writers on working-class ways of life remark on what appears as a stubborn determination not to develop - and not to allow others to develop - attitudes or behaviour that would make for a richer and more interior life. (1965 p.7)

But this does not explain anything. It gives us a necessarily determinist picture: 'That's the way workers are in traditional communities'. The question still to be answered is 'Why are they that way?'

To return to the main argument, the starting point of research was that schools and education were "good" things. Thus it was assumed that the factors inhibiting the educational development of the working-class child were external to the school. So it was necessary to go outside the school and analyse the pupils' social environment. To

understand their attitudes to education and their behaviour in the school it was necessary to understand the values they received from their homes and local communities. An implicit acceptance of the present social and economic structure of society led to a simple comparison of the cultures of those who succeed in school and those who do not. Thus, to our surprise, we are told that the working-class have certain deficiencies, vis-a-vis their middle-class counterparts - in linguistic competences, in values and so on. Even when the impact of the school experiences was examined, their effect was seen to reside in compounding these cultural deficiencies through, for example, streaming.

The academic sociology of education developed initially as a response to post-war economic 'problems' as perceived within the apparatus of the State. It was also shaped by the meritocratic ideologies present in the Fabian end of Labour Party traditions. For sociology this dual problematic had important consequences for its understanding of the relationship between the education system and working-class children. The initial demonstration of an untapped pool of ability identified certain statistical correlations associated with working-class failure, but provided no explanatory power. Importantly, class was understood not as a dynamic relationship, but as a number of variables correlated with income. Thus the search was on for the adequate causal mechanism, and in line with developments in sociology generally, the cause of failure was located in the attitudes, values, and language of the local working-class community. Subsequently, these findings were articulated more clearly in theories about a "culture of poverty" or the "cycle of deprivation". Working-class failure in education was precipitated by the deficiencies in their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and, logically, policy should aim to compensate for these deficiencies.

Impacts

The impact of these findings needs to be assessed at two levels: in relation to policies about the internal organisation and activities of the school, and in relation to Labour Party policy. In the first case it broke the stranglehold of psychology on school organisation and on progressive teaching methods. As Simon (1974) demonstrates, the development of intelligence testing and its related selection procedures generated the introduction of internal streaming, and subsequently legitimated the tri-partite system. Sociologists criticised these practices, by pointing out the unreliability of the selection mechanisms, then by questioning the whole basis of differentiation, and finally by demonstrating their "self-fulfilling" quality. So for J. W. B. Douglas, the selection and streaming reinforced, and was largely based on, the cultural/material deficiencies of the working-class child (1964).

Secondly, child-centred teaching had been advocated in government reports since the 1930s, alongside proposals for classifying children by intelligence levels. Both concepts were related to a psychological understanding of man as a creature with innate, determinate capacities. Intelligence level was, however, pivotal, and set limits on the capacities and potentialities that could be drawn out by a child-centred approach. Thus, intelligence determined structure and organisation, and within these confines a child-centred approach could be utilised. The compatibility of these views is demonstrated by the joint appendix to the Hadow Report (1933) written by Sir Cyril

Burt, "the father of intelligence testing", and Susan Isaacs, one of the most influential progressives. Sociology, then, by undermining the concept of intelligence, removed the theoretical linchpin which legitimated the organisational structure, and consequently released progressivism as a method from its constraining and determining influence.

Thus, sociologists were able to demonstrate that it was the school's reinforcement of working-class deficiencies, rather than innate incapacity, which contributed to working class failure. Consequently, the structural and internal organisation of schooling should be reorganised to compensate for these deficiencies, rather than compound them. The political force of this argument was augmented by governmental reports in the later 1950s and early 1960s, which not only recognised the need for more highly-trained technologists, but also argued that a higher level of attainment was necessary for even those of average ability. They were able to do this by pointing to the decrease in absolute number of unskilled jobs and a rise in the level of skills demanded by the occupations which had emerged as a direct consequence of technological developments. Previously, reports of this nature, such as the Norwood Report, had presupposed a belief in three broad categories of children whose intellectual capacity and potential were largely predetermined. However, by the time of the Newsom Report we find that this assumption has been undermined and that:

intellectual talent is not a fixed quantity with which we have to work but a variable that can be modified by social policy and educational approaches. (1963 p.6.)

That is to say:

The evidence of research increasingly suggests that linguistic inadequacy, disadvantage in social and physical background and poor attainment in school are closely associated. Because the forms of speech which are all they ever require for daily use in their homes and the neighbourhoods in which they live are restricted, some boys and girls may never acquire the basic means of learning and their intellectual potential is therefore masked. (1963 p. 15)

Therefore, the Newsom Report, with its sociological definition of capacity, is able to argue that the "average and below average pupils are sufficiently educable to supply the additional talent", and thereby meet the needs of the labour market. This was seen to require more flexible and "relevant" education programmes, the raising of the school leaving age and the provision of adequate staffing facilities.

From an original limited concern with selection and social mobility, attention was now given to education as a preparation for life - particularly economic life. So the theoretical position developing within sociology was mediated by government reports and translated into policy for the schools.

In looking at the impact of the educational sociologists on Labour Party policy, it is important to recognise the implications of the sociologists' structural position. We have already identified the

link between Fabianism and the work of the LSE, and it is widely acknowledged that most orthodox educational sociologists had some degree of commitment to comprehensive reform and the Labour Party. However, the relationship differs significantly from that of the pre-war Labour intellectuals whose work was organically connected both theoretically and practically, to the politics of the Labour movement. Indeed, this point is recognised by Crosland when he argues:

Educational research, in any case a very new tool, can give new facts, illuminate the range of choice, show how better to achieve a given objective, but it cannot say what the objective ought to be. For this must depend ... on judgements which have a value component and social dimension. (Crosland 1974 p. 207)

The emergence of a specialist, academic sociology of education, carried with it commitments to objective professional work, implying a definite division between institutional research and political activity. The consequences of this for the work produced are significant. Importantly, by working within an institutionally and professionally delimited field of knowledge, which specifies key problems and approaches, the work is distanced from the direct political/moral/philosophical discussions which characterised the work of people like Tawney and Webb. Furthermore, the technical concerns and professional expertise required by writing within sociology, the need for an "objective" and fair treatment of the material and subject, generates political ambiguities, but at the same time gains legitimacy as being "scientific".

Labour's alliance with the sociology of education in the post-war period - its use of the technical expertise and the findings - directly influenced the direction and implementation of its educational policy. Kogan, in his interviews with Crosland and Boyle (Kogan 1974), points to the growth of a new educational establishment in the late 1950s and 1960s made up of social scientists and the like, drawing on the work of professional experts such as Vaizey and Halsey. Furthermore, this process was accelerated with Labour's return to office. Crosland tells how, when in office, he effectively exploited the ideas of sociologists like Halsey and Burgess and constituted an informal consultative body made up of similar "experts" such as Young and Donnison. Indeed, Crosland attributes the successful undermining of the eleven-plus to such "experts":

It wasn't the Department, in fact, that cracked the Eleven Plus doctrine, but it was mainly such outsiders as Vaizey, Floud, Halsey and the rest. (Kogan 1974 p. 186)

More importantly, the framework of assumptions within which the sociologists worked was compatible with, and complemented, Labour's post-war revisionism. Both accepted the framework of Welfare State capitalism and its hierarchical occupational structure, which was seen, somehow, to reflect directly the technical requirements of the production process. Having accepted this stratification as given, the question posed for political policy is access to positions in the hierarchy. Equality of opportunity, in this perspective, is understood as equalising chances in the lottery of job allocation. But now the basis of differentiation in education, the IQ test, has been undermined and shown to be largely a function of the environment. Therefore

education takes on a new role: we must allow, as Crosland says, "the beneficial influence of education to compensate for the deficiencies of upbringing and early circumstance" (Crosland 1974 p.199).

From these assumptions flows the argument for comprehensive and other policy initiatives. If we consider Crosland's major speech in 1966 on the necessity for comprehensives, we find that he argues that the research of the sociology of education, and the government reports, prove that working-class children, for various reasons, are unable to exploit their educational opportunities effectively. Therefore, policy must necessarily be aimed at ameliorating those factors inhibiting the "equal" chances of the working-class child. Yet the abolition of fees and the provision of "secondary education for all" have not, as educational sociologists have conclusively and "scientifically" demonstrated, improved the relationship between working-class ability and attainment. Research has also demonstrated that the eleven-plus is unreliable as a predictor of capacity, and furthermore, that the tri-partite division in education perpetuates anachronistic class privilege and divisions which are no longer relevant to a modern post-industrial society. Finally, the demands of the economy in terms of the average level of skill required necessitate the provision of a more effective, and efficient, education for the "average and below average ability" pupil. Thus, he concludes that the tri-partite system is "educationally and socially unjust, inefficient, wasteful and divisive." (Crosland 1974 p.165).

These arguments and assumptions, widely held in the Labour Party, represent and epitomise a shift in the way Labour understands inequality and social change. From the pre-war emphasis on wide-scale redistributive policies, we now have an emphasis on a technical/organisational problem in a relatively discrete social policy area. This fracturing characterised Labour's response to the "social problems" confronting the political system. These discrete areas reflected, and in part generated, the intellectual fields occupied by organised professional interests. Within sociology, for example, the various sub-disciplines relating to social policy worked within intellectual fields which specified quite narrow empirical problems. Working with specific methodologies and addressing particular "technical" problems, evidence and recommendations were advanced, "objectively", to inform the process of political decision-making. Thus, the "problem" of poverty was divorced from that of ownership, the "problem" of working-class educability was divorced from that of real, ongoing, class relationships, and so on.

The sociology of education not only provided the "legitimate" rationale for Labour's comprehensive programme, but also, crucially, helped to generate the political consensus on education characteristic of the 1960s. In responding to the economic, political, and social "problems" of the period, the characteristic assumptions and palliatives of the ideological alliance precipitated the era of educational expansion

TEACHERS AND TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

Before attempting to locate the specific contribution of teachers to the ideological coalition we are describing, we feel it is necessary to say something about their class location. Apart from rejecting the simplistic thesis that class is a familial characteristic

passed on from one generation to another, we would also argue against the thesis that teachers, because they are wage-earners, are unambiguously members of the working-class. (Teachers' Action Collective 1975). Whilst it may be useful to see them, alongside the family, as playing a crucial role in the production of labour-power, in the production of value which later appears on the market, we would argue that it is an error then to assume a direct correspondence between the school and the factory. Fundamentally, the school is not a factory, characterised by the appropriation of surplus value and by capitalist relations in the classical sense, and furthermore teachers are not proletarians, they are "unproductive" labourers.

Similarly, the reduction of teachers to the unambiguous status of "workers" neglects the particular determinations of what Poulantzas (1975) describes as the political and ideological levels. Centrally, the whole tendency of teacher organisation has been to define themselves as professionals, experts, and so on; to reinforce the fact that in terms of the work they do they are firmly distinguished from manual labour. Their class location is not simply given by their economic position as wage earners, but is also defined both ideologically and politically, and their place on the mental-manual labour divide in this context is crucial. Thus, it is an error to characterise "professionalism" as a "wrongheaded and subjective term which is used to place teachers into a classless limbo" (Lawn 1975). Rather, teachers and their organisations have emphasised (with fatal continuity) their professional status, the mental-manual labour divide, their distance from parentdom, and so on, so that teaching has been ideologically constructed to emphasise differences from the working-class.

The ideology of professionalism has been used by the teaching organisations to either defend their middle-class status, or to assimilate themselves into that class. Trapped between the developing power of monopoly capital and the advances of the working-class, professionalism can be understood as a petit-bourgeois strategy for advancing and defending a relatively privileged position. For the teachers it has manifested itself as an occupational strategy aimed at creating a unified and self-governing profession.

Reviewing the achievements of the NUT in its centenary year, Sir Ronald Gould, the retiring General Secretary, felt able to comment that with two exceptions the original aims of the union had been largely met. The exceptions he noted were the failure to secure adequate salaries for all members, as well as the failure to secure control over entry to the profession and over teacher registration. One of the aims which he assumed as being long secured, a prerequisite for the pursuit of the others, was the right of teachers to be free from "obnoxious interference". In the light of recent events, Callaghan's speech in particular, Gould's assumption seems unwarranted. The Callaghan speech signals a direct confrontation with the practice of teachers as well as a challenge to the autonomy which they exercise in the control over their own affairs, both inside and outside the classroom. Though this confrontation has been experienced differently by the various sections of the teaching force, their responses have operated on one basic-level assumption. This assumption, common to the different teaching organisations, is that of the professional nature of teaching -

albeit unrecognised in any formal structure - as a counter to suggestions of outside interference or direction.

Professionalism and Educational Reform

The struggle for professional status has characterised the teaching organisations since their emergence as a force on the political landscape during the educational debates of the late nineteenth century. Their initial interventions in the debate on the Revised Code were dismissed, characteristically, by Robert Lowe, in the following terms: "teachers desiring to criticise the Code were as impertinent as chickens wishing to decide the kind of sauce in which they would be served" (Coates 1972 p.8). This cynical response emphasised the lack of status and effective power of the National Union of Elementary Teachers. Its very title reflected the internal divisions among teachers. Separate organisations represented teachers in the private and secondary schools, and in their case there was a real determination to defend their status and relative privilege against the expanding body of elementary school teachers. Furthermore, within the ranks of the elementary teachers sectionalism was rife. The division between certified and unqualified teachers produced, not only two distinct organisations, but continual conflict over "dilution" issues. Even when this was resolved by the NUT's acceptance of uncertified members, the issue of equal pay for women precipitated another split with the formation of the National Association of Schoolmasters.

Out of this alignment and re-alignment of forces a relatively coherent policy on professionalism emerged. For the elementary teachers the notion of professional self-government, with teacher control over professional standards and a register of qualified teachers, was seen as a means of equalising conditions within teaching and thereby raising the status of the elementary sectors. Thus the aim of a single profession and the unification of the schools into one system was central to the development of their occupational strategy. While the grammar-school teachers argued for keeping the primary and secondary system distinct, elementary teachers and those in the higher grade schools called for the integration of the two, with the right of automatic transfer from one stage to another as a means of extending overall educational provision. It was in this educational context that the first calls for "equality of opportunity" were heard from outside - the TUC making such a call as early as 1897, demanding that secondary education be placed within the reach of every worker's child.

The co-existence of these demands, one articulated from within the education system by the unions and the other politically expressed by the Labour Party, was a key feature of educational politics in the inter-war period. But whereas the Labour Party's educational policy was part of a broader social and political strategy, of which education was an integral and important part, the unions' policy was essentially an educational one with its own discrete rationale.

The major practical aim of the teachers' organisations and the Labour Party during this period was the expansion of secondary education, with the "ultimate" objective of "secondary education for all". The contentious area was the nature of the provision to be implemented by the proposed expansion. The teaching organisations broadly supported "multi-lateral" or "multi-bias" proposals, where one school

could cater for a whole range of abilities in the same building or on the same site, albeit internally divided into academic and non-academic sections. The Assistant Masters' Association expressed support for this scheme as early as 1925, and the NUT was similarly in favour. The "multi-bias" proposals, as well as potentially offering the equalisation of working conditions, also offered the possibility of extended job opportunities for women, hence the support of groups like the Association of Assistant Mistresses. Similarly, the division between the Higher Grade schools and the secondaries could also be overcome with the implementation of a system of "common schools"; thus within the NUT the teachers in the Higher Grade Schools were particularly vociferous in their support for the proposals.

It is important not to exaggerate the distinction between professional and political interests. Indeed, one of the characteristics of these years was the general drift of teachers towards electoral support for Labour - underpinned by the party's opposition to cuts and economics, and by its commitment to reform the education system. This trend, particularly in the early 1920s, provoked consternation in Government circles, and alarm amongst Conservative teachers. Speaking of this drift, one ex-NUT President was moved to argue that there "will be a danger not only to the teacher themselves but to the State generally" (Simon 1974 p.120). This concern with the political orientation of teachers as a group prompted, among other things, Special Branch surveillance of the activities of the Teachers' Labour League. A group of Tory MPs even tabled a "Seditious Teachings Bill" directed at preventing the diffusion of anarchistic ideas among the young, on pain of imprisonment.

Within the Labour Party it was only the Teachers' Labour League which consistently raised the "content" of education as a matter for political debate. Their "proscription" by the party in 1927 signalled Labour's evacuation of that area. For the party, therefore, the intermediate level between the scale of provision and what went on in the classroom, namely the level of the curriculum, remained uncontested. The subsequently re-constituted teachers' interest group, the National Association of Labour Teachers' concentrated almost exclusively on the organisational form that "secondary education for all" should take.

While the teachers' union stressed the educational and professional benefits of multi-lateralism, the NALT, as the main spearhead of Labour's educational policy, was eager to pursue the "common school" as a means of mitigating the divisive social effects of the existing system. However, in implementing the 1944 Education Act the new Labour Minister of Education did so on the basis of the Norwood Report (1943), which had recommended the tri-partite system. Controversy raged - on the one hand the Minister emphasised the "parity" of the separate schools, that is their financial and organisational equality, and on the other hand, successive NALT Conference resolutions were passed rejecting the tri-partite system and calling for the rapid development of comprehensive schemes. The end result was that during Labour's period of office only thirteen comprehensives were established, with eight more granted to the LCC on an interim basis.

It was during the period of opposition in the 1950s that the Labour Party became firmly committed to comprehensivisation and the abolition

of the eleven-plus. Those revisionist changes in the party, and the findings of the educational sociologists and psychologists, discussed above, saw the "right" and "centre" of the party, under Gaitskell, unite around the call for comprehensivisation.

However, while it is obvious that NALT teachers enjoyed membership of the NUT it is clear that the over-riding rationale employed by the teachers' organisations in support of "secondary education for all", was of securing equalised conditions, as well as furthering their longer-term professional and educational aims.

Teacher Autonomy and Progressivism

In this section we wish to examine those longer-term professional and educational aims which occupied a central place in the teachers' support for education reform. Crucially, we want to look at the development of teacher autonomy over, and control of, the curriculum. The demand for professional status was closely related to the struggle for autonomy. More importantly, it was the teachers' control of this area, coupled with the development of "relevance" and "progressivism", which provided the missing centre of social democratic policies in the 1960s, that is, the content of the curriculum. However, it is important not only to analyse these developments at the policy level, but also to consider the immediate school context in which they operate.

Control of the secondary school curriculum was relinquished by the Board of Education in 1917, when effective control passed to the examination boards. These institutions ensured that the secondary school curriculum was appropriate for university preparation and, since the boards determined syllabuses their control might have been indirect but it was absolutely effective. Likewise in the elementary schools, the concern was, after 1907, not only to instil good conduct and discipline but more specifically to win the maximum number of "free" places at the grammar school, which was now required to offer a quarter of its places, free, to children from the public elementary schools.

The winning of free places as a primary concern of elementary schools led to the internal organisation of the school being subordinated to this aim. In this respect streaming represented the "pragmatic" solution, though the increasing numbers of children qualifying for scarce places resulted in the introduction of more sophisticated selection mechanisms, particularly intelligence testing. Thus, whilst in the inter-war years no "formal" prescriptions existed about what had to be taught, a very real set of determinations operated on the teaching situation through the elementary and secondary stages. The public recognition of teacher "autonomy" in this respect came from Lord Percy in 1927:

If government, whether local or national, began to prescribe to the teacher a certain method of teaching, or even attempt to influence such matters, we run the risk of all those evils that we have seen in various forms, both in the Prussia of the past and in the Russia of today. (Bernbaum 1967 p.90)

The curriculum was to remain, in Sir William Pile's words, a "Secret Garden", into which politicians entered at their peril,

since any incursion could be represented as totalitarian in nature and intent.

For teachers, in the inter-war period, one of the main sources of dissatisfaction with the "educational" practices of the unreformed system was the concern to secure greater freedom within the curriculum. The all-pervasive influence of the examination boards, and the effects on the elementary and secondary schools of streaming and selection, provided ready arguments for a move towards institutional arrangements whereby the direction of the examination boards could be circumvented. Furthermore, in those areas of the schools least affected by the external determinations - the lower streams of the elementary schools - experimental curricular reforms demonstrated the viability of alternative modes of teaching. As the teaching force expanded, pupil-teacher ratios decreased. Coupled with the introduction of "progressive" methods, via the training colleges and the Inspectorate, the elementary school curriculum began to develop in a child-centred, inquiry - based direction. However, this movement was not universal; reports as recent as Flowden (1967) still called on teachers to adopt such an approach. The pressures to enter more and more pupils for the selection exams, and the demand for more educational qualifications, inhibited the spread of these methods.

Thus, within the education system the struggle for comprehensivisation was one directed not only at the formal organisation of schooling, but also at the external control exercised over the curriculum both by the selection procedures, and by the examination boards. The NUT, for example, called in 1946 for the abolition of external examinations. In the post-war period the proliferation of external examining bodies intensified the problem and it was not until the Beloe Report in 1960 that the teachers gained control of their own examination system - the CSE. This was followed by another success in 1963 when, after considerable controversy and argument, the teachers gained control of the Schools Council on Examinations and Curriculum. This Council, as one of its working papers makes clear, has no direct power to influence the curriculum:

The Council's intention in all its development work is not to impose a new curriculum, but to reinforce the freedom of the head in making his own decisions by extending the range of courses and materials from which he can choose. (Schools Council 1971 p. 5).

So, whilst the Council is concerned to promote and initiate curriculum developments, its constitution and position act to reinforce and enhance teacher autonomy in the classroom.

These developments in the education infrastructure were paralleled by the organisational changes promoted at the policy and political levels. Particularly in the 1960s, the introduction of comprehensivisation and other reforms opened up areas and spaces within the schools requiring a new content, and it was this area which the teachers controlled.

However, this "control" is not an abstract quality, but a freedom which operates in a specific context - the school. Obviously, activity within the school is structured by powerful external determinants, but it also contains within it social and cultural

processes of considerable complexity. One of the most important of these is the characteristic resistance of a large number of working-class children to the overt aims of schooling. (Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970, Willis 1977, Hammersley 1976). This resistance cannot be simply explained by the working-class "deficiency" model, which assumes that if the child fails or succeeds, then it is something external to him which is responsible - be it cultural values from the home and the community or a simple structural determination, such as status achievement or deprivation. Even where research is carried out in the school, it is the institutional practices of streaming, for example, which are seen as wholly responsible for his success or failure. Hargreaves (1967), for example, argues that the peer group reinforces and is predicted on failure. Failure, and the concomitant rejection of the school's values, provides the organisational focus of the group, status in the group being accorded with the degree of rejection. The implication being, seemingly, that there was some original "fall from grace".

Within these frameworks, no understanding can be developed of the ways in which these children create a culture in response to the institutional practices and organisation of the school. An analysis which reduces this culture to inherited values or a simplistic acceptance or inversion of the "official" message of the school basically rejects the role and nature of subjective experience.

Fundamentally, the actions of the pupils in the school must be viewed as intentional, logical and geared to doing or getting things done. In this sense, subjective experience provides and informs the active, day-to-day process of the creation of frameworks of meaning, which, in the case of the "anti-school" culture, under-mine the teachers' expectations and the school's objectives, and provides the pupils with attitudes, practices and evaluations whereby they make sense of their own situations. Similarly, it would be dangerous to see the "achievers" as simple vacuums for the overt messages of the school. Here too, though with important differences, cultural meanings are created through subjective experience. The school's objects and the teachers' expectations achieve a particular resonance, but in many areas, ambivalence and even opposition are generated. The configuration of peer groups in the social landscape of the school provides meanings and affiliations of considerable complexity.

Apart from this overlapping and social interpenetration amongst the pupils themselves, it must be remembered that the home, neighbourhood, class, etc., provides a reservoir of accumulated meanings and cultural practices which are used, changed and appropriated by the children in creating their own practices and meanings, to come to terms with and, in certain cases, subvert, the official organisation and ideology of the school. In this sense the cultures of the pupils' social groups can be seen to draw upon, and be situated within, the wider context of working-class culture.

It would be wrong to suggest that these children have total autonomy and freedom in developing their cultural responses to the schools. The process of cultural response occurs strictly on the terms and parameters delimited by the structure - 'It is a stony

desert', which they have to make habitable by their own efforts'. Thus, a hidden curriculum comes into play - other people organise their life, they are streamed by 'ability', it is legitimate for teachers to make demands on them and so on. Paradoxically, the creation of meaningful frameworks, within these parameters, implies an accommodation to these forces. It submerges the potential oppositional stance of cultural responses - not inevitably, but practically.

Again, as Paul Willis has attempted to demonstrate in his study of working-class adolescents: "it is not so much that the creation of subjective meanings and its related actions reproduce the existing social relations of production, so much as that in their outcomes these things maintain - indeed are - the fabric of the present structure" (Willis 1976 p.8). Thus, the "success" of the "habitation" created by the anti-school culture, the informal group culture, leads into and prepares the way for the culture of the shop-floor.

These processes - manifestations of class struggle at the level of the classroom - are "hidden" to the educational policy makers. They are unable to conceptualise class as a relationship, rather it is a complex of variables which impinge on the school from outside. The policy thrust is to accommodate the variables, through resource-based learning, a relevant curriculum, school assessment schemes, remedial departments and so on. Thus areas are opened up within the school which can be colonised and invested with meaning. The "achievers", however, must tread the line between the arid instrumentalism of commitment to exams, and the pull towards, and partial adoption of, cultural meanings visible on the social landscape. It would be too simplistic to infer that these were the only cultural options, but what we want to indicate are the unintended consequences of reform - their use and appropriation by the pupils. That is to say, while the schools reproduce the social relations of production, "behind their backs", they also reproduce historically specific forms of resistance.

It is within this school context that the policy prescriptions outlined in government reports, Schools' Council documents, and so on, have to be translated, via the teachers, into actual classroom practices. In this context, there have been three basic developments feeding into the curricular work of the school - the science curriculum work of the early 1960s, the prescriptions about "relevant" working-class education outlined in government reports, and the curriculum work of the Schools Council. However, the relationship between the curriculum projects and proposals generated by "researchers" and their reception in actual classroom practice is complex.

This curriculum work has been framed within certain assumptions about the teachers' pedagogic stance and relationship with his pupils. Importantly, this work has been designed for use in a "child-centred" approach, where the older, traditional mode of education as the performance of hard labour has been replaced by a "community of interest" between teacher and taught. These pedagogic assumptions say more about the distance from the school of the researchers, than they do about the actual classroom situation.

Progressivism as an ideology has a history distinct from the more utilitarian concerns of professionalism. Its roots in romanticism can be traced back to the Rousseau of Emile, or even further.

However, its articulation as a pedagogic style and approach is much more firmly rooted in the period of compulsory State education. Its initial reception and development in the educational infrastructure during the 1930s was constrained and channelled via its subordination to the central concept of intelligence. Its prescriptions, and its acceptance in the training colleges, partly fuelled the teachers' demands for autonomy in the classroom. Without that autonomy, the flexibility demanded by this approach was sharply limited by the external determinants on class-room practice and organisation.

In the post-war period, with the attack on the concept of intelligence and the divisive structures of school organisation, progressivism was increasingly presented, via the training colleges, the "specialists", and so on; as the desirable mode of teaching. Indeed, government reports recognised and argued that the external determinants were preventing the more widespread adoption of these methods. Crowther made the point in 1959:

the most promising part of the educational system for experiments in new methods of teaching relatively difficult things will be in the middle streams of the modern schools - but only if they are left free from the cramping effects of a large-scale external examination. (1959 p.94)

Thus, the policy arguments about the forms of secondary education were informed by an implicit assumption about the new modes of teaching this changed organisation would require. This aspect, however, was separated off as a professional concern, and was only developed and extended by the research and training industry which emerged in the wake of institutional reforms. This approach, which acquired its own hegemony in the regions of the training colleges and research institutions, particularly in the 1960s, corresponded with the real power and space of teacher autonomy and was directly related to the relatively spontaneous ideology of romanticism, common to students and teachers.

However, if we look in particular at the work of the Schools Council, the major institution in this field, we find complex mediations between the findings of research and their implementation in the classroom. The first point to note is the distance of research from the classroom. If we look at the document Projects, issued in June 1971, we find that of the 111 projects discussed 76 were situated in universities, 11 in colleges of education, and two in schools. Furthermore, as Jenkins and Shipman point out:

The Schools Council lacks the infrastructure, the advisory staff, and the local support to go far beyond projects that develop ideas, methods and materials ... and leave behind publications and evaluations. The consequent take up remains largely in the hands of the teachers themselves. (1976 p.53)

This position is reinforced by the central principle enshrined in the Schools Council, via the voting power of the teaching unions, of teacher autonomy - its proposals have to be designed on a voluntaristic basis. The contradictions in this stance have been outlined by M. F. D. Young (1972), who points out that whilst it is legitimate for the unions to have a policy on exams, they

would be infringing autonomy if policy decisions were made on the curriculum of the school. This individualistic notion of autonomy turns out, in practice, as the right not to do something. Curriculum developments are received, and then rejected or accepted. This involves the teacher responding, not initiating. So for example, faced with RSLA pupils, he must choose between resource-based learning, integrated studies, and so on. Yet the choice is made within the parameters of the particular projects, and the parameters of his, and his pupils', past experience.

The levels between the research bodies and the school are occupied by a complicated web of institutions - from the local "advisers" to the teachers' centres; from the subject bodies' publications to the local examining board committees. Even within the school, complex hierarchies operate; from the curriculum innovations of the Deputy Head, to the innovations of the remedial teacher. It is within this context that we have to see the practice of progressivism, which may be far removed from the theoretically coherent accounts developed in the original research.

At this point it is important to stress the distinction between "progressivism" and "professionalism", neither of which is simply reducible to the other, even though they share roots in petit-bourgeois ideology. Professionalism, as such, is not concerned with the method or content of teaching per se, its central concern is with the economic status of teachers. Similarly, progressivism is an educational and ideological approach to the technical and pedagogical problems of teaching which is not concerned with the occupational position and status of the teacher as such. Both ideologies, as they are expressed in the educational apparatus, have institutional supports and generators - in the training colleges, in the unions, in the research institutes, and so on. It is through these bodies that they exert a powerful influence on the conduct of teachers and on what happens in the classroom. At the same time, it is important to note the disjunction between the level of practice and ideology. The incorporation of progressivism into classroom practice, as an approach and a method of control, takes place within the determinants of the class struggle in the classroom.

We have argued that the occupational strategy of the teachers' organisations was implicitly tied up with the rationalisation and equalisation of the educational system. Furthermore, we have argued that around this assertion of professionalism - institutionally supported by a separate form of education - has been constructed a teachers' educational policy and ideologies. Importantly, the struggle for autonomy has been closely linked with the development of the ideology of progressivism. Thus, the teachers' ability to respond to the "needs" of their pupils was enhanced by their control over their own exams and the curriculum. This flexibility, though more apparent than real, has had important consequences for the internal development of the schools. While it was possible for the Labour Party to avoid the question of content, the teachers were obliged to translate policy prescriptions into actual classroom practice.

EDUCATIONAL EXPANSION IN THE 1960s

In the preceding discussion we have tried to identify certain key elements and institutions which, both ideologically and materially,

legitimated the educational expansion and "consensus" of the 1960s. Crucially, the convergence between these elements, both institutionally and politically, provided a framework of basic assumptions within which educational "problems" were understood and policy prescriptions formulated. The political dominance of this framework was assured with Labour's return to office in 1964. In this section, via a brief outline of Labour's policies, we want to extract the fundamental assumptions underlying those policies and subsequently, by looking at a key text, to see how those assumptions were articulated or submerged within the ideology.

On return to power Labour was committed to the abolition of the eleven-plus; the introduction of comprehensive reorganisation; the expansion of further and higher education; a massive increase in teacher training to reduce class size to 30; and the raising of the school leaving age. This was the "new" Labour dedicated to the eradication of the archaic hangovers which frustrated Britain's technological development. The new government was there to lead, and to protect and advance the national interest. Nowhere was this more evident than in education; it introduced sweeping reforms and embarked on massive expansion plans. For the first time expenditure on education was to outstrip that on defence. Labour's commitment to make British capitalism work, and its meritocratic impulse, had increasingly identified education as the lever for social change, as against the redistributive policies of the pre-war period.

The 1960s was also characterised by educational consensus, as well as expansion. Apart from its general acceptance of the meritocratic argument, the Tory Party's policy on comprehensive education changed dramatically. Conservative spokesmen at both national and local levels increasingly recognised that the principle of early selection was no longer viable, educationally or electorally. A grudging acceptance of the "good" comprehensive school crept into their speeches in the early 1960s, and by 1967 the approach of the 1958 White Paper Secondary Education for All: A New Drive which had aimed at the vigorous development of secondary modern schools towards "parity of esteem" with grammar schools became Heath's "it has never been a Conservative principle that in order to achieve (selection or grouping by ability) children have to be segregated in different institutions" (Jenkins 1973 p. 131).

The parties still disagreed over the pace and details of comprehensive reorganisation, particularly in its effects on the status of independent and direct-grant grammar schools, but on most educational issues there was consensus. Even in 1970, a year after the publication of the first Black Paper, both Manifestos were fundamentally similar - more resources for nursery and primary education, raising the school leaving age to sixteen, expansion of further and higher education; - the only difference was Labour's commitment to legislate for compulsory comprehensive reorganisation and the Conservative pledge that local authorities would have the right to determine their own form of secondary schooling.

In summarising the practical policies of the Labour Party in power during the 1960s we can note that it postponed RSLA until 1972. It endorsed the Robbins Report (1963) and transformed the Colleges of Advanced Technology into universities. It issued a White Paper in 1966 establishing the binary system in higher education, whereby universities retained their independence and other sectors remained

under the control of LEA's. Similarly, it created the new polytechnics and the Council for National Academic Awards, and expanded teacher training. As regards comprehensivisation it issued Circular 10/65, which initiated the phase of reorganisation, and set up inquiries into the status of public and direct-grant grammar schools. When Labour came to power there were 189 comprehensives in 39 authorities. By the time it was defeated in 1970 the number of comprehensives had risen to 1,300 educating 35% of children (though some existed alongside selective schools).

Finally, the development of pre-school education was encouraged, particularly after the publication of the Plowden Report in 1967. This Report also had implications for the schools, through its endorsement of progressive teaching methods and its suggested policy of positive discrimination. Its basic idea, the Educational Priority Area, indicated that policy should intervene in social inequalities. It designated areas where positive discrimination, in the form of better school facilities, more teachers, greater resources, etc., should be implemented. The Government responded with a £16m. programme.

The policies pursued by Labour in office can be seen as a response to certain "problems" impinging on the educational apparatus. Their status as "problems" is delivered by their effects on the "national interest". That is to say, there is an economic problem about the manpower requirements of the economy, and at the same time, a political and social problem about equal opportunities and the "realisation of individual potentialities". These problems are articulated as a concern with working-class failure in education.

Centrally, this "failure" is seen as socially determined - by the "cycle of deprivation" or the "culture of poverty" - and is considered amenable to social policy and educational approaches. Underpinning this assumption is a view of class which sees it as a combination of cultural and material deficiencies - the response is to compensate for the deficiencies, via the schools and social policy. However, the present educational structure is seen as irrelevant and in certain instances damaging - through streaming, selection, etc., - so it must be modernised, both in terms of relevancy and organisation. Crucially, the response to working-class failure is to change the structure of education and to provide more of it.

Thus, if working-class failure in education can be overcome through more resources, better teachers, a relevant curriculum, etc., and if at the same time a more educated labour force is a crucial determinant of our economic success, it is not only logical to call for more "investment" in education, but that redirection of resources becomes a moral and economic imperative. This logical process is underpinned by a view of education as self-evidently a "good" thing, a view which constantly displays itself as naive optimism:

The Government believe that better educational provision can by compensating for the effects of social deprivation and the depressing physical environment in which many children grow up, make an important contribution to over-coming family poverty. Better education is the Key to improved

employment opportunities for young people in these districts and to enabling them to cope with the social stresses of a rapidly changing society.
(Department of Education and Science 1967)

Now, when the explicit link between education and the economy is made, in terms of "investment", it necessarily opens up the content of education, to see "if its doing its job". At the same time, report after report had stressed the need for a "relevant" education for "average and below average" pupils both to realise their individual potential and to dredge the "pool of ability". Also these reports, and political developments, created institutional areas within the schools requiring a new content, for example the "social" education side of the comprehensives, the CSE's, etc., However, these areas are not amenable to policy prescriptions, but fall within the expertise of the teaching profession.

Whilst curriculum innovation and research can be organised and disseminated, and "good practice" encouraged by the Inspectorate, in the final analysis what is taught in the classroom is, theoretically at least, the teacher's autonomous domain. A domain jealously guarded by the teachers' organisations, and extended by their control of the Schools Council and CSE's. Even the external examining bodies were under attack in this period. For example, The Labour Secretary of State, Edward Short, in October 1969 referred to them as "a millstone round the necks of the schools" and hoped that before long people in education would apply themselves "to ridding our secondary schools of the tyranny of the examination" (Locke 1974 p.8.).

Teacher autonomy was rarely questioned in the 1960s. Throughout the reports and policy documents it is assumed that given adequate facilities and training teachers can do the job - what happens in the school is their domain of expertise. Recommendations can be made and structures changed, but it is the teachers who control the implementation of these changes at the "chalk-face".

During this period the most influential body which articulated the relationship between the political problems about education and the changes necessary within education, via its reports, was the Minister of Education's Central Advisory Council, established under the 1944 Act. During the 1950s and 1960s the Council issued a series of influential reports which provided the rationale for major policy initiatives, such as RSLA, and provided guidelines enabling the schools to develop their internal responses to these changes. It was this body, according to Crosland, which documented "the good and the bad of the system and, in particular, legitimised the radical sociology of the 1950s and 1960s". (Kogan 1974 p.174). Fundamentally, these reports displayed those central assumptions which characterised the basic elements of the ideological convergence that was taking place during this period. We now wish to look at these assumptions as they are articulated in one particular report - the Newsom Report - the central importance of which has been indicated in an earlier section.

The Newsom Report, Half Our Future was commissioned in 1961 to advise the Minister on the education of pupils aged 13 to 16 of average and less than average ability. The report itself adopts a problem-

solving stance, though the problems to which it is addressed are never clearly spelt out. However, two central concerns do stand out. Primarily, "our children", as the report describes them, are seen to be bored, apathetic and rebellious in school, and this is seen to be a "bad" thing and damaging to the individual's personal potential. (It should be noted in this context that the late 1950s and the early 1960s witnessed a visible increase in delinquency rates, with their associated moral panics - the Teds, the Mods etc.) Furthermore, the demands of a rapidly expanding technological economy are seen to be creating the need, not only for skilled workers, but also for a much higher general level of skill in the average worker. Thus:

the future pattern of employment in this country will require a much larger pool of talent than is at present available; ... and at least a substantial proportion of the "average" and "below average" pupils are sufficiently educable to supply that additional talent. The need is not only for more skilled workers to fill existing jobs but also for a generally better educated and intelligently adaptable labour force to meet new demands. (1963 p.5).

Importantly, the solution to these problems is seen to reside in the schools, particularly as ability and attainment are now thought to be amenable to the initiatives and activities of social policy. The greatest barrier to "our children" in the schools is seen to lie in their ability to participate and communicate effectively, due to linguistic inadequacy and the schools' lack of relevance to their real needs:

There is a gulf between those who have and the many who have not, sufficient command of words to be able to listen and discuss rationally; to express ideas and feelings clearly; and even to have any ideas at all This is a matter as important to economic life as it is to personal living; industrial relations as well as marriages come to grief on failures in communications. (1963 p.15)

Thus a longer period in schools which have adequate resources, coupled with curricular and internal organisational changes, is necessary if "our children" are going to be able to develop their potential.

The writers of the report are not naive, in that they recognise that for most of "our children" the world of work will not offer them great opportunities for personal expression and realisation:

In any immediately foreseeable future large number of boys and girls who leave school will enter jobs which make as limited demands on them as Arthur Seaton's: can their time in school help them to find more nourishment for the rest of their personal lives than loony-coloured phantasies? (1963 p.27)

To this question, they answer with an unqualified "yes". The schools must provide, not only instruction in the three Rs, but experiences which "will help them to develop their full capacities

for thought and taste and feeling". So, on one level, the schools will provide curricular relevance, through work-experience, craft training, domestic science, etc., yet on another level, they must also provide a social education which will help "our children":

to develop a sense of responsibility for their work and towards other people, and to begin to arrive at some code of moral and social behaviour which is self-imposed. It is important that they should have some understanding of the physical world and of the human society in which they are growing up.
(1963 p.27)

We can see, then, that the report is concerned with the social and economic role of the working class. Though class is submerged in euphemisms such as "socially deprived", "disadvantaged", etc., the report acknowledges that "five out of six are likely to be children of manual workers, skilled or unskilled". Throughout, the report displays a consuming concern with control - to stop the pupils being bored and rebellious, education must be relevant, to stop workers having "loony-coloured phantasies" in dead-end, repetitive jobs, they must have outside cultural/social interests which compensate for job deprivations, and so on. Though couched in the language of equal opportunities, its policy prescriptions reinforce status and economic hierarchies. Indeed, its very title Half Our Future, reifies those educationally created categories which differentiate between "those who work with their heads" and "those with their hands". It is the future work situation which is the determining factor - it is the natural and unproblematic needs of the labour market and domestic production which structure the suggested educational reforms.

To achieve these objectives the report argues that we need to invest more money in education and that the teachers who deal with "our children" need a more appropriate training coupled with an improved financial and social status. Not surprisingly, these teachers, during their training, "should have some introduction to sociological study ... in order that they may put their own job into social perspective and be better prepared to understand the difficulties of pupils in certain types of areas" (1963 p. 103). The value of this perspective was no doubt underlined by the nature of the evidence supplied to the committee by people such as Jean Floud, Brian Jackson and Basil Bernstein. Throughout the report there is an implicit reliance on the professional expertise of teachers. Whilst it is legitimate to suggest both improvements in training and curricular materials, the ability of the teachers to carry out the work suggested is never questioned.

So the assumptions - that education is a "good" thing, that we need to "invest" more, that the teacher can do the "job" with the right materials, that intelligence is amenable to policy initiatives, and so on - provide the ideological framework of the report. Contradictions are neatly resolved, or do not surface. Opposed class interests are collapsed into an inability to communicate. So:

Given the opportunities we have no doubt that they ("our children") will rise to the challenge which a rapidly developing economy offers no less to them than to their abler brothers and sisters. But there

is no time to waste. Half our future is in their hands. We must see that it is in good hands. (1963 p.xiv).

CRITIQUE.

From time to time through this essay we have noted assumptions that have underpinned the prescriptions of "experts" and politicians. These assumptions have been surprisingly constant within the social democratic tradition. We wish, in this section, to recapitulate the more deep-rooted presuppositions and to establish a critique of them. We shall argue that social democratic ideology attempts to reconcile contradictory goals, poses objectives that cannot be realised by the means that are proposed, misrecognises the cultural processes which generates 'failure', and fails in its political purposes - the mobilisation of popular support. This analysis of "theoretical" or intrinsic inadequacies will be followed by a practical demonstration of the weakness of social democratic positions. For the "education crisis" is in large part a crisis of social democracy, in which the ideological initiative has passed to rivals.

Recapitulation: The Dual Repertoire

Social-democratic ideology is a complex formation. Much of this complexity arises, as we have seen, from the heterogeneity of its supports in a particular social coalition and political alliance. But the ideology has been complex in another sense: it has revolved around a persistent duality of ideas which, we will argue, has been rooted less in any direct social basis than in the external and internal relations of the Labour Party as an organisation. This duality is by no means limited to the educational region of Labour's ideology - it spans the whole range of its political discourse - but is particularly evident there.

Labour's educational rhetoric has always moved, as we noted at the start, between two poles. These poles may (in a convenient and familiar shorthand) be dubbed those of "equality" and "equality of opportunity". The demand for "equality" has been essentially social and cultural in nature, a demand for "community", for the equalisation of conditions, for the forging of a "common culture". Equality has been valued because it is a source of cohesion; inequality opposed because of its divisiveness. Such notions have their ultimate point of reference in a social organicism shared with more conservative philosophies and they have been carried in England typically in the culture-and-society tradition. "Equality of opportunity" by contrast, is best understood as an economic goal, based on the conception of education as a "good" which ought to be more fairly shared, the use and consumption of which has pertinent economic effects. The ultimate point of reference for this series of notions has been an essentially liberal conception of society as a market, within which individuals compete. The point, according to this "philosophy", is to enable them to compete more fairly.

For both positions, then, "class" is a problem. But it is a problem in different ways. For egalitarians it is a problem because it creates social conflicts, envy and domination. For "Fabians" (we use the term in the most general sense) it represents a range of artificial restrictions on the acquisition of skills or the

employment of talent. For both positions, likewise, education is a very important means to reformation, but is somewhat differently envisaged. Egalitarians stress acculturation and the absorption of democratic values; Fabians stress skills, especially "useful" ones. In matters of "scaffolding" too, there are differences of emphasis between those who see limited resources as the only bar to universal provision (the egalitarian position) and those who see selection as necessary, while hoping it can be made more flexible and fair. In general egalitarians view education as a "right" co-extensive with citizenship or "humanity", in general Fabians view its distribution as ultimately, a matter of utility. The two poles may, in summary, be presented as follows:

Egalitarians

"equality"

social/cultural goals

class as division

education as attitudes-

rights

social order or "community"

Fabians

"equality of opportunity"

economic goals

class as inhibition

education as skill

utility

market or "efficiency"

It is possible to cite relatively pure examples of both positions, especially in the early history of the repertoire. As we have seen, Tawney, in his general moral stance, if not always in his detailed proposals, personified educational egalitarianism. Sidney Webb personified Fabian "capacity-catching" and a unity (of a rather modern kind) of "national efficiency" and meritocratic arguments. The distinction is also inherent in more recent debates. Defenders of "community schooling" or of de-streamed comprehensives, for example, may be counted egalitarians (Jackson 1970, Midwinter 1972); defenders of streaming or, in another sphere, of the binary system and the "new polytechnics", may be deemed out-and-out Fabians (e.g. Robinson 1968). Much more typically, however, and especially among the politicians, the two strands have been combined and even conflated. To Crosland, for instance, comprehensives are necessary to remove the waste of talent revealed by Robbins and Crowther and "to increase the sense of social cohesion in contemporary British society" (1974, p.206). But Sir Harold Wilson supplies us, as usual, with the classic instance of Labour's dualism, speaking to the party faithful in the run-up to the 1964 election:

we cannot afford to force segregation on our children at the 11+ stage. As socialists, as democrats, we oppose this system of educational apartheid, because we believe in equality of opportunity. But that is not all. We simply cannot as a nation afford to neglect the educational development of a single boy or girl. We cannot afford to cut off three quarters or more of our children from virtually any chance of higher education. The Russians do not, the Germans do not, and the Japanese do not, and we cannot afford to either.

The movement of the argument is typical: first the "gut" appeal to the party's egalitarianism ("segregation", "our children", "educational apartheid"); then the invocation of WHERE WE STAND "as socialists" (and in case this is a bit too strong for all present, as "democrats" too); finally, the slide, through "equality of opportunity" with its fundamental ambiguity, into the most obvious

of "national efficiency" arguments.

The interest in the analysis of this repertoire lies, then, more in its internal relations than in the disappearance of whole components. One such change has already been noted: the shift to dominance of "equality of opportunity" after the War, together with a more markedly economic or technocratic inflection within this complex itself. But even at the height of Labour's enthusiasm for "modernisation", the egalitarian rhetoric (as the quotes from Crosland and Wilson show) was not abandoned.

Politically, indeed, the co-existence of the elements has been of crucial importance. The party's egalitarianism has "spoken" to rank-and-file socialists who constitute its most active workers and, more residually perhaps, to working-class parents. Its retention has much to do with the party's need for a popular base and its reliance on trade unionism. Labour's Fabianism, on the other hand, reflects quite directly the party's structural and historical commitment to managing and reforming a capitalist society. This involves securing, through appropriate social and educational policies, a really progressive capitalist adaption. The chance or reality of office and the inescapable exigencies of governing within the structures of an untransformed capitalist State have rendered this part of the repertoire dominant. In this way, social democratic ideology in education is very much an expression not of working-class educational "demands" (itself a wholly problematic concept), nor of a pure capital logic or interest (an even more problematic idea), but of the particular place of the Labour Party in British society and politics.

Critique I: The Elements Are Contradictory

It is a commonplace of social philosophy that the two kinds of equality represent different positions and point to contradictory outcomes. In Equality, Tawney identified equality of opportunity as a fundamentally bourgeois creed, born in the struggles with the ancien regime, particularly over legal privileges. His dismissal of its relevance to more popular needs stands as a classic and ought to be quoted:

Slavery did not become tolerable because some slaves were manumitted and became slave-owners in their turn; nor, even if it were possible for the units composing a society to be periodically reshuffled, would that make it a matter of indifference that some among them at any moment should be condemned to frustration while others were cosseted. What matters to a nation is not merely the composition and origins of its different groups, but their opportunities and circumstances. It is the powers and advantages which different classes in practice enjoy, not the social antecedents of the varying individuals by whom they happen, from time to time, to be acquired. Till such powers and advantages have been equalized in fact, not merely in form, by the extension of communal provision and collective control, the equality established by the removal of restrictions on property and enterprise resembles that produced by turning an elephant loose in a crowd. It offers everyone, except the beast

and his rider, equal opportunities of being trampled to death. Caste is deposed, but class succeeds to the vacant throne. (1964, p.111)

As an invocation of an historical transition, and for the moral security of its humanism, this is superb. But long after the publication of Equality in 1931 (and despite frequent official recapitulation of Tawney's truths), Labour Party leadership has continued to combine "bourgeois" attacks on "privilege" with the more "socialist" conceptions which, rightly, Tawney saw as incompatible with them. Whatever the slips and slides of language, there is a real, substantial and irreducible difference between the two conceptions. Equality challenges (however futilely in practice) the distribution of "powers" and advantages" which divide classes, while "equality of opportunity", though it may be pressed toward equality in practice, is concerned merely with the occupancy of class places.

Politically, Labour's ideological mix was quite successful. In retrospect, however, it is easy to see that this success rested on historically specific conditions. Some of the relevant contingencies were quite apparent, acknowledged within the ideology itself. It was overtly part of social-democratic ideology, part of the bargain struck with "the people", that a faster rate of "economic growth" was necessary in order to pay, as the saying went, for "more hospitals and schools". In other words the strategy of educational expansion and of "equalising" social policies in general was dependent upon economic success, the success, that is, of a basically capitalist economy. Yet, as we have already noted, by the mid-1960s the inverse relation was also assumed. The expansion and equalisation of education would make a tremendous contribution to economic success. It would cure the "waste of talent" and remove "the scarcity of skills". At the same time it would secure something that was important for its own sake - a greater social justice. We may recall, once more, Crosland's formulations of 1966:

But there is also ... a wider social waste involved. If ever there was a country which needed to make the most of its resources, it is Britain in the second half of the twentieth century; and the chief resource of a crowded islands is its people. Moreover the proportion of relatively inexpert and unskilled jobs to be done declines from year to year. To believe in these circumstances as though there was a fixed 25 per cent of top ability at eleven not only flies in the face of the evidence which I have quoted; it amounts to feckless prodigality. (1974 p. 200)

Before examining these assumptions more closely, we ought to note the absolute centrality of Crosland's argument about "skill". The notion that late capitalism required, generally and not merely for its elites, a wider diffusion of "skill", and that the education system could supply it, was completely taken^{or}granted. Moreover this assumption held together all the main elements in the repertoire. First, it provided a thoroughly hard-headed and vulgar-materialist justification for equalising policies - ending or mitigating selection, comprehensivisation and even the EPAs. Without this, the charge that such policies were "doctrinaire" and even "socialist" was liable to stick. Secondly, it reconciled the inevitable tension

between the characteristic humanist/ideology of educational practitioners - the importance of doing your best for the personal development of each individual child - and the world of work afterwards. For educators were informed (whatever their more direct experience might suggest) that there would always be plenty of up-skilled and interesting jobs for their pupils to enter. Thirdly, since the form of the relation of school to production was left extremely vague, teachers could conscientiously fill the empty spaces with stimulating and relevant activities, reassured by a sense of their usefulness, even though their pupils might appear inexplicably uninterested in what was on offer. Finally, the education - growth combination fitted perfectly the kind of alliance which the Labour leadership in this phase sought to build: workers, especially those in the newer technologies, petit-bourgeois professionals like the teachers, and the more progressive, modernising sections of management and national capital.

In fact, as events have shown, educational expansion which is egalitarian in form and more or less indiscriminate in content is by no means self-evidently beneficial to capital. Labour's recent volte-face marks a recognition of this. It is now easy to criticise the older view, but it is much more difficult to establish some alternative conception of this important set of relations. What is involved is not merely the substantiation of a critique of social democracy, but the development of a whole theory about the post-war movement of capital and its relation to educational expansion. We offer here a few pertinent points.

First, the 1960s argument was based on a limited, reductive and largely unexamined concept - "skill". As Ted Benton (1974) has noted in an excellent critique of social democracy, the 1960s saw a heavy emphasis on "technical development" and, in effect, upon a technological determinism. Just as the general economic problem was analysed in terms of the need for progress in technique, so occupational roles were narrowed to "skill" or "technical knowledge". While we doubt whether in the 1960s the "technological ideology" was as pervasive within education as Benton argues (it seems to us a good deal stronger in the 1970s), its effect was undoubtedly to mystify the whole relation of school to production and to hide altogether, at this moment of analysis, the relation of school to the social relations of production.

As Benton argues, drawing on Althusser, the reduction to "skill" neglected "the crucial ideological training for the place that the student is to occupy in the structure of power and authority relations which is woven into the occupational structure" (1974 p.25). If we are to think the school-production relation more complexly, it is probable that the category "skill" will have to be abandoned altogether in favour of more precise categories: technical knowledge, ideology and control. The everyday inventiveness of "awkward" children in a classroom is, after all, quite as much a "skill" as the ability to read.

What is true of learning "skills" is true also of their exercise. "Skilled", "unskilled" and "semi-skilled" are among the least precise categories of industrial sociology. Again other concepts are necessary that stress the extent of the workers' or capitalists' control of the labour process or the extent to which the conception

and execution of tasks are divorced. Using Marx's categories, Harry Braverman (1974) has argued, with great power, that post-war capitalism in the USA has seen a tendential process of de-skilling, an increasing dependence of labour on managerial control and a more complete division, even within the "mental" side of labour, of conception and execution. The logic of such a process is systematically to lower the educational requirements of the mass of occupations, including many white-collar jobs. More detailed studies will probably reveal an altogether more complex and uneven picture - skills recomposed as well as destroyed - yet the general tendency which Braverman describes seems at present altogether more plausible than the sociological orthodoxies of which he disposes.

We may conclude that the assumption of an unproblematic complementarity between educational expansion (in its 1960s forms) and economic growth was almost certainly incorrect. It seems quite as likely that the 1960s was a period of the marked autonomy of the educational system. The ultimate determinations from the movements of capital and from the forms of class struggle remain to be examined. But it is clear that they worked in altogether more mediated and subterranean ways than the determination through the need for and evocation of "skills". In the early 1970s, by contrast, a strenuous work began of returning to a closer conformity between the educational system and the necessities of production.

Critique II: The Objectives Cannot be Realised

We insist here on the utopianism of the social-democratic position, especially of its egalitarianism. This is best considered through the notions of "class" which inform equalising strategies and party rhetoric. Without these conceptions, "equality" cannot be thought at all.

For social democracy, class is inequality. It is inequality, especially of culture and of social condition. Its economic content is reducible to income or, at best, the reductive view of "occupation". But the economic criteria are usually limited to the sphere of circulation.

Class, then, is an essentially distributive term. It follows that one can have more or less of it and that it is meaningful to speak, with Crosland, of "the distribution of wealth, power, and class status" or even of "a more classless society" (1974, p.107, our emphasis). It follows that class is removable. In some versions indeed it dissolves at the sociologist's touch, in a scatter of variables, emerging only in social work euphemisms like "deprivation", "social handicap" or "disadvantage". In the more culturalist versions, educational solutions may suffice. In the post-war social policy mainstream, concerted attacks on cultural and material deprivations (which always assume the inferiority of the "sufferer") are envisaged, the strategy implying the possibility of an ultimate success or at least "a more classless society". Sometimes, "class" is not merely removable, but actually archaic and residual, a passive reminder from the past.

As in the case of "equality" there are several, sometimes contradictory, conceptions here. No full anatomy can be attempted. We merely note, speculatively, four main tendencies: the more technical, sociological conceptions we have already described; the liberal attack on privilege

("class" as it is used in the public-school debate for instance); the anti-industrial (and hence anti-class) organicism of the culture-and-society tradition; and barely visible under all this, the relatively spontaneous, grass-roots egalitarianism of working-class culture, especially of the culture of work. All these traditions, except perhaps the last, while acknowledging "class" as important, emasculate it severely, or render it rather ephemeral. Thus when "divisions" repeatedly re-appear (even after their end has been celebrated), explanations seem quite inadequate. In the absence of anything better, stress is sometimes laid on amazingly persistent national traits. As Crosland put it (1974, p.44) "British Society - slow-moving, rigid and class-ridden has proved much harder to change than was supposed". In the same way, it is hard to explain, within the built-in optimism of the social-democratic framework, why compensatory policies fail to remove the inequalities which are diagnosed. As Marx said of the French social democrats of the mid-nineteenth-century: "No party exaggerates the means at its disposal more than the democratic party; no party deludes itself more frivolously about the situation" (1973 p. 176).

It is always open for social reformers to plead for another trial. But it is possible that in modern Britain this particular repertoire is exhausted. It has moved all the way from "secondary schools for all" to Priority Areas and 'Action Research', the latter a kind of agitational community politics actually displaced, in an extraordinary manner, into the State apparatus itself! As the current fate of Community Development Projects suggests, action research represents the outer limit of social policy solutions - the point where they start to change into something else, and have therefore to be stopped.

In fact British socialists have repeatedly rejected or ignored some of the categories which might really illuminate their dilemmas. Both Tawney's socialism and Crosland's revisionism, the latter quite explicitly, were constructed as answers to (a kind of) Marxism. Crosland's work is full of attacks on "Marxists" and the "New Left". But what if class in capitalist society is neither residual, nor passive, nor removable but an ever-present source of transformations? What if classes are intrinsic to the production of material life itself? What if they are systematically and daily reproduced as part of the organic workings of the society along with their concomitant inequalities? What, in short, if class is rooted in social relations of production, a category which is quite invisible in social democratic ideology? From the stand-point of such a conception of the social formation the futility of social policy can be fully grasped. It can deal with no more than occasional symptoms which must constantly re-appear and must serve to hide what lies beneath them. More absurd still must be the attempt to "equalise" through an education which is supposed also to serve to reproduce relations within capitalist production

Critique III : Why do children 'Fail'?

There were two main absences in the accounts of 'failure' offered by the sociologists of education. The first absence was the actual views or cultural worlds of the pupils who were identified as 'failing'. It was only in the late 60s and early 70s that processes within schools were looked at, and even then the work was framed by the familiar assumptions. The focus has been on the cultural

or psychological effects of failure (Hargreaves, 1967, Lacey 1970). One of the few studies to break from this - Paul Willis's study of the school-based cultures of conformist and disaffected white working class-boys (Willis, 1977) - shows very clearly how the anti-school culture is predicated on the boys' refusal to accept what school has to offer, not on their failure to get on. They prefer their own style of life to that of the 'earoles' (pupils who listen to and accept the legitimacy of teachers). They share a jocular, 'matey', masculine culture, subversive of established authority often to a 'shocking' degree, but also shot through with sexist and racist elements and some ultimate conformities. Even so, the findings of this work are an important corrective to the ways in which the whole question has been framed in the past.

The second major absence is the relation between educational processes and the economic prospects (as opposed to backgrounds) of working class children. By supplying this dimension the rationality of the anti-school culture becomes apparent. For once we cease to believe in the availability of all those pleasant up-skilled jobs, we soon see that most schoolchildren are inexorably destined for tasks with very little intrinsic satisfaction. Nothing would be more embarrassing for educational reformers and 'manpower' planners than success, in terms of education's formal objectives. What on earth would 'society' do with thousands of eager and ambitious school-leavers equipped with 'O' levels and C.S.E.s., but with the objective chance of only the most simple and repetitious labour? In practice, as Willis shows, many working class children prepare themselves for labour in the surest way they know how - by equipping themselves with the cultural resources needed to make the work place, like the school, a place of some enjoyment and satisfaction. But that also involves the rejection of most of what school has to offer.

Armed with that kind of insight - a 'materialist' understanding of cultural processes - we can see some of the inadequacies of the ideological representations. In themselves neither comprehensivisation nor compensatory provision will out the circle of culture and circumstances. Similarly, we might expect that newer policies, especially those pursued by the Manpower Services Commission, will have all kinds of unintended and unexpected results, passing as they must through the attitudes of school-leavers themselves.

Finally, much the same argument seems to apply to the reproduction of sexism and sexual inequalities: working class girls 'choose' femininity and a romantic orientation to 'love'n marriage' (in practice, very often, extremely oppressive forms of monogamy) as better than the sexist predations of boy-groups and the irrelevance and boredom of school (McRobbie, 1977). But we know still less of the deeper determinations in the case of sexual relations - the force of specific family forms for instance - and we have hardly begun to examine the relationship between class and gender relations.

Critique IV : The policies Must Fail

Initially, so we have argued, Labour's commitment to educational expansion was attuned to organised working-class demands and, to some extent, to parental aspirations. Latterly, expansion was argued for, among other things, as responding to the interests and "needs" of ordinary parents and children. Yet there has been little

sign since 1944 of large-scale popular support for comprehensivisation or any other aspect of Labour policy. Parents have usually been indifferent; their children have actually resisted the effects of policy, as the school counter-culture and opposition to RSLA suggests.

If we recall the argument at the beginning of this essay this apparent paradox need not surprise us. Nor need we invoke some notion of the natural apathy of working-class parents to an education of any kind. The fact is that the Labour Party has never sought to educate the popular classes from within, but has sought access to the state to educate them from there. But this state is not the neutral "machinery" which Social Democracy takes it to be: it systematically transforms the political demands that are made on it on behalf of subordinate classes. What is claimed "as of right", returns in unrecognisable forms. Of this process education is the best example. In a general sense, pressure for the extension of social rights and for greater "equality" has fuelled the long-term growth of the state system. But in practice this process has been inflected and given its content by specific features of the state in the educational region. The key features have been the structural separation of the schools from other kinds of learning and their tendency to monopolise the whole notion of education; the professionalisation of the teachers and their pursuit of sectional interest within the apparatus; and, above all, the structural necessity for educational policy-makers and administrators to take account of capital's interests. So it happens that, as in production so in school, a nature-imposed necessity - to learn - is experienced as something quite alien. School becomes, moreover the site of class struggle. The divisions of parent, teacher and child, barely disguised antagonisms, are intrinsic to the apparatus itself. The general tendency of Labour's policy in concert with the teachers, moreover, has been to exalt the "experts" of the region over the mere parent and to devalue the common sense of the parental culture. The social reforming tendency in the party's ideology does this in an absolutely insulting way, scarcely compensated for by a romantic opposition (Bernstein 1973, Rosen 1973). At the same time progressivism has rendered schooling more and more esoteric. In this way, Labour's whole educating stance, not only vacating the ground of agitation, but actually sponsoring new forms of oppression, has opened up massive opportunities for demagogic, anti-bureaucratic, anti-statist Toryism.

THE CRISIS

In the preceding sections we have offered an account and critique of the salient features of social democratic educational ideology in the 1960s. In doing this we have sought to point out the inherent theoretical weakness of the social democratic perspective, and its ramifications in educational policy. In this section we therefore wish to address ourselves to the nature and form of the current "crisis", in the light of the analysis already offered. When we speak of a crisis we are referring to more than the individual experiences of those in education, to which we alluded in the introduction, though this subjective dimension is important. The crisis of the educational sector is bound up with the overall crisis of the economy and the State. But while we recognise that the specific form of the educational crisis has its determinations in the general crisis, we must insist that the educational crisis is also a regional one. It is a crisis which is not simply reducible to financial retrenchment or the breakdown of a consensus, but which must be examined in terms of its own social base and the coalition which gave rise to it.

Social Democracy and its Enemies

Recently the assumptions which underpinned Labour's educational programme have been increasingly attacked, from both inside and outside the Party. Our awareness of this has been greater during the least two years because of the increased intensity of that critique, and Callaghan's speech formally signalled a sort of "open season" on educational issues - intended to further the overall policy shift already in motion. But Callaghan's sentiments were not original for Labour politicians, even if his tone was. During 1969, for example, suggestions that tighter controls on teachers might be forthcoming were made to curb an increasingly militant teaching force. Edward Short addressing the 1969 NAS Conference, referred to the adoption by teachers of trade union modes of struggle, and pointed out that this could involve unpalatable consequences for them:

Do we really want a rule book which will lay down the minutiae of how the teacher is to do his job? Let me assure you that you are within weeks of considerable pressure to introduce one ... once begun the process might be difficult to halt and impossible to reverse. (Burke 1971 p. 49)

Later in the same year Harold Wilson pointed out the curiously exposed nature of teachers' work and the vulnerability of their situation - an implied warning that should "professional" standards be eschewed in favour of traditional methods of wages struggle, then public opinion could easily be mobilised against them.

Callaghan's speech shows how far the Labour leadership has moved from the "velvet glove" approach. Instead of the advice and "persuasion" offered to teachers in the late 1960s, the choice is now for a much more robust challenge. Through this shift does have an immediate political character, in making a pre-emptive move to wrest the initiative away from the Tories, the underlying change is contingent on a series of other developments. These are essentially concerned with the systematic challenge to the assumptions of the previous educational programme - a challenge which has

developed since 1969.

We can see that the assumptions which gave rise to the Newsom Report, discussed earlier, have been found wanting, and therefore the institutional forms which they gave rise to have come under attack. Thus, from viewing the schools as the means of solving a problem, namely working-class failure and its attendant economic and cultural consequences, the emphasis is now one which charges the schools with failing to do this, despite the resources which have been invested.

Concretely the shift has been marked by a series of educational "events" which have been identified against a background of dissensus. Through the period of the Tory government, and the industrial struggles which marked it, but also during the late 1960s, the Right came to identify education as an important causal factor in the "moral crisis" of the period. The Black Paper of 1969 was able to identify the subversive effects of egalitarianism in the ruptures of 1968/69, while the associated moral panics of the period around the issue of "youth" all served to reduce the causal base to the institutional framework of education. It is in this context that educational events have been publicly defined.

The allegations of a decline in reading standards in ILEA schools between 1968 and 1971 touched an exposed nerve - because of the emotive connotations of reading as perhaps the *raison d'être* of schooling. Thus when Start and Wells had their findings published by the National Foundation for Educational Research in 1972, Thatcher was able to exploit the ensuing controversy by setting up the Bullock Committee to inquire into the whole question of literacy, its assessment and control. More recently, in the wake of Bullock's findings (1975), the focus on schools was accentuated by the events at William Tyndale and by the reception accorded Bennett's report on teaching methods (1976). Continued failure of working-class children, and the apparent lack of impact of the compensatory programme, all validated charges that the internal organization of the school, and specifically the teachers, were at fault.

The culpability of schools, in facilitating educational failure rather than success, had been a central theme in the Black Papers since 1969. Their equation of progressivism as a method with anarchism and moral disintegration as consequences, was coupled to a general critique of declining standards in higher education, this latter phenomenon being reduced to the nature of the post-Robbins expansion. In the 1975 Black Paper, marked by the emergence of Boyson as co-editor, this analysis was given a programmatic political dimension. A much more populist line was espoused, parental involvement in the work of schools becoming a basic tenet of the programme. Legitimacy for the Black Paper positions was no longer sought solely through explicit and rather academic discussions of the political and philosophical issues, but rather through criteria of parental approval for the work schools were seen to be doing. Thus popular definitions of the purpose of education and of the most appropriate teaching methods, were invoked against the alleged orthodoxy of progressivism, as practised by teachers owing responsibility to no one outside the school. The call was therefore for "public accountability".

These changes in the mode of discussing educational problems and policies by the political right, specifically the Conservative Party,

should be viewed not only in relation to their educational targets but also to wider areas of policy. It is therefore necessary to say a little about the overall direction of Tory policy in this period - the dilemmas encountered - as well as examining some aspects of the way in which Tory educational thought has developed.

The Right and Education.

In a sense it is paradoxical to speak of right wing educational thought, as during this century the right has usually wanted little of education except the inculcation of a certain brand of English values. There has certainly been no right wing equivalent to Tawney. Instead the right has typically offered complaints about the dangers of education - in falsely arousing expectations, or in too actively promoting critical thought - or of the failures of schools to keep order, and in letting standards drop. These complaints come round again and again; now muttered, now shouted and fulminated over, as circumstances permit.

The steady drip effect of such an ideology, in its common sense forms - 'discipline never did us any harm', or 'they don't seem to learn anything these days' - is easily underestimated. It may even be that as a conventional wisdom, as a stock of grumbles, it has retained a real purchase among some parents and teachers while social democratic ideas took hold elsewhere: 'up there', in the colleges, in government and the liberal media. In this respect the banality of right wing views on education, their lack of subtlety or originality, is beside the point. They are also likely to survive Nigel Wright's extremely clear plotting of the intellectual weakness, and fraudulence of the recent right polemics. (1977). The movement from the vague circlings of the first Black Paper (1969) to the confidence and range of Boyson's Crisis in Education (1975) has been rapid and substantial. By the mid-70s the central concepts of the right - concerned mainly with 'standards' - and their wide ranging demands for 'more control', seemed close to being uncontested at all. An originally discredited group of right authors found themselves in a position where they were near to dictating the terms of debate, and able to identify the issues for a number of unusually direct political interventions in schooling. This was justified by reference to a 'mounting public concern' as expressed in the press reports of the period - a form of coverage which itself, to a considerable degree, actively constructed and articulated this concern.

Schools were coming close to being indicted: 'children are not naturally good' was the swaggeringly archaic and 'unfashionable' opening credo of the 1975 Black Paper, which noted with satisfaction a wider realisation that education 'had not delivered the goods ... there was now a case that had to be answered'.

The potency of the right's ideas was to prove threefold: in discrediting the purposes, needs and achievements of the school system as they had been represented throughout the 1960s - the heyday of the social democratic consensus; in suggesting new limits and constraints within which schools ought to operate; and in generally sanctioning the changed terms of educational reference which subsequently came to be formalised during the period of the 'Great Debate'.

But so rapid a shift could not have occurred without fertile conditions on which to work. Of central importance, in this respect, was the distance of all parties in educational policy-making and practice from the attitudes and anxieties of parents. Indeed, many of those committed to comprehensives, with a fair degree of backing from parents, found no ways of acknowledging real concerns about large schools, mixed intakes and new methods. The rapid changes in school structures and teaching methods, not to mention the new forms of examination, could quite reasonably provoke bewilderment on the part of those not directly involved in the everyday work of schooling. It was in these circumstances, at the turn of the decade, that both younger radicals and the new Tory right were for very different reasons articulating their strong distrust of both schools and teachers.

The 1969 Black Paper 1 evoked a combination of teachers and Labour politicians bent on 'egalitarian destruction'. But this was a convenient fiction, since by then many senior Labour advisers and also many of those entering teaching were becoming critical of the educational developments of the 1960s. Schooling was increasingly expensive, in no clear way assisting the reconstruction of a battered economy, and had not notably improved working-class access to higher education or better employment. In addition, while Britain enjoyed no equivalent to the French May 68 'events', university disorder and disaffection, and a mounting interrogation of the system and its purposes were fairly widespread. Education Ministers dropped in cabinet ranking as the conviction set in that education was failing to deliver: attention turned to Whitehall and to the sheer expense of it all, while student radicals fiercely criticised education's role in the reproduction and maintenance of privilege which Tawney had wanted it to help abolish.

Heath and the division of the Conservative Party

The visible radicalisation of part of a generation in the late 60s coincided with a strenuous attempt to restore and reinstate a genuine right ideology against the grain of the middle-ground occupied by the Conservative Party in the mid-60s.

Tory educational policy before the war had been mainly defensive, restricted to resisting educational demands on financial grounds and making concessions when driven to it. But the 1944 Education Act in part typified the emergence of a new kind of conservatism. A dominant group in the post-war party was determined that the Conservatives should lead, through the state, in the restructuring of capitalism. In order to do this it was necessary to break the party's identification with elites, which had been so damaging in 1945. Rather, the party's cross class 'modernising' purpose and vision was stressed against the 'archaic', 'divisive', 'backward-looking' policies of Labour. Given the electoral risks in merely defending grammar and public schools, the Conservatives were willing to seek comprehensives by the 1960s, and Crosland's 10/65 circular - requesting the submission of comprehensive plans - was a follow up to initiatives by his Conservative predecessor, Boyle.

But in the late 1960s the Conservatives were driven, by intensifying economic problems and by widespread signs of social and political dissent, to break with the consensus oriented reforming middle ground. It became a main part of Tory strategy to identify Labour

rule with 'breakdown' at many levels, from inflation and strikes to permissiveness. The party's Bow Group yielded ground to the Monday Club, one of whose members argued in 1969 that 'modifying socialism is not enough': there was a need for a 'superhuman labour of rescue and an end of consensus politics'. After 1970 Heath led a party explicitly and toughly determined to re-establish firm control and take charge, not least against 'union might', in a general reshaping of the social and industrial order. But, as anticipated, such government was abrasive, and it came closer to setting class against class. In addition, Heath's pro-European ideology was markedly managerial and technocratic - narrow in appeal, and raw edged in its wish to see the industrial GNP upped at almost any price. The party, likely to lose in elections in this shape, badly needed a broader based ideological appeal, legitimated by a claimed support in 'public' fears and anxieties. The result has been a search for likely winners in different policy areas: always a flexible combination of experimentally strong postures with a soft liberal underbelly; always a probing of possible parameters towards a redrawing of the ideological maps. In this respect education and race have been central and, for Tory ideologists, politically fruitful.

Thus Thatcher's withdrawal of the 10/65 circular on taking office was largely gestural, and her period in office in some ways lacked real initiatives or direction. It took longer to build up a distinctively Tory educational ideology, even though the arena was, as we have seen, already largely vacated. But with some shrewdness schools could be used as a focus for a wide range of worries conjured from the dramatic social conflicts of the late 60s, and compounded by the confrontations of Heath's first years and by continuing economic failure. 'Youth' could be represented to connote a general violence and unrest; teachers, the penetration into the 'non-political' schools of a trendy, progressive or militant left; large schools, a threat to individual freedoms. Above all, right ideology voiced again the importance of aspirations to a better life, with schools as the central site of their fulfilment, but currently of their frustration because of the 'holding back' of the clever child - and whose child, for a parent, is not?

The new Tory educationalists had not as yet felt obliged to produce new policies, nor did they work centrally through argument. The amplification of their new strands and emphases took place primarily through the media's willingness to highlight school 'problems' during the 70s, especially through its emphasis on reporting issues such as truancy or educational research like Bennett's. In this respect Tyndale became the central spectacle, offering a view of teachers who were at worst 'dangerous ideologists' and at best 'sincere but misguided', of parents who were kept out of school decisions, and of managers and inspectors who were failing in their statutory duties. But through the media's handling of these complex events a 'coherent' account and remedy was under construction, with a powerful spokesman.

Rhodes Boyson and Black Paperdom

As polemics, the Black Papers argued for what they represented as awkward truths forgotten by mealy mouthed theorists. Central to their view of education were certain alleged 'facts' of inequality,

taken as demonstrably established. The claim in Black Paper 2 was that working-class children are on average innately less intelligent, and according to Boyson in 1975 genetic differences accounted for '70 - 80%' of intellectual abilities. To deny these data was to be guilty of 'social engineering' - the manipulation of the young for ulterior motives. Second, competition was essential to learning (without it the bright are held back) and to Britain's international economic struggle. Thus, in a new version of social Darwinism, the intellectually able should climb on the backs of the weak.

In the right's view this (vigorous, healthy) process had been stunted by the rise to power of 'progressive' teachers - variously cranks, anarchists, sentimentalists and in general permissive - colluding in the weakening of authority and the rejection of traditional, Christian values. 'Evidence' for this was seen in a broadly painted picture of school truancy, anarchy and violence, and by repeated claims of a decline in standards of attainment in basic skills. Nigel Wright has analysed the systematic misrepresentation of highly ambiguous evidence in this debate and he has shown how, at other times of social unrest, there have been panics mounted over school 'standards'. 'Remedies' for this alleged decline lay in firmer controls, and educational growth needed to be curbed: 'It is no good educationalists clamouring for more money when education increases problems, lowers standards and increases widespread cynicism'. It was argued that traditional examinations, not run by teachers, would provide a goal for learning and a hope for 'clever' working class children, while saving money for employers. Schools should be inspected and monitored more closely, and parents given more information and closer contact with the school. There should be a voucher system allowing parental choice, and the popularity of particular schools would become a 'test of their efficiency'.

The right's ideas continue to be centrally contradictory, and this needs saying clearly and often, and in as many contexts as possible. In schools, the right may take up the cause of the able but frustrated working-class child, yet in no way increase their structural chances of educational progress, and therefore has to fall back on monstrous claims about genetics. This argument, fostered in the Black Papers by Cyril Burt, and further promoted by Eysenck, Jensen and others in the educational area, has not significantly entered into popular conservatism. It does, however, provide an alternative explanation for the failure of social democratic policies. Its reappearance in the USA was precisely in the context of opposing the reforms associated with compensatory programmes.

More generally the right combines a populist identification of problems - the exclusion of parents from a say in what happens in schools (an exclusion brusquely confirmed by some teachers insisting on their professional skills) - with a set of authoritarian solutions involving enlarged state intervention and control. It still remains to be seen whether a Tory government could integrate these various motifs into new policies, especially in the wake of the pre-emptive Labour strategy subsequently enacted.

New Sociology and De-schooling.

While the political Right had been developing its own ideological initiative, a critique of a different order had acquired a currency within the sociology of education. The emergence of the "New Sociology" (Young 1971), with its emphasis on epistemological questions, and its rejection of positivistic assumptions which under-pinned much previous work in the sociology of education, challenged the hegemony of those assumptions which were so important in the social democratic/sociology of education coalition. Instead of providing the "scientific" and theoretical rationale for the specific forms of expansion adopted, such as comprehensivisation, the new sociology argued that such policy shifts did not fundamentally alter the previous situation. The performance of working-class children had not improved dramatically, and the reasons for this lack of success should be sought in the specific political location of schooling. The implication was, therefore, that remedial action could not simply be enacted by policy prescription. Consequently the logical continuity between sociological research findings and overall policy development, so central to the main thrust of social democratic expansion in education, was lost. The new sociology, itself, had no clear policy implications; if anything it pointed to variants of de-schooling, (a complicated transplant from South America and the USA). Making its appearance in England to the abhorrence of Labour Party reformers like Vaizey: 'I not only disagree with them I disapprove of them'.

Writers across the range from Holt (1964) to Reimer (1971) argued the damage done by school behind its declared purposes: indoctrination through a 'hidden' curriculum, divisiveness through tests and exams, knowledge made useless and privatised because of schools' separation from family, work and the learning needs of adults. These ideas in the English context of the late 60s were to be fertile in arousing distrust of schooling as a regulated work of the state. The energies of the de-schoolers were variously directed towards experimental schools, children's rights and the need to democratise school government.

Certainly the political bearings of deschooling and the 'New Sociology' were various and ambiguous - deschooling ranging from the support of distinctively working class schooling as a 'left' priority, to an interest in parental voucher schemes, soon to be taken up by Rhodes Boyson. But both questioned and outflanked the central social democratic hopes and strategies.

The subsequent emergence of Marxist and neo-Marxist critiques of these positions and of social democratic perspectives, have in turn further removed sociology from the persisting assumptions of social democracy, and from any immediate political articulation with the Labour Party. While the expansion of the 1960s was seen as offering qualitative change through quantitative provision, the evidence emerging in the 1970s was that this qualitative change had not in fact occurred. The conclusion seemed inescapable that "equality of opportunity", even if accepted in principle, could not be secured by institutional arrangements, universal access or compensatory programmes.

The Significance of Bullock

The disintegration of the sociology/social policy coalition can be concretely identified in the official policy formation process. The Bullock Report, (1975) a report as symptomatic of the 1970s as Newsom was of the 1960s, was concerned with the fundamental issues of language development and educational achievement. It relied on the old repertoire of compensatory theory so generative in the Plowden Report. Conceptual innovation was, however, replaced by a much harder set of policy proposals for the implementation of the old theory. The suggested programme of intervention assumed that the causal chain of educational failure could be traced back to the pre-linguistic stage of child development, specifically to the ante-natal social environment of "the home". The appropriate remedial action was seen to take the form of systematic intervention in the home environments of the target population, that is, the homes of unskilled manual workers in the Educational Priority Areas. The purpose of this intervention was to restructure the early linguistic environment of those infants who were "at risk". Such a programme would have required a considerable expansion in the number of visitors and counsellors, and would have amounted to the reductio ad absurdum of a "compensatory education for the foetus".

Despite the revival of genetic explanations of inequality, Bullock maintained its commitment to compensatory education, but at the same time it explored the contemporary educational determinations of failure. In this respect teachers were identified as the crucial variable, whose skill in teaching could offer the possibility of longer-term success for children otherwise handicapped by environmental factors. The report noted that because of the predominance of progressive teaching methods, and the inexperience of many young teachers, considerable confusion existed about the most effective teaching methods. This situation could best be resolved through the development of teaching schemes, at the level of the school, but the report also proposed the desirability for regular, national, monitoring of standards of attainment in schools. The assumption, so apparent in these proposals, was that the competence of teachers could no longer be automatically relied on. Teaching was basically too important to be left to the teachers.

In this last respect the report was a signal one, providing legitimate strategies for intervention within the home and within the school. It is therefore surprising that the reception accorded to Bullock, by both the national and professional press, failed to seize on the longer-term implications of the report's recommendations. The main discussion revolved around the contentious issue of whether standards had fallen, while the expansionist aspects of the recommendations were generally welcomed - especially by the NUT. However, it was clear from Prentice's remarks in accepting the report that, in the context of financial retrenchment, the major proposals were inoperable because of the prohibitive costs involved (£100m. according to the NUT). Although the analysis of teacher failure and the proposals for assessment and monitoring were to prove perfectly suited to a situation where efficient control of public spending had become a major issue, at the time of publication they were referred to the Assessment of Performance Unit at the DES, the significance of which was only later to emerge.

Callaghan's critique, two years later, was clearly informed by Bullock's analysis and internal DES responses to the "public panics" around Tyndale and other causes celebres.

In giving concrete expression to efforts directed at restricting teacher autonomy, Callaghan was able indirectly to invoke Bullock to lend legitimacy to his proposals. This is not to suggest that this was the purpose or the intention of its authors, but their work made available the detail for a political campaign. The report was appropriated selectively, rather as Robert Lowe once appropriated the report of the Newcastle Commission in support of the Revised Code of 1862.

The DES and the "Great Debate"

We have now seen how the hegemony of the Labour Party, teachers and educationalists collapsed in the 1970s. The economic crisis undercut its first premise that an expansive capitalism would supply the means. At the same time an extraordinarily successful and (in its own terms) accurate Tory critique, forced Labour's leadership to shift its ground. It became obvious, too, that social democratic solutions had almost reached their necessary limits, or now involved, as in the case of Bullock's proposals, a quite disproportionate expenditure. Within the sociology of education, the dominance of what had once been a "radical" tradition was ended by still "Newer" sociologies, and by revived Marxism, always social democracy's hidden antagonist.

The collapse of these orthodoxies posed acute political problems for the Labour Government, whose general political position was in any case quite perilous. What was to replace the old hegemony? Some new inflection had to be given to the social democratic ideology; some new combination of elements or some drastic simplification. Similarly there was a need for new (or refurbished) agencies of control, to steer the whole system onto a new tack. The key solutions were, in fact, a reassertion of control from the DES and the ideological work of the Williams - Callaghan "Great Debate".

It is important to note that during the 1960s the DES had come to take a 'back seat' when it came to taking specific initiatives within schools. For example when the Curriculum Studies Group was established in 1962, by the Ministry of Education to examine the question of curriculum organisation and reform, it was strenuously opposed by the teachers' organisations. The major result was the abandonment of the CSG and the establishment of the Schools Council. The subsequent development of CSE courses from 1965 onwards, and the implementation of the Mode 3 (teacher assessed) schemes in 1970, were further pointers to the shift away from external controls, towards regulation originating within schools. The final stage of this development was seen in the reception of the 16-plus examination proposals, which if accepted would have given almost total control of the curriculum to the teachers. The response to this proposal tended to crystallize the various concerns about teacher autonomy, and the extent to which teachers should be in control, as opposed to being merely the functionaries at the "chalk face".

In the "Yellow Book" of 1976, prepared by the DES, teacher control is the major issue, especially the domination of teachers' interests

on the Schools Council. The success of the Schools Council in its development of curriculum projects, and its initiation of reform through non-statutory means, had systematically eroded the influence of external agencies - the DES and the Examining Boards. Moves to re-establish external control have been fuelled by the Auld Report into William Tyndale. This report precisely addressed the problem of teacher autonomy, its function of maintaining "proper standards" in schools. These proposals have already been taken up in London, where there has also been a considerable increase in the size of the Inspectorate's establishment. Thus the role of the DES and the Inspectorate has been systematically highlighted as a centre of "sanity" and arbiter of standards, checking the excesses of the teachers.

The urgency of the demand for a new strategy had also been emphasised by the increased intervention of representatives of employers' organizations, and other voices of industrial interests. They echoed many of the themes established in the Black Papers, and elsewhere, especially the theme of accountability, but also stressed their own theme: the need to restructure the relationship between education and industry.

In early 1976 a TES article by Arnold Weinstock, managing director of GEC, entitled 'I Blame the Teachers', suggested that the shortage of skilled workers - especially engineering, could be explained by the anti-industry attitudes of many teachers. These teachers, he charged, not only lacked practical experience of industry but operated in a very loose organizational structure, free from immediate control over what they taught the children and unaccountable to the wider 'community'. The malaise, he argued, could be countered in some practical ways. His prescription in this respect were subsequently to become characteristic of educational discussion in the following two years:

"Experience indicates that tightly administered organisations, in which you get on if you are good and get out if you are bad, have higher morale and provide more job satisfaction - than their opposites. So perhaps a re-look at this side of the education system would be in the best interests of teachers as well as the community." (Times Educational Supplement 23.1.76)

This focus on the shortcomings of teachers and schools, namely that they failed to prepare young people for the demands made upon them in the real world of work, also involved other dimensions. John Methven, Director General of the CBI, followed the theme later in the year but also stressed the demarcation line between the responsibilities of employers and those of schools:

"Employers are firmly of the view that shortcomings in the vocational preparation of young people are basically an educational problem which cannot be passed on to employers under the guise of training and induction".

(TES. 29.10.76.)

While the argument that education should deliberately and selectively prepare the workforce of the future was becoming established, another rationale was presented to emphasise the legitimacy of

the project: the concern for 'social justice'. The failure of education to respond to the pressing needs of the economy could be represented as not only weakening the prospects of economic recovery, but also in failing those children who were subject to that form of 'non-relevant' education. Joe Rogaly of the Financial Times suggested that the question of curriculum content was therefore of central importance, since:

"...industry is suffering from an undereducated workforce, while many working class children are being given the added disadvantage of a non-education on top of all their other burdens." (FT. 3.1.76.)

During this period therefore the discussion of the social purposes of education, and the assumption that schools were failing, became very much part of the wider political discourse. The anxiety about standards of numeracy and literacy, orchestrated in press campaigns, served to establish the political climate in which new forms of intervention became both possible and desirable. It was on this basis that the plans for the 'Great Debate' were laid.

Shortly after taking over as PM, Callaghan instituted a series of meetings with ministers, the first of which was held with Fred Mulley, the then Secretary for Education. Following this meeting the PM called for a paper to be prepared on four aspects of the educational scene. These areas - primary education and the '3 Rs', the later years of compulsory education, examinations, and the education of the 16 to 19 year-olds - were discussed in what came to be known within the DES as the Yellow Book. The report, prepared by the Inspectorate, offered a wide ranging critique of schooling and its problems, and offered a series of proposals which the government could take up in policy.

The way in which the Inspectorate sees itself operating illustrates the kind of thinking behind the plans for the Great Debate, more through the use of existing controls and 'persuasion', than through formal intervention or reorganization:

"No exercise of power is involved in this search for improvement; the Inspectorate, by tradition and by choice, exerts influence by the presentation of evidence and advice." (Guardian 13.10.76. (?))

This influence was to be pursued through an increase in the work of the Assessment of Performance Unit at the DES, which was charged with the identification and definition of standards which children might be expected to achieve in the different areas of their work. Since 1975 the APU had been considering the recommendations of the Bullock Report into literacy, recommendations which emphasised the desirability of measuring standards, as we have already noted. In addition to the assessment of standards, the Yellow Book also proposed that the workings of the Schools Council should be re-examined, and that use should be made of every opportunity for extending the links between schools and the world of work.

This briefing document therefore served as a guide to the themes which Callaghan took for his now notorious Ruskin College speech of October 1976. The speech was to serve a signal purpose: the

public redefinition of educational objectives through the device of the 'Great Debate'.

Callaghan's intervention into the debate was, as we mentioned earlier, a carefully managed media "event". Having assumed Boyson's populist mantle for the occasion, he was able to set the "legitimate" concerns of the parents against the actual organisation of the school and its relative inaccessibility to them. The proposals for a "core curriculum", a necessary precondition for any national comparison of "standards", were presented as equalising conditions, serving the interests of both parents and children, and in the process the political and economic strategy of the state. It is clear that in initiating the "Great Debate" on educational issues, the Prime Minister was also concerned with the wider cultivation of political consent. However, in the Regional Conferences subsequently announced, the initial implication that the debate might be an exercise in participatory democracy was reinterpreted somewhat - only 200 guests and the press being invited. Likewise, the conference agendas, concerned as they were with the curriculum, assessment, teacher training and the relationship between schooling and life, addressed issues which have been developed as of concern to parents, but which do not necessitate parental involvement to resolve them. It is implicitly assumed that the "interests" of parents are represented through the rational organisation, by the State, of the school/work transition, and the matching of the appropriate skills to the requirements of the labour market.

The 'Great Debate' crystallised many aspects of the current situation, serving as a response to the Tory critique of Labour's educational policy, and also as a justification for tighter controls over educational finances - the cuts in public expenditure. However, it also very significantly marked a shift on the part of Labour's leadership into policies which would allow new forms of intervention in education, premised on the analysis that the quality of the labour force was a major part of the problem encountered by industry in a period of crisis.

While the 'Great Debate' was under way, and attracting considerable media attention, the existence of a confidential Whitehall document was revealed which explicitly set out some of the thinking behind the Great Debate, especially the non-educational dimension. The memorandum, revealed in a Guardian story, was prepared jointly by civil servants in the Treasury and the Departments of Industry, Education and Employment and was intended for very limited circulation. It openly identified the relationship between the government's economic strategy and the current educational debate as important in the winning of public support, and as a means of allaying fears about the future of the country. So in addition to any real reforms being promoted, the process was equally one of cultivating and winning consent:

"The industrial strategy needs to be developed in a way which can provide a confident vision of the future and awaken a sense of national pride which we have not seen since the last war was won and the Empire was lost."

(Guardian 13.2.77.)

Though the necessity for winning consent was expressed in more strident and wide-ranging terms than the more 'educational' ones of the Yellow

Book, there is a similar preference for less formal and more subtle pressures:

"The existence of national monitoring should provide a psychological impetus for the teaching profession which, coupled with greater stability in the profession now that posts are more difficult to find may help to raise standards more than any amount of overt exhortation."

(Guardian 13.2.77.)

This less formal approach to the problems of curriculum control, via the creation of 'climates of opinion', was not of itself sufficient, but illustrated the problem of formal interference and direction which could easily be characterised as totalitarian in intent, as well as rigid and counterproductive, especially when faced with calls from industry for an adaptable, 'flexible' workforce. This need to secure education to its economic role was a concern also taken up by other areas of government, in addition to those already mentioned.

The primary work of the 'Great Debate' is clear in the lines of argument which subsequently emerged as non-contentious, namely the legitimisation of policy changes which had already been prepared. The TES, in a review of the events of 1977, pointed out what was then self evidently true:

"The trappings of the 'Great Debate' are unimportant alongside the climatic changes in received opinions which it was intended to proclaim."

(TES 30.12.77)

The main ideological shifts contained in the 'Great Debate' were the retention and further stress, but in more precise forms, of the education-equals growth arguments; the attempt to cover the major weakness over parental involvement and the almost total disappearance of the Labour Party's egalitarianism. Callaghan's targets - the teachers and their autonomy - have proved incapable of making any coherent response, beyond economic struggle and calls for opposition to any formalisation of central control of curriculum. The National Association of Schoolmasters even colluded with calls for greater accountability, in order to establish its members' professional competences, if only in opposition to the alleged dilletantism of the typical NUT members. Similarly, the generally conservative stance of the NAS/UWT against progressive methods, and their hostility to any radical educational content, has facilitated an expedient alliance between them and the Labour Party's new strategy. This weakness in the teachers' organisations is exemplified by the Schools Council's ready acceptance of the need to reform its own structure, in the light of the Callaghan critique.

The "Great Debate" has revealed the metaphorical character of education. Education, the universal, unifying experience, has become the vehicle, par excellence, for the exploration of wider social questions. The relationship of education to the economy, the relationship of the individual's development to the "national interest", captures other themes which are currently part of the political discourse. The bidding for consent, the forging of a new hegemony on the basis

of a corporate capitalism, can be seen through the educational debate. Central to both are themes of discipline, and the subordination of the individual to the collective interest. The collective interest is now defined, however, less in Labour's old terms of a "More equal society", but more in terms of the survival of a capitalist economy.

NOTES

1. It is acknowledged that we do not supply an adequate explanation in fully Marxist terms of the post-war expansion of the educational system. This is an important absence to which further work will be addressed. We would note that our object here is primarily a study of educational ideologies, not the educational expansion as such. So far as the larger process is concerned, we reject simplistic explanations of the type, for instance, which reduce the phenomena in question to the effects of a one-dimensional tendency in the economic base. eg. de-skilling.
2. The Sillitoe reference comes from the introduction to Chapter 4 of the Report which is introduced with the following quotation from Saturday Night and Sunday Morning: "If your machine was working well... you went off into pipe-dreams for the rest of day... You lived in a compatible world of pictures which passed through your mind like a magic lantern often in vivid and glorious loopy-colour." (p27)
3. The involvement of parents in school government was considered, among other things, by the Taylor Committee, which presents its report to the Secretary of State during the latter part of 1977. This was rather too late to give parents a voice in "the Great Debate".

Conclusion: Some Political Implications of the Analysis.

In revising this paper we planned to end it with some directly political comments about the current situation in education and about the broad features of an adequate socialist strategy. But we found a conclusion of this kind extremely difficult to write and to agree on. Some of us found the same, or similar difficulties in talking about our findings to different kinds of groups - teachers, academics, researchers, adult education students, political groups. This led us to think quite hard about the sources of these difficulties and it is worth recounting some of our conclusions as these, indeed, concern the position of education researchers now, after the collapse of the 1960s alliance.

There are, perhaps, two obvious traps. One is simply to leave the analysis as it stands. After all people can draw their own conclusions. And wasn't the analysis posited on some political assumptions anyway, in the first place? It was indeed written under the pressure of real political events and contingencies. There is much truth in all this, yet this option seemed to us unsatisfactory. First, we feel an obligation to try to close, a little more, that continuing and maybe necessary gap between intellectual analysis and political practice. We want at least to make the political implications of the analysis clear enough so that people can get a more complete view of what, politically, we are saying. At the same time such an exercise is important for us too, since the writing of a text like this is also, for the authors, a kind of political education: it is not the case that we can see the full implications of the analysis, even now. All this pointed, then, towards some attempt to sum up, politically.

The second danger is to attempt to say too much, beyond our own competences. One form of this would be to attempt to prescribe, for this group or that, what it should or should not be doing in the aftermath of the education crisis and at the beginning of some new settlement. But the fact is that there is a large distance fixed between the position of researchers, even those who are trying to make their research a resource for a more grass-root constituency, and the grass roots itself. Only some of us have the kind of close located experience of day-to-day school or teacher politics, for instance, that would be necessary for such a job. We simply cannot know enough in detail about the immediate and pressing tangles of issues that constitute an educational, let alone other kinds of politics, at the 'lived' level. It is significant that when we tried to write this sort of conclusion, it tended to degenerate into that kind of moral exhortation that is a sure sign you are making prescriptions for someone else to follow. All this suggests a quite limited exercise in which we try to cash in the strengths of our position - the fact that we have the time and resources to take a relatively wide and broad view of issues, somewhat removed from the immediate demands of the job. This means that we will concentrate mainly on the implications of our own analysis. This is a long way from anything as grandiose as 'devising a socialist strategy for education'; but it may have its uses.

The central implications of the study were addressed to 'social democrats' themselves; that is people on the left wing of the Labour Party or, while outside it, seeing it as a means to 'socialism'. We think that we have shown, quite conclusively, that the educational politics

of the 1960s, formed, after all in a period of Labour Party defeat and 'revisionism', were totally inadequate to their avowed aims and had very little to do with the creation of a socialist society. The period did see the achievement of some goals that are worth having from a socialist perspective: we would count the abolition of the 11+ and the expansion of further and higher education as real gains of this kind. It is important to oppose any tendency to roll them back. Nor would we automatically oppose 'compensatory' policies, for though they will not achieve the kinds of pacifications that are intended, they may well increase local and race-specific resources for resistance organisation and struggle. Similarly, though the moves towards comprehensivisation did not and could not achieve all that was expected of it, it was a change worth having and a necessary base-line for further progress. What was wrong about the 1960s strategies was, quite simply, the attempt to serve two masters - to secure some kind of equalisation of life chances and to provide capital with the required forms of labour power. Beyond a certain point - and that point has clearly been reached in the 1970s - these goals are incompatible. If we continue to think in purely 'educational' terms, the choice is now much starker than before: it lies between serving capital's needs (which involves for most people minimum skills and knowledge and the maximum of induction into fundamentally unrewarding labour in family and/or factory) and securing an education worth the name. The Labour Party leadership seems to have chosen, equally starkly, the first of these routes.

But the other feature of the 1960s was the enormous over-loading of the educational issue itself. Education was represented as a solution to a myriad of national problems. It follows that education, in the 1970s, has a kind of scape-goat role, blamed for a whole range of national failures. Either way the fault lies in ascribing altogether too determining a role to education itself: this leads to what we called earlier an 'educational utopianism'. It has had its 'answer' in an extreme educational cynicism. Against this, it is important to argue that many of the determinants on education - on the failure or success of working-class children for instance - lie outside the educational system or process itself. They are the 'fault' neither of parents, nor of teachers, nor, indeed, of the children themselves. They are a regular and predictable effect of class and gender relations which are reproduced more broadly within the society as a whole. 'More education' will never be a solution to the problems that result. We need, rather, to reverse the arguments of those who seek a new settlement in education: it is not the quality of schools or teachers or parents that is a fault in relation to 'the needs of industry' - it is those 'needs' themselves that ought to be questioned. It's not just a question of fitting education to 'the fact' of massive youth unemployment and a continued trend to 'enforced leisure'. If that is accepted, education becomes a scapegoat for problems quite extrinsic to schools. The problem is why mass unemployment in the first place and how can it be avoided? All this points to the necessity of an altogether broader socialist politics, even if the starting-point, for some of us, is the massive condensations of issues around education and schools.

There is also a second general implication for 'social democracy' which concerns the actual forms of state power. One of the things we have argued is that because educational demands have always been relayed through a particular form of the state, they have tended,

systematically, to return in unrecognisable forms. It is as though what is demanded as a 'right' is imposed, now, as a quite objectionable duty. One of the reasons why this is so must be because there is no really living popular democratic connection with the schools of their infrastructure at state or local state level. This in turn implies that one feature of a socialist strategy would have to be some form of the democratisation of control over schooling. We'll return to this point in a later context. The point to note here is that the classic social-democratic illusion concerns the neutrality of the state; that in education this can be shown to be quite false and that the implication is for some qualitative transformation of state forms, a process likely to be achieved only by long and protracted struggles.

But our analysis does carry some implications for educational politics more narrowly. We hope to have shown, for instance, that one of the weaknesses of teachers in the current situation is that they have come to be defined as 'failed' experts, implicated in the general shift of the policies of the early 1970s. This typification has been exploited by critics of educational expansion who seek to 'represent' parental interests. If this analysis is correct, everytime teachers take a public stand on autonomy and against some move (like the Taylor Report) towards involving parents or others in the schools, they re-inforce the arguments of the right and encourage fresh forms of control. Tactically, the insistence on professional autonomy may stem the encroachment of state and capital; ideologically and in the long run, it is hard to see how it cannot but fuel the case of the controllers.

More generally, our argument suggests the need for a critical re-evaluation of 'professionalism', its strengths and its limits. It certainly provides a pervasive vocabulary of teacher politics and teacher self-identifications. But actually it is a deeply ambiguous and contradictory set of attitudes, with very different political implications. It is worth thinking how the different elements could be distinguished, prised apart and given a rather different political logic. One element in professionalism, for example, is simply the search for status, whether this is individual (careerism and anti-unionism) or collective (a corporate interest). Teacher unionism, in turn, may be a way of emulating higher paid professions and stressing the mental/manual labour divide. It can be a way of linking teachers to the labour movement. Professionalism contains too a kind of mystique of knowledge which draws lines against the 'laymen' and may oppress them. It may exclude from the dialogue those with whom we should be working. This applies as much to the powerful internal hierarchies between different kinds of intellectuals and teachers (academics/lecturers/secondary/primary/nursery nurses) as between teachers on the one side and school children and parents on the other. Yet there are clearly positive aspects of 'professionalism': an individual and collective sense of responsibility, a stress on competences and a willingness to stand up to pressure from industry and the bureaucracies. We would argue that these different elements are separable and that the expertise of teachers, like that of researchers, could and should be redefined. That involves shifts within the profession itself - struggles with colleagues in fact - but also answering responses outside from a larger constituency. The natural constituency, of a popular kind, for teachers is, of course, the children, the parents and the locality. We would argue that part of such a redefinition would be a changed attitude among

teachers towards the question of the nature and extent of involvement of parents (and indeed others) in schools and the encouragement of parental involvement as 'normal'. In this way, though this is not a sufficient condition, it is more likely that struggle within and over the schools will become part of a broader popular socialism linked to the local labour movement as well as a natural arena for a teacher politics itself, as it were, a part of the 'job'. This part of our argument connects with what we said earlier about the long-term need to occupy and transform elements of the local and national state.

Finally, our study has important, if very general implications, around the term 'ideological struggle'. We have tried to emphasize throughout that a politics that is not informed by this dimension will be very inadequate. It is worth trying to spell this out in relation to education.

First, most generally, an emphasis on ideological struggle constitutes a criticism of mechanical or purely organisational forms of politics - those that consist mainly of setting up committees, or getting people on them. We have in mind strategies which would stop short at, say, securing trade union representation on governing bodies of schools. It should be one aspect of a policy, but the trouble is, in itself, it would do little to shift opinion, win consent to new ways of thinking about education, or even create any kind of popular support for schools. In other words, mechanical forms of politics don't transform situations nor open up new possibilities. They consist rather of the very conservative activity of moving around pre-constituted blocks of power or influence - blocks which may actually dwindle before our very eyes. The history of the Labour Party is full of episodes that illustrate this process precisely.

Secondly, it's worth saying a little about what we take to be the characteristic process of 'ideological struggle'. It might be described as the process by which unconscious or half-conscious assumptions or divisions or contradictions are raised to the level of full consciousness and made the explicit and knowing object of a politics, what Gramsci often referred to as 'education'. The effects of such a practice - whose systematic character we have hardly begun to explore - is to broaden the sphere of the political, that is the sphere over which we can struggle. One such complex of relations concern the inter-sections of career and control hierarchies within teaching with the sexual divisions of labour, the specific place of women as the subordinated majority of the profession and the particular experience of girls within the school system. As we have noted, but not yet adequately explored social democracy even at its most generously egalitarian was blind (or worse) to sexual inequalities. That was sufficient to disqualify it as an adequate educational politics for socialists. It may well be that there are particular features of education that make sexism and sexist practices there peculiarly opaque and therefore difficult to struggle against. But all such divisions - race is the other salient case - have an objective existence in relations of power and oppression and an everyday effect in the experience of black people or women. They won't just go away if we ignore them. So it is not being, as is sometimes said, racist or sexist to point to their existence: what matters is the context in which this is done and for what purpose. Such divisions have to be seen and recognised before they can be acted upon, and this is a form of politics which we can practice, every day and

all the time. It requires us to struggle against the forces that simplify or suppress such issues as they operate within ourselves, among our colleagues, and within the developed institutionalised forms of the schools themselves.

Thirdly, we have noted throughout our analysis that the major absence in the social-democratic complex has concerned the actual content of schooling. In many ways this is the most important dimension of ideological struggle in education. We have already argued that education is inescapably a political question. We can't teach in a not-political way. So this politics of teaching, of content, and of pedagogy should actually be thought about in a more collective way. This means considering, if not the content of a socialist curriculum, certainly a curriculum and a pedagogy that is compatible with socialist principles and which tends to aid a socialist transition. Such practices are unlikely to develop among isolated individuals within the schools system. This is one reason why it is important to build on a recurrent socialist and current feminist practice: the development of informal, adult, independent educational forms, with the dual function of self-education and informal support for struggles within the existing apparatuses. We certainly have in the development of radical teachers journals and socialists teachers groups the beginnings of one such 'regional' development. But teachers and other intellectuals have an important role to play in a much wider development of this kind of activity, as extension of their more formally defined roles as teachers and researchers.

Finally, ideological struggle in education does mean combatting adverse and self-interested public definitions of education of the kind cultivated by the right-wing press and politicians over the last few years. Such a defence has to take account of arguments of a more qualitative kind such as we have marshalled here. We have to take account of the fact that education (or more correctly schooling) is experienced by most children for most of the time as boring and oppressive. In a longer historical perspective we have to recognise that education has not been an unmitigated good, it has, in an important sense, been imposed. This helps to explain why working-class attitudes to schooling have been and remain very ambiguous: on the one hand education, in itself, may be a good which parents desire for their children; on the other hand it is actually experienced by children, and in the event, by parents, in alienating forms. It is important to distinguish, then, between schooling as it is and education as it might be. Schooling is formed in a contradictory set of compromises between what are seen as the requirements of industry and the need to win the consent of parents and children to successive educational settlements. In the 1970s it is easier to see through the logic of these compromises as they become more overtly concerned with the control and reproduction of Labour power. Our response to the argument that education should be developed to secure economic growth by increasing capitalist efficiency, can now be quite brusque and decisive: capitalism is not 'efficient' (otherwise it would be unnecessary to plan for the long-term unemployment of the young, to reduce expenditure on schools, and to so starve absolutely necessary health-care as actually to cause avoidable disease and indeed death). Besides, capitalism does not actually require, as part of its logic, the development of a more egalitarian system of education. The educational 'logic' of capitalism divorced from specific historical contingencies, remains

what it has always been: a supply of managers and controllers and technical workers, some system of induction into fairly standardised labour for the majority, either for the sphere of social production or for the reproduction of fresh workers in the home. The 'profile' of desired skills and attitudes has, of course shifted, but capitalism is best served by selective not egalitarian systems. Schooling has a particular place in this process of selection or distribution but it also happens by other means, chiefly through the effects of the structures of economic life on the expectations of parents and children. In so far as education has pushed beyond these simple functional relations, this has been achieved not through some economic logic but through real struggles and forced compromises. The whole history of Labour's educational policies clearly reveals this pattern, for Labour, more than any other party, has been continuously caught between the aims of maintaining a popular and working-class base (and so 'representing' the working class in some sense) and seeking some progressive capitalist adaption. It was not education that failed in the 1960s but this utopian dream: of a more equal citizenry under some modified 'more classless' form of society.

If this analysis is correct it follows that there are a whole series of important alliances to be made on the basis of an opposition to capitalist schooling. This is not an opposition to schooling in itself, since our analysis suggested that schools are shot through with alternatives and even oppositional elements. It is an error to make this simple identification of the educational system as a whole with a set of functions for capital. Schools do not simply function for capital, though capital does have a major stake in the schools. The problem, then is how to articulate, to bring into forms of union, the various and contradictory elements that stand against and interrupt this 'reproduction': an alliance which should be made, not only in education but within a wider socialist and feminist politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althusser, L. 1971 "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in Lenin & Philosophy (New Left Books)
- Anderson, P. 1964 "Origins of the Present Crisis". New Left Review, 23
- Barker, R. 1972 Education and Politics 1900-51 A Study of the Labour Party (OUP)
- Bennett, N. 1976 Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress (Open Books)
- Benton, T. 1974 'Education and Politics' in D. Holly (ed.) Education or Domination (Arrow)
- Bernbaum, G. 1967 Social Change and the Schools 1918-1944 (CUP)
- Bernstein, B. 1975 Class, Codes and Control (Paladin)
- Board of Education, 1945 Report of the Departmental Committee on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools (Norwood) (HMSO)
- Board of Education, 1935 Report of the Consultative Committee on Infant and Nursery Schools (Madow) (HMSO)
- Burke, V. 1971 Teachers in Turmoil (Penguin)
- Draverman, H. 1974 Labor & Monopoly Capital (Monthly Review Press)
- Central Advisory Council for Education, 1963 Newsom Report: Half our Future (HMSO)
- Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967 Plowden Report: Children and Their Primary Schools (HMSO)
- Coates, D. 1975 The Labour Party and the Struggle for Socialism (CUP)
- Coates, D. 1972 Teachers Unions and Interest Group Politics: A Study in Behaviour of Organised Teachers in England and Wales (CUP)
- Cox, C.B. & Dyson, A.E. (eds.) 1969 Fight for Education: A Black Paper (Critical Quarterly Society) 1969 Black Paper II: Crisis in Education (Critical Quarterly Society) 1970 Black Paper III: Goodbye Mr. Short (Critical Quarterly Society)
- Cox, C.B. & Boyson, R. (eds.) 1973 Black Paper 1975 (Dent)
- Cox, C.B. & Boyson R. (eds.) Black Paper 1977 (Temple Smith, 1977)
- Crosland, C.A.R. 1956 The Future of Socialism (Cape) 1962 The Conservative Enemy (Cape) 1974 Socialism Now and Other Essays (Cape)
- Department of Education & Science Circular 11/67, School Building Programme: School Building in Education Priority Areas (HMSO)
- Department of Education & Science 1975 Bullock Report: A Language for Life (HMSO)
- Douglas, J.W.S. 1964 The Home and the School (MacGibbon and Kee)
- Floud, J. 1961 "Sociology and Education" Sociological Review Monograph
- Gramsci, A. 1971 Prison Notebooks (Lawrence & Wishart)
- Gray, C.L. & Moshinsky P. 1938 "Ability and Opportunity in English Education" in L. Hogan et al. Political Arithmetic (Allen & Unwin)
- Hall, S. et al. 1975 Mugging & Law'n'Order (CCOS Stencilled Paper, Birmingham)
- Halsey, J.H., Floud, J. & Anderson, C. 1961 Education, Economy and Society (Collier-Macmillan and Free Press)
- Hammersley, M. and Woods, P. 1976 The Process of Schooling (Open University UP)

- Hargreaves.D.H. 1967 Social Relations in a Secondary School (RUP)
- Henriques. P., Dennis N. and Slaughter C. 1956 Coal is our Life (Eyre and Spottiswoode)
- Holt. J. 1964 How Children Fail (Pitman)
- Howell.D. 1976 British Social Democracy (Croom Helm)
- Jackson.B. 1964 Streaming: An Education System in Miniature (RUP)
- Jackson.B. and Marsden D. 1966 Education and the Working Class (Pelican)
- Jencks.C 1975 Inequality (Peregrine)
- Jenkins.D. and Shipman.M.D. 1976 Curriculum: An Introduction (Open Books)
- Jenkins.S. 1973 "Conservatives and Comprehensives" in Bell.R. et al Education in Great Britain and Ireland (Open University and RUP)
- Johnson.R. 1976 "Really Useful Knowledge", Radical Education 7 & 8
- Klein. J. 1965 Samples from English Culture (RUP)
- Klogan.M. 1974 The Politics of Education (Penguin)
- Lacey.C. 1970 Hightown Grammar (Manchester U.P)
- Lawn.M. 1974 "Educational Worker" (Radical Education 2)
- Lister.I. 1974 Deschooling: A Reader (CUP)
- Locke.M. 1974 Power and Politics in the School System (RUP)
- Marx.K. 1973 Surveys from Exile (Pelican)
- McKibbin.R. 1974 The Evolution of the Labour Party (CUP)
- McRobbie.A. 1977 Working Class Girls and the Culture of Femininity. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Birmingham
- Midwinter.E. 1972 Priority Education (Penguin)
- Miliband.A. 1972 Parliamentary Socialism (Merlin Press)
- Ministry of Education : Secondary Schools Examination Council (Deloe Committee) 1960 Secondary School Examinations Other than the GCE. (HMSO)
- Nairn.T. 1964 "The Nature of the Labour Party" New Left Review 27 and 28
- Pelling.H. 1965 The Origins of the Labour Party (Penguin)
- Poulantzas N. 1975 Classes in Contemporary Capitalism (New Left Books)
- Reimer.E. 1971 School is Dead (Penguin)
- Robbins, Lord (Chairman) 1963 Higher Education: Report of the Prime Minister's Committee on Higher Education (HMSO)
- Robinson.E. 1968 The New Polytechnics (Penguin)
- Rosen.H. 1972 Language and Class: A Critical Look at the Theories of Basil Bernstein (Falling Wall Press)
- Schools Council 1971 Choosing a Curriculum for the Young School Leaver (Evans/Methuen)
- Simon.B. 1974 The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1700-1870 (Lawrence and Wishart)
- Simon B. 1974 Education and the Labour movement 1870-1940 (Lawrence & Wishart)
- Simon.B. 1974 The Politics of Educational Reform 1920-40 (Lawrence & Wishart)
- Stedman Jones.G. 1974 "Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London 1870-1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working Class", Journal of Social History

- Sugarman, B. 1966 "Social Class and Values as Related to Achievement and Conduct in Schools", Sociological Review 14 No.3
- Tawney, R.H. 1922 Secondary Schools for All (Allen and Unwin)
- Tawney, R.H. 1964 The Acquisitive Society (Fontana)
- Tawney, R.H. 1964 Equality (Allen and Unwin)
- Teachers Action Collective 1975 Teachers and the Economy
- The pson, L.P. 1960 "Homage to Tom Maguire" in A.Brings and J.Stville (eds.) Essays in Labour History (Macmillan)
- Thompson, P. 1967 Socialist Liberals and Labour: the Struggle for London 1885-1914 (RKP)
- Thompson, P. 1976 The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society (Weidenfeld and Nicholson)
- Williams, R. 1961 Culture and Society 1780-1950 (Pelican)
- Willis, P. 1977 Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs (Saxon House, forthcoming)
- Willis, P. 1976 The Main Reality: Transition from School to Work (CCCS Stencilled Paper, University of Birmingham)
- Wright, N. 1977 Progress in Education (Croom Helm, London)
- Young, M.F.D. 1972 "On the Politics of Educational Knowledge: Some Considerations with Particular Reference to the Schools Councils", Economy and Society
- Young, M.F.D. 1971 Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education (Collier-Macmillan)