

Dave Hill interview with Pierre Orelus, [June 2010 on Politics and Education](#)

How does the social/political system of a country directly or indirectly impacts the school system of this country?

The question requires an analysis of the relationship between the economic, the social and the political. While there is not an automatic mechanistic and deterministic relationship between an economic structure (such as capitalist economic and resulting social relationships) and its social and political structures, I think it's fair to say, with Althusser and Gramsci, that the apparatuses of the state sure don't brook much meaningful dissent for long, if it starts to threaten either the riches of the rich, or the capitalist system itself (which is pretty much the same thing).

I do view schools and universities, following Althusser, as ideological state apparatuses whose purpose, for the capitalist class, is to preach and instill pro-capitalist and anti-socialist beliefs (as well as, as Rikowski argues, to (re-)produce tiered hierarchicalised labour power for the workplace). And, of course, the same is true of the media. Those who own the Press, control the Press. Alternative views are mocked, vilified, ignored.

Within schools and universities, and vocational colleges, it is true that oppositional teachers/ faculty in the public education system in Britain and the USA do get sidelined for promotion, isolated, dismissed. I have been effectively 'moved on' from three of my jobs- not unrelated to my trade union/ labor union activities. So have many trade union and socialist activists in schools and universities. Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, for example, and in Britain, my comrades in the Hillcole Group, Mike Cole, Glenn Rikowski suffered many years of management hostility).

One difference between the media and schooling/ education state apparatuses is that the control by media bosses is more complete than that of school and university bosses/ management. While there is contestation, fighting the culture wars, in both sets of apparatuses, with resistant and counter-hegemonic individuals and groups battling within each apparatus, the spaces for socialist and liberal ideology, praxis, social relationships exists more fully in education than in than in the more easily 'hired and fired' mass media.

Even the 'impartial' BBC in the UK scarcely allows socialist or radical left speakers on to programmes like 'Question Time'. And the days when trade union leaders were routinely interviewed on BBC radio and television are long gone, their places filled by business leaders and their public relations apologists. Even the 24 news programmes now have, in addition to Showbiz sections, lengthy Business News sections. These are new developments over the last 20 years in Britain, the crowding out of 'unsafe' (as opposed to sanitized) alternatives, by brain numbing Showbiz infotainment, and by huge attention lavished on pro-capitalist ideology and its spokespeople.

This extends to treatment of war. Despite a clear majority of the British general public wanting an end to the war in Afghanistan, and a withdrawal of British troops, such opinions are rarely heard on British radio and television. And as for public control/nationalization, to take one example, a large majority of the British public support the re-nationalisation of the (privatized) railway system in Britain. But you don't hear much of that in the media. In Britain, by and large the public is considerably to the left of the three major parties.

In your experience, to what extent has the US capitalist system impacted the US school system, teachers' teaching performance and student learning?

I think it's best if I respond to this concerning the UK, or, to be more precise, England and Wales (Scotland and Northern Ireland have major devolved powers concerning education, Wales has some devolved powers). Although, having said that, there are very pronounced similarities between USA and England/Wales education policies, with the JW Bush administration policy borrowing from the increased marketisation, stratification, and importation of new public managerialism and commercial interest in state/public education that were introduced by the Thatcher governments(1979-1990) in the Education Reform Act of 1988. The *No Child Left Behind* legislation has had very similar impacts in the USA. David Hursh writes on these similarities.

So, to get back to three questions above, how has the US, and the England/Wales capitalist system impacted on the school system, teachers' teaching performance and student learning?

In the competitive market system of schooling in England, where schools are ranked on published 'league tables' of SATs and 16+ exam (GCSE) attainments, 'rich' schools have got richer, and so called 'sink schools' have sunk further. By hook or by crook, 'high performing schools manage to select those children who have more [\(to use Bourdieu's term\)](#) high-status 'cultural capital'. They become more 'middle class', and low-performing schools more 'working class'. Class differentiation has increased.

As a classical Marxist I hold more or less to a binary analysis of class (see the Deborah Kelsh and Dave Hill 2006 article in JCEPS) but do recognise, of course, the existence of different strata within the working class, that class of people who sell their labour power.

Steven J. Ball's writings show how the 'middle classes'(strata) take 'positional advantage' in a market system. Thatcher's policies, continued by her Conservative successor and intensified by the Blair government, by New Labour, have to a large extent destroyed the (already flawed) system of all ability, mixed social class comprehensive schools in Britain.

The rich do not have to bother maneuvering for positional class advantage. They buy it. With school (elementary school, high school) fees for one child being two and three times the income of the minimum waged and the lower paid than that. (In Britain, around 7% of the children in the country have privileged education bought for them in private

schools). Needless to say, they proceed, by a process of scarcely modified class reproduction, to monopolise power, wealth, position in the economy, politics and society.

The National Curriculum, introduced by the Conservative government in the 1988 legislation, has policed by inspection since then (with dire penalties- ultimately job-losses for those who are non-compliant or who are at the foot of the league tables). Of course it is the schools in the poor areas, often those with the most committed teachers, that are near/at the bottom of the attainment league tables. The attainment map in Britain pretty much mirrors the map of social deprivation, more specifically, the map showing the percentage of students receiving 'Free School Meals'. Nationally the figure is around 13%. It varies from virtually zero percent to schools where most students are poor enough to be allowed FSM. [\(I was once one of them. So are/were members of my family. It hits personally, not just theoretically\).](#)

The impact of the national curriculum has been to stultify creativity, group work, collaborative work, interdisciplinary work, teacher autonomy. And teachers can only 'merit' Performance related Pay' if they play by the government rules. I have been teaching in higher education since 1973, and I currently teach a module on Diversity and Inclusion to final year student teachers at Middlesex University (which recruits students from Inner City London). I've been teaching student teachers for nearly 40 years. Liberal-progressive/ child-centred education, and the flourishing of socialist and egalitarian education that developed during the 1960s and 1970s in England and Wales were deliberately snuffed out in the revanche of the neo-conservatives and neoliberals that comprised Thatcherism. The Marxist teacher education course that I developed and led under a more permissive, pre-Thatcherite regime, bit the dust. Many teachers do resist, and adapt, and work for futures other than those mapped out by the government, and the capitalist class that it serves. There are some wonderful teachers!

user 28/6/10 19:05
Deleted:

The impact on students has been that on narrowly defined instrumental criteria, students' attainments have now shown considerable improvement. But the curriculum is less broad, less interesting, and more stressful. The national curriculum and its associated high stakes testing regime causes more bedwetting, and more boring lessons, more teaching and learning to the test. And less questioning and critique. Despite the wonderful and inspired and loving and skilled determination of many of our teachers.

Capitalism is essentially about profit. Therefore, capitalists' goals are to maximize their profits at the expense of workers. Do you then believe that we can still have equity and social equality in a Capitalist society such as the US? If so, how do you think this is possible? If not, why not?

It depends what you mean by equity and social equality. Within capitalist society there are and can be degrees of equity/ inequity, social equality/ inequality. Capitalist society can be regulated to control profits and spread wealth, in the form of wages/ salaries/ income, and also in the form of the social wage, the welfare state, unemployment benefits, housing benefit/subsidy for the low paid, free universal health care, and state pensions.

This is what social democratic version of capitalist governments have gone for- at least in times of boom, where there is enough profit in the eyes of significant sectors of the capitalist class, for large profits, and enough too for spending on actual and social wage rises. And Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*, recognise that it is necessary to "fight for the attainment of the immediate aims. . . of the working class".

Where we socialist and Marxists disagree with reformists is that we fight for reformist improvements within capitalist society, but *from a critical position* (Deborah Kelsh and I develop on this in our 2006 JCEPS article), where we say, 'We support reforms and revisionist political and economic advances that seek to improve the lives of workers, for example, anti-capitalist as well as reformist campaigns and movements such as campaigns for tenants' rights, gender equality, race equality, and campaigns against SATS or the privatization of schools. But, it is crucial to note, we do so *from a critical position*'.

In Marxist terms, there can never be equity and social equity within capitalist systems. They are incompatible. Capitalist economic relations are essentially- I repeat- essentially, in essence, anti-egalitarian. As the British Marxist Glenn Rikowski, and the US Marxist Deborah Kelsh, and the *Red Critique* group around Mas'ud Zavazadeh and Teresa Ebert- as perhaps all Marxists understand, profit is the life blood of capitalism. Capitalists profit from the surplus value taken from the labour power of workers. This is an essentially exploitative and anti-egalitarian relationship.

In your view, what role should critical pedagogues play in fighting against US capitalism?

I have believed- and tried to act on through my working life, that teachers should be actively involved in the fights for economic justice and social justice, that they/ we should be critical, organic, public, socialist, transformative intellectuals. Each of those five descriptors is important. *Organic* is being part of, knowing about, living, representing the class/ section of the class you are representing. *Public* means just that, going public, speaking out, defying intimidation. *Socialist* means being egalitarian, working for a socialist, egalitarian, non-capitalist society. There are many different transformations on offer, from the various religions and New Age beliefs to the many varieties of ideology. Hence the need to specify 'socialist'. *Transformative* means using out abilities, our teaching, our membership, our leadership, to critique and to work towards reconstruction. *Intellectual* in the Gramscian sense recognises that all people can think and can and do intellectualise. But that those of us who are educational or cultural or political workers have a unique position- and responsibility. Our job is to think. To offer intellectual stimulus, analysis, utopianism, hope, vision- and an analysis of how to get there- organization.

So you can see that I don't think critique is enough. It's necessary, it's urgent and it's powerful, particularly, with respect to education, in the pens/ keyboards of writers such as Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, and other critical pedagogues. The incisive political

- user 28/6/10 19:06
Formatted: Font:Italic
- user 28/6/10 19:06
Formatted: Font:Italic
- user 28/6/10 19:06
Formatted: Font:Italic
- user 28/6/10 19:06
Formatted: Font:Italic
- user 28/6/10 19:07
Formatted: Font:Italic

economy analysis of Michael W. Apple for example. And in the searing US journalism of Jonathan Kozol.

But, as well as stoking rage, and analysis, as being deconstructive, we must be *reconstructive*, and develop and work systems that are collegial, socially and environmentally responsible and egalitarian, anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-homophobic. Now what I've just said could be equally said by liberals and radicals, perhaps by Obama for example. But the *reconstruction* I'm after, that I spend my academic life teaching about and trying to practice, and my political/ labor union activist life making speeches about and arguing for in closed party and open public meetings, is socialist. Is informed by my Marxist analysis and programmatic experience and developments. About every macro-meso, micro-programme, I ask, 'who wins, who loses'. That's the fundamental of critical policy analysis. And in designing programmes, pedagogies, action plans, government legislation, education policies, fiscal, economic and employment policies, I look at things through a class perspective. Will this aid equality, egalitarianism, the exploited, the oppressed?

In some of my writing (in *Policy Futures*, in *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, for example) I talk about the different arenas where socialists can (and subject to their/our strengths) be active- inside the classroom, in the staffroom/wider school organization, in (aspects of) the local community, in the wider national polity, and globally. There ain't enough hours in the day to do all of that effectively.

In my own life, I didn't write much, other than journalistic pieces, pamphlets, policy leaflets, while I was an activist and elected trade union representative and Labour Party elected councillor and parliamentary candidate through the 1970s and 1980s. I then spent the next 20 years writing increasingly at an academic level, and trying to lead work-based change, as a Course Leader at two different universities. The union and political activity lessened in intensity. Now, again, fighting European and national elections for socialist and trade union backed coalitions (most recently, for the Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition in the 2010 UK general election) and trying to build and develop my own organization, Socialist Resistance, as part of a wider merging and realignment of parties and groups to the left of Labour, I have had less time to write academic writing. We do what we can and where we can- but with a recognition that all the above arenas are arenas of contestation, of ideological culture wars, sites of ideological and cultural struggle- and, importantly- sites of struggle that do either presently or ultimately affect the material conditions of life.

What is your position about universities that have been following a corporate model of education? How should we, as critical public intellectuals, fight against this form of corporate of education that has been imposed on institutions where we are doing our critical work?

Critique, and propose alternatives. Socialist alternatives. It's difficult. We get sacked/ fired. Our jobs are made redundant. Especially if we are activists, if we speak out. We fight with whatever means we have. In our writing, in our teaching, and, throughout my

life, in the union. I've been a labour movement activist since my first job. As Billy Bragg sings, in one of my favourite songs, 'there is power in the union'. Now unions can be bureaucratic, and actually impede the development of working class struggle, put a brake on strikes and demonstrations and mobilizations. This is a familiar Trotskyist critique of Stalinist top-down control practices. But there is power in the union, and power in numbers. And in some circumstances, then popular front activity at local and national level- for example against privatisation, corporatism, new public managerialism, war, racism, sexism, homophobia, is necessary.

user 28/6/10 19:07

Deleted: are

The danger with popular fronts, of seeking movements bringing together conservatives, liberals, socialists, is that they become the unity of the lowest common denominator, lacking in political education, other than the powerful experience of 'being there'. As socialists, as critical public socialist intellectuals and political activists, my view is that politics and political strategy is like an onion... at the core, a determinedly socialist group (such as the one I belong to in Britain, Socialist Resistance; a broader layer, involving alliances and coalitions (such as, in Britain, TUSC, the Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition, a united front coalition of socialists, and Respect, more of a popular front); and wider movements- such as Campaigns Against the Cuts, pro-Gaza, anti-War, anti-Islamophobic, pro-public sector, campaigns. Through the wider struggles, and our involvement, we can carry out what Marx called for, the development of (subjective) class consciousness, a consciousness in which workers see through the lies and blindfolds of media manipulation and scholastic segregation, and become committed to class struggle.

user 28/6/10 19:07

Deleted:

user 28/6/10 19:09

Deleted: .

One thing I learned from a young age was that five voices, five brains, five on a demonstration, is better than one, And Five hundred better than five. And with five million- then we advance. So it's important to work in groups that give (and to which we can give) emotional and intellectual and political sustenance and support. In England through the 1990s the Hillcole Group did that, provided a support network in these dimensions to otherwise isolated and besieged individual and small groups of socialist and Marxist educators. We nourished each other. And laughed together, and got angry together, and published together. We worked, and discussed, and wrote collaboratively, collegially, democratically. With *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* I try to do the same, on an international level.

user 28/6/10 19:09

Formatted: Font:Italic

Can democracy be possible in a capitalist country controlled by CEOs of corporations that are oppressive to workers? In other words, can capitalism and democracy go hand in hand?

What is democracy? The ability to vote every four or five years for candidates who have had to pass through political machines. Capitalism is essentially anti-democratic, it is about misleading and duping and cheating the people to ensure that the plutocracy, the capitalist class, retains and increases its wealth, power and control. And it's doing a pretty good job at doing that. Marxists call this system 'bourgeois democracy'.

But it is, at least, by virtue of periodic elections, open to major (as opposed to cosmetic) change. Chavez in Venezuela, Morales in Bolivia, both socialist radicals redistributing wealth, land, power, services, welfare, to the masses, taking away from the capitalist

oligarchies, both benefitted from this imperfect model of periodic elections. I am not an uncritical supporter of both, or of Castro. But all three have spread education, health care, the [enhanced](#) material conditions of existence [of/ for millions of workers](#), and, at a cultural level, [promoted](#) *independencia*. And in Western Europe on the post WW2 period, many countries elected redistributive social democratic governments which did, for some decades (and still in Scandinavia) substantially remove fear of hunger, disease and destitution from their populations.

But parliamentarism isn't enough. In Europe for example, at this [current](#) time of massive assaults on the material conditions of life of workers, especially the low paid, it is likely to be the millions on the streets in Greece and France and Italy and Portugal and Spain, and- hopefully- in Britain, that can stop and reverse the cuts. Parliament / Congress can be a valuable forum, platform, for resistance, but it's direct action- such as the defeat of the Poll Tax in Britain, that has more effect than the well padded wallets and posteriors of leaders and parliamentarians who are either mega-rich or who are in the pockets of the multinationals, the corporations, the capitalist class.

But I want to end on a note of saying that the ability to get rid of governments parties and leaders at the ballot box in periodic elections is not enough to institute democracy, rule by and in the interests of the people, but it is essential. Chavez has been re-elected in Venezuela many times, in free, open elections. Populations should have the right to remove leaders whether I like them or not.

What is your take on US model of democracy? Also, what is your position on US imposition of its form of democracy on other countries? What should be done about that?

My take on the US model of democracy is that it is an institutionalised capitalist plutocracy/ kleptocracy. If there were strict limits on spending by and on behalf of candidates, then that might help modify a system where, in general, multimillionaires with almost identical policies provide a fig leaf for mass impoverishment and insecurity for millions. There should also be controls on media monopoly, with free publicity or minority parties, I saw this as a photo-journalist in the Portuguese elections after the 1974 'Carnation' revolution that restored democracy and free elections. The rules of democracy should be about widening choice, not restricting and funneling it.

How would you imagine citizens being active participants in political and educational decision-making processes?

I don't just imagine it, I see it and join with others who are active in it. Sometimes in ones or twos, sometimes- as throughout British history- in movements of hundreds of thousands or millions. From the Chartists of 1848, to the first dock strikes in London in the 1870s, to the one General Strike we have had in Britain (in 1926), through more recently to the inner-city rebellions of 1981 and 1985, or black and white urban youth rebelling against the Thatcherite recession/ joblessness/ police harassment, the (successful) poll tax rebellion (and riots) of 1990-91.

user 28/6/10 19:12

Deleted: 8-

So large scale direct action moves politics. At the small scale, in workplaces, staffrooms, then we have to fight for egalitarian social relationships, for manager and boss accountability to workers and consumers. We have to require transparency, about 'who wins' and who loses' in any particular situation.

And we have to, as critical cultural workers and political activists, co-develop, work to develop, knowledge of, commitment to critical pedagogies, radical democracy, socialist democracy, and not just social justice/ dignity, but to the economic relations (of co-ownership, workers' control, collective ownership, accompanied by flattened differentials between rich, middle income and poor, of a comprehensive welfare state) that actually gives material meaning to the cultural acceptance of dignity and difference.

Now we have the first Black US president, Barack Obama. Throughout the presidential campaign, many people including some of my colleagues were very hopeful that under Obama's administration the US foreign policy towards other countries, particularly former colonized countries and currently US occupied territories, would not be as bad as it was under Georges Bush. Are you also hopeful in this regard?

In symbolic terms it was resounding throughout the world that an African-American was elected president of the USA, and that, furthermore he seemed, in USA terms, a liberal. Moreover one who seemed committed to introducing in the USA what every other rich industrialized state has got- a universal/ national health service.

Was I hopeful that Obama would row back on the historic imperialism and neocolonialism of US global policy? Not for a minute. He was selected by the Democrat Party, not by a socialist, Marxist, communist, or even a liberal party.

As I see it, the USA is great on choice. How many kinds of coffee are there to choose from in Starbucks. How many types of muffin or cookie? How many types of topping on the coffee or cookie? Whenever I go to the USA, the choice is staggering. And when it comes to politics? What is the choice? A choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

No choice at all. (Other than the u important- ability to throw out one set of capitalist rascals and replace them by another). But the USA is a dictatorship- a dictatorship by Capital.

So No, I didn't suddenly imagine that John Lennon's imagining in his song 'Imagine' would actually become reality.

The capitalist class needs a reliable reserve team, to protect the mega rich and use their state apparatuses that serve to protect and deify their profit. Sometimes, in times of economic trouble, when workers' living wages, benefits and standards, are deemed too high and expensive by the capitalist class in general, then a more 'moderate', or 'liberal' or 'labour' party can be brought in, supported by sections of capital and their media, for people to vote for a 'a lesser evil'. That's what Obama is. It's what Blair was. Claiming to speak for workers and minorities they are the more successful in suckering those workers and minorities and disabling their rebellion. Sometimes the strength and power of workers' organizations- trade unions- and of issue campaigns- for womens' or

user 28/6/10 19:13

Deleted: `

user 28/6/10 19:13

Deleted: - residually

minority rights for example- can win change. But changes have to be, have had to be fought for, on the streets, also using the *fora* of elected bodies. The capitalist class is not a bunch of philanthropists, even if a few become philanthropic. They are a bunch of robbers and looters, despoiling the just demands of workers- black/ white, men/ women, extending their wealth, privilege, power.

Look at the bankers'/ banking crisis! It is the workers who are paying for the crisis. The bankers caused the crisis, neoliberal finance capital did. Yet across the capitalist world governing capitalist parties are using Naomi Klein's '*Shock Doctrine*' to once again wrench back to themselves what David Harvey (in his '*A Brief History of Neoliberalism*') [exposed as the increasing concentrations of wealth in a class war from above](#). The result is welfare is slashed, the poor live [more precariously, more](#) unhealthily, and die earlier. The low paid strata of the working class are duped and failed by the ideological apparatuses of the state, and repressed and kept in line and in prison by the repressive apparatuses of the state. And laws are nodded through disarming solidaristic, trade union activity.

Do you foresee US imperialism taking a different form or direction, hopefully a more human one, in the next decade to come?

No, I don't. I read Noam Chomsky, Naomi Klein, David Harvey, John Pilger, David Korten, Slavoj Zizek, the socialist press in the UK, and international socialist press, such as *International Viewpoint*, (published by the Fourth International), *Socialist Review*, (published by the Socialist Workers' Party), *Socialism Today* (published by the Socialist Party), Socialist Resistance (published by Socialist Resistance) and *The Guardian*, the liberal left British broadsheet that publishes some socialists, and I'm a member of the USA Rouge Forum group of radical educators, whose website and publications proclaim 'No Blood for Oil'. I read various online Marxist and critical pedagogy journals, such as *Cultural Logic*, and *Workplace* and the Indian online journal, *Radical Notes*. And I am active in speaking at meetings, recently against the Israeli state assault/ murder on the Gaza Peace flotilla, at meetings calling for withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Would I like to see the USA government sign up to a human rights, anti-imperialist, global development, ecologically sustainable agenda. Of course I would. And at some stage it might. No Empire lives forever, not the Roman Empire, the Soviet Empire, the British Empire or the *Bellum Americanum*. I fear the direction of the US state is in more of a Fascist direction, with the intolerance of dissent typified by Bush's 'Patriot Act', Cheney's promotion of torture of suspects, 'extraordinary rendition' and Guantanamo. Blair and Bush and Cheney should be put on trial for War Crimes. But more likely, I feel, is a dystopian future foreseen in films like *Metropolis*, *Bladerunner*, *Fahrenheit 451*, *Soylent Green* and *The Handmaids' Tale*.

Having said that, *we never know*. We never know when a particular liberatory, emancipatory moment will arise, when a balance of class forces will alter, when peoples' determination, hope, organization, will create a revolutionary situation, by which I mean a situation, a possibility, of making major change, of reconstituting the economic, political, social structures of economy, polity, society, of transitioning from capitalism into democratic socialism. That's our project, as socialist political and union activists, as

user 28/6/10 19:14

Formatted: Font:Italic

radical democratic teachers, as critical pedagogues, or, better still as Peter McLaren proposes, as *revolutionary critical pedagogues*. This to work for democratic socialism, where we can contribute to the anger, the analysis, the hope and utopianism, the organization, and the achievement of an egalitarian economy, society and polity.

It takes courage, what Freire called 'civic courage'. But that's our alternative. To be explicit or complicit in the cruelty that is capitalism, the obscenity of unimaginable inequality, exploitation and oppression, the death of the dreams of millions, the ghettoisation of despair and hardship, the environmental social and educational degradation that ruins our planet and peoples while lavishly enriching the few capitalists and their senior servants.

So, are we to be explicit or complicit in our servile, or self-justified, acceptance of the currently exponentially expanding capitalist kleptocracy. Or do we take a principled stand. And stand up. For humanity, for social justice. For the rather more fundamental economic justice and massive redistribution of wealth, income, power, life chances. For a critical- and self-critical!- democratic socialist, anti-capitalist, future? That's the choice!

user 28/6/10 19:15

Deleted: m

References

Althusser, L. Althusser, L. (1971) Ideology and State Apparatus. In L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.

Apple, M.W. (1993). *Official Knowledge*. New York: Routledge

Apple, M.W. (2004) *Ideology and Curriculum, 25th Anniversary 3rd Edition*. New York: Routledge.

Ball, S. (2002) *Class Strategies and the Education Market: the Middle Classes and Social Advantage*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bourdieu, R. and Passeron, J. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Chomsky, N. (2004) *Noam Chomsky speaks out: Education and power*. Online at http://www.indymedia.ie/newswire.php?story_id=66441&condense_comments=false#comment88500

Cole, M., Hill, D.; McLaren, P., and Rikowski G. (2001) *Red Chalk: On Schooling, Capitalism and Politics*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk.cwc.net/redchalk.pdf>

Freire, P. (2001) *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*. Lanham, Maryland, USA: Rowman and Littlefield.

Giroux, H. (1988) *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Granby, Massachusetts, USA: Bergin and Garvey.

- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, D. (2003) *Brief Autobiography of a Bolshie Dismissed*. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk/papersdh.php>
- Hill, D. (2004) Books, Banks and Bullets: Controlling our minds- the global project of Imperialistic and militaristic neo-liberalism and its effect on education policy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2, 3-4, pp. 504-522 (Theme: Marxist Futures in Education). <http://www.worlds.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=pfie&vol=2&issue=3&year=2004&article=6> Hill PFIE 2 3-4 web&id=81.158.104.245
- Hill, D. (2004) Critical Transformative Teacher Education: a four-year Marxist undergraduate programme for student teachers: contexts, intents, constraints and effects. Paper presented at the British Education Research Association Annual Conference, Manchester Metropolitan University, England, Sept, 2004. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk/papersdh.php>
- Hill, D. (2005) Globalisation and its educational discontents: Neoliberalisation and its impacts on education workers' rights, pay, and conditions. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education* 15 (3), pp.257-288. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk/papersdh.php>
- Hill, D. (2006) Class, Capital and Education in this Neoliberal/ Neoconservative Period. *Information for Social Change*, 23. Online at <http://libr.org/isc/issues/ISC23/B1%20Dave%20Hill.pdf>
- Hill, D. (2007) Critical Teacher Education, New Labour in Britain, and the Global Project of Neoliberal Capital. *Policy Futures*, 5 (2) pp. 204-225. Online at http://www.worlds.co.uk/pfie/content/pdfs/5/issue5_2.asp
- Hill, D. (2007) Socialist Educators and Capitalist Education. *Socialist Outlook*, 13. Online at http://www.isg-fi.org.uk/spip.php?article576&var_recherche=dave and <http://www.ieps.org.uk/papersdh.php>
- Hill, D. (2008) Crisis, the Bankers' Bailout, and Socialist Analysis/Strategy *Radical Notes* (Delhi, India) <http://radicalnotes.com/journal/2008/11/24/crisis-the-bankers-bailout-and-socialist-analysisstrategy/>
- Hill, D. (2009) Theorising Politics and the Curriculum: Understanding and Addressing Inequalities through Critical Pedagogy and Critical Policy Analysis. In D. Hill and L. Helavaara Robertson (eds.) *Equality in the Primary School: Promoting good practice across the curriculum*. London: Continuum. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk/papersdh.php>

Hill, D. (2010) A Socialist Manifesto for Education. Online at <http://socialistresistance.org/?p=905> and at <http://rikowski.wordpress.com/2010/04/08/statement-and-education-policy-manifesto-by-dave-hill/>

Hill, D. and Boxley, S. (2007) Critical Teacher Education for Economic, Environmental and Social Justice: an Ecosocialist Manifesto. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(2). Online at <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=96>

Hillcole Group (1997) *Rethinking education and democracy: a socialist alternative for the twenty-first century*. London: Tufnell Press.

Hursh, D. (2005) Neo-liberalism, Markets and Accountability: transforming education and undermining democracy in the United States and England. *Policy Futures*, 3 (1). Online at <http://www.worlds.co.uk/pdf/freetoview.asp?j=pfie&vol=3&issue=1&year=2005&article=2> Hursh PFIE 3 1 web

Kelsh, D. (2001). (D)evolutionary socialism and the containment of class: For a red theory of class. *The Red Critique: Marxist Theory Critique Pedagogy*, 1(1), 9-13. Retrieved February 20, 2005 from <http://www.redcritique.org>.

Kelsh, D. and Hill, D. (2006) The Culturalization of Class and the Occluding of Class Consciousness: The Knowledge Industry in/of Education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 4 (1). Online at <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=59>

Klein, M. (2007) *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Korten, D. (2001) *When Corporations Rule the World*. Bloomfield, Connecticut, USA: Kumarian Press.

Kozol, J. (2005) *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Macrine, S., McLaren, P. and Hill, D. (eds.) (2010) *Revolutionizing Pedagogy: Education for Social Justice Within and Beyond Global Neo-Liberalism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1977) [1847] The Communist Manifesto, in *Karl Marx & Frederick Engels: Selected Works in One Volume*, London: Lawrence and Wishart

McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy Against Empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. (2004). *Capitalists and Conquerors: Critical Pedagogy Against Empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Pilger, J. (2002). *The New Rulers of the World*. London: Verso.

user 28/6/10 18:52
Formatted: Font:Italic

Unknown
Field Code Changed

user 1/7/10 20:19
Formatted: Font color: Auto

user 28/6/10 18:53
Deleted: .

user 28/6/10 18:52
Formatted: Font:Italic

user 28/6/10 18:55
Formatted: Font:(Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold, Italic

user 28/6/10 18:54
Deleted: Shock Doctrine

user 28/6/10 18:56
Formatted: Font:Italic

user 28/6/10 18:56
Formatted: Font:Not Italic

user 28/6/10 18:59
Formatted: Font:Not Bold

user 28/6/10 18:59
Formatted: Font:Not Bold, Not Italic

user 28/6/10 18:59
Deleted: P

user 28/6/10 18:51
Deleted: .

user 28/6/10 19:00
Deleted: Rowman and Littlefield .

Rikowski, G. (2001). Fuel for the Living Fire: Labour-Power! In: A. Dinerstein and M. Neary (eds.) *The Labour Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

user 28/6/10 18:51

Deleted: Radical Notes -

user 28/6/10 18:51

Deleted: -

Rikowski, G. (2007d) Critical Pedagogy and the Constitution of Capitalist Society. *The Flow of Ideas*, 9 Sept. Online at <http://www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=articles&sub=Critical%20Pedagogy%20and%20Capitalism>

Zizek, S. (2010) *Living in the End Times*. London: Verso.

user 28/6/10 19:00

Deleted: -
Rouge Forum -
Socialism Today -
Socialist Resistance -
Socialist Review -
The Guardian -
Workplace -

Pierre W. Orelus is Assistant Professor in the Curriculum and Instruction department at New Mexico State University. He has received several fellowships including the ALANA Minority Fellowship, ACCELA Fellowship, and New Perspectives Fellowship. Professor Orelus' research interests include post-colonial studies; critical race theory; gender studies, particularly masculinity and maleness; multiracialism; critical multicultural education; TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) and bilingual education; Caribbean studies; and cultural studies. His first book *Education under Occupation: The Heavy Price of Living in a Neo-Colonized and Globalized World*, was published in 2007.

user 28/6/10 19:01

Formatted: Font:Italic

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12 pt, Bold

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12

user 1/7/10 20:23

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12 pt, Italic

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12 pt

Pierre Wilbert Orelus was born and grew up in Haiti. The son of a struggling carpenter father and a madan sara (woman who transports and sells merchandise) mother. Pierre attended and received his first formal basic education in an old church building; when Pierre was 11 years old, he moved from the countryside to the capital, Port-au-Prince, with his older siblings to continue his education. Pierre completed high school at the age of 22 and attended college when he was almost 23 years old. Being the youngest child in his family, he is also the first one to have completed high school and the first one to attend college.

While in high school, he took part in numerous student movement protests that led to the overthrow of the principal and assistant principal of the school. This high school principal was notorious for attributing communist epithet to students who wanted to challenge the status quo and effect social change. As a college student in Haiti, Pierre continued to be politically active. He participated in many student protests against Haitian de facto regimes while he continued to lead a youth organization he founded and presided for two years.

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12 pt

In 1997, Pierre completed his Bachelor's degree in Human Services Advocacy from University of Massachusetts-Boston. In 2001, Pierre earned a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics with a focus on ESL (English as a Second Language) from the same university. A former high school teacher in the Boston Public Schools and currently a doctoral candidate in Education at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, Pierre has been carrying out for the last four years qualitative and quantitative research in western Massachusetts that involve urban middle school teachers. In addition, he has taught

user 1/7/10 20:22

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman, 12 pt

writing and grammar courses to college students at various institutions in Boston and western Massachusetts.

Dave Hill is Visiting Professor of Critical Education Policy and Equality Studies at Limerick University. He also teaches at Middlesex University, London. Formerly he was Professor of Education Policy at the University of Northampton, England.

Dave was born to London East End parents, his father a carpenter, his mother a dressmaker/ factory worker. After his parents' divorce, Dave and his brothers were brought up in some poverty. Dave's brothers left school at 15 and then became construction workers. After working sporadically with them, and also his father, on various building sites, Dave became a teacher of 'social education' in Stockwell manor comprehensive school, in inner city Brixton, London. Subsequently he taught at Chichester University, Tower Hamlets College, and the University of Northampton, leading and developing teacher education and 'education studies' courses dedicated to equality and social justice, courses with a Marxist perspective.

Dave was co-founder and Chair of the Hillcole Group of Radical left Educators through the 1990s, and is the founding editor and chief editor of the open access peer-refereed scholarly journal, *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, at www.jceps.com. He heads the independent e-Institute for Education Policy Studies, at www.ieps.org.uk, where much of his work is online.

He is Routledge Series Editor for the *Education and Neoliberalism* series. He has published 17 books and over a hundred chapters and academic articles, as well as activist and polemical short pieces, specialising in issue of social class, 'race', education policy, critical policy analysis, and Marxism and Education.

He is a socialist political activist, and has fought nine elections, including two Parliamentary campaigns for Labour (1979, 1987) and one (in 2010) for a socialist coalition. He is a former Brighton Borough Councillor, Labour Council Group Leader on East Sussex County Council, elected trade union regional leader in England and long-time trade union branch chair/shop steward.

He lectures worldwide on Marxism and Education and on Radical/Socialist education. T

There is a wiki entry on Dave Hill at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dave_Hill_\(professor\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dave_Hill_(professor)).

A number of his online articles are at www.ieps.org.uk

user 1/7/10 20:25

Formatted: English (UK)