

Class, neoliberal global capital, education and resistance

Dave Hill*

The paper bases itself in the tradition of transformative activism stressing the need to develop a just society. Outlining the contemporary context of neoliberal capitalism it seeks to understand the educational developments in the larger context of the labour-capital conflict with certain specific examples from Britain. It highlights the obscene and widening economic, social and educational inequalities both within states and globally; the detheorisation of education and the regulating of critical thought and activists through the ideological and repressive state apparatuses; and the limitation and regulation of democracy and democratic accountability at national and local educational levels. The author argues that there are possibilities of bringing about change in the education system and this can be undertaken by the critical educators and intellectuals. Education being a product of social relations and an instrument of reproduction therefore becomes an important site of struggle and change. As the conclusion Dave Hill outlines the ‘arenas’ located at diverse sites where the struggle to bring about change can be undertaken such as through a broader movement for economic and social justice, local action outside the classroom and within the education and media apparatuses.

INTRODUCTION: THE AIMS OF THIS CHAPTER

This paper calls for transformative activism by education and other cultural workers in order to develop an economically and just economy, polity and society. It calls for this material and ideological contestation within different sites of struggle.

1 Professor of Education Policy at the University of Northampton, UK. Chief Editor: *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. www.jceps.com

This article sets out key characteristics of neoliberal global capitalism (and its accompanying neoconservatism) and its major effects on society and education. It highlights the obscene and widening economic, social and educational inequalities both within states and globally; the detheorisation of education and the regulating of critical thought and activists through the ideological and repressive state apparatuses; and the limitation and regulation of democracy and democratic accountability at national and local educational levels.

The article analyses three components of the ‘Capitalist Agenda for/in Education’ within the current neoliberal globalising project of Capital, and, calls for engagement with the Radical Right in its neoliberal, Conservative and its revised social democratic (‘Third Way’) manifestations. The chapter also calls for engagement with ideological and cultural fashions within the media and the academy – fashions such as postmodernism, social democracy/ left revisionsim that, ultimately, serve the function of ‘naturalising’ neoliberal Capital as the dominating ‘common sense’. They do this partly by virtue of their ignoring, or deriding Marxist derived/ related concepts of social class, class conflict and socialism. Such academic fashions as postmodernism and left revisionsim debilitate and displace viable solidaristic counter-hegemonic struggles.

This chapter seeks to address the question:

What role can we, as critical transformative and revolutionary educators and cultural/media workers play in ensuring that the Capitalism, with its dystopian class-based apartheid is replaced by an economic and social system more economically and socially just and environmentally sustainable than state capitalist, social democratic and (secular or religious) traditionalist alternatives?

SECTION 1. NEOLIBERAL GLOBAL CAPITAL

In its current neoliberal form in particular, capitalism leads to human degradation and inhumanity and increased social class inequalities within states and globally.

These effects are:

- increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality within states
- increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality between states

- degradation and capitalisation of humanity
- environmental degradation impacting primarily in a social class related manner

WHAT IS NEOLIBERAL CAPITALISM?

For neoliberals, ‘profit is the God’, not the public good. Capitalism is not kind. Plutocrats are not, essentially, or even commonly, philanthropic. In capitalism it is the insatiable demand for profit that is the motor for policy, not public or social or common weal, or good. With great power comes great irresponsibility. Thus privatised utilities, such as the railway system, health and education services (schools, trade/vocational education, universities), free and clean water supply are run, just as much as factories and finance houses, to maximise owners’ and owners’ and shareholders’ profits and rewards, rather than to provide a public service.¹

The current globally dominant form of capitalism, neoliberalism, requires that the State establishes and extends the following policies:

1. The control of inflation by interest rates, preferably by an independent central bank.
2. The balancing of budgets, which should not be used to influence demand – or at any rate to stimulate it.
3. The privatisation/private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.
4. The provision of a market in goods and services – including private sector involvement in welfare, social, educational and other state services (such as air traffic control, pensions, postal deliveries, prisons, policing, railways).
5. Within education, the creation and exacerbation, through selection, of ‘opportunity’ to acquire the means of education (though not necessarily education itself) and additional cultural capital.

¹ Following the privatisation of British Rail, public safety has been subordinated to private profit. For example, between 1992 and 1997, the number of people employed in Britain’s railways fell from 159,000 to 92,000, while the number of trains increased. Capital downsizes its labour forces to upsize its profits. One result has been an unprecedented series of major train crashes in Britain since the railways were privatised.

6. The relatively untrammelled selling and buying of labour power, for a ‘flexible’, poorly regulated labour market, deregulation of the labour market – for labour flexibility (with consequences for education in providing an increasingly hierarchicalised schooling and university system).
7. The restructuring of the management of the welfare state on the basis of a corporate managerialist model imported from the world of business. As well as the needs of the economy dictating the principal aims of school and university education, the world of business is also to supply a model of how it is to be provided and managed, and micro-managed and monitored.
8. The deriding and suppression of oppositional counter-hegemonic critical thought, spaces and thinkers/ activists within the media and education.
9. Within a regime of denigration and humbling of publicly provided services.
10. Within a regime of cuts in the post-war Welfare State, the withdrawal of state subsidies and support, and low public expenditure.

Internationally, neoliberalism requires that:

1. Barriers to international trade and capitalist enterprise should be removed.
2. There should be a ‘level playing field’ for companies of any nationality within all sectors of national economies.
3. Trade rules and regulations, such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services (the GATS), are necessary to underpin ‘free’ trade, with a system for penalising ‘unfair’ trade policies.
One increasingly important proviso, in the face of growing Chinese and Indian economic muscle and exports, is that
4. Rich and powerful countries reserve the right to exempt themselves from these rules, to slap on quotas, and to continue subsidising their own agricultural industry, for example, the subsidies afforded to agricultural production in the USA and the European Union.

McMurtry (1999) describes ‘the Pathologisation of the Market Model’. He suggests that to argue for a ‘free market’ in anything these days is a

delusion: the ‘market model’ that we have today is really the system that benefits the ‘global corporate market’. This is a system where the rules are rigged to favour huge multinational and transnational corporations that take-over, destroy or incorporate- the ‘cancer’ stage of capitalism – small businesses, innovators, etc. that are potential competitors. Thus, opening education and other public services to the market, in the long run, will open it to the corporate giants – who will run it in their own interests.

WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF NEOLIBERALISM? WIDENING INEQUALITIES

NEOLIBERALISM AND ITS EFFECTS

Neoliberal policies globally have resulted in

1. A loss of Equity, Economic and Social Justice for citizens and for workers at work
2. A loss of Democracy and Democratic Control and Democratic Accountability
3. A loss of Critical Thought and Space.

THE GROWTH OF NATIONAL AND GLOBAL INEQUALITIES

Inequalities both between states and within states have increased dramatically during the era of global neoliberalism. Global capital, in its current neoliberal form in particular, leads to human degradation and inhumanity and increased social class inequalities within states and globally. These effects are increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality within states, increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality between states. The degradation and capitalisation of humanity, including the environmental degradation impact primarily in a social class-related manner. Those who can afford to buy clean water don’t die of thirst or diarrhoea. In many states across the globe, those who can afford school or university fees, where charges are made, end up without formal education or in grossly inferior provision.

Kagarlitsky has pointed out that ‘globalisation does not mean the impotence of the state, but the rejection by the state of its social functions, in favour of repressive ones, and the ending of democratic freedoms (2001, quoted in Pilger, 2002: 5).

In Britain the increasing inequalities, the impoverishment and creation of a substantial underclass has also been well-documented². Brenner has noted how in the USA Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) owned 2 per cent of market capitalisation in 1992, yet by 2002 they owned 12 per cent, ‘the greatest of the appropriations by the expropriators’ (Brenner, 2002a. See also Brenner, 2002b, c.)

The current form of globalisation is tightening rather than loosening the international poverty trap. Living standards in the least developed countries are now lower than thirty years ago. Three hundred million people live on less than a dollar a day (Denny and Elliot, 2002). Inequalities within states have widened partly because of the generalised attack on workers’ rights and trade unions, with restrictive laws passed hamstringing trade union actions (Roskam, 2006. See also Hill, 2005a, Hill *et al.*, 2006).

Weissman (2003) writes that

There is something profoundly wrong with a world in which the 400 highest income earners in the United States make as much money in a year as the entire population of 20 African nations, more than 300 million people.

THE GROWTH OF EDUCATION QUASI-MARKETS AND MARKETS AND THE GROWTH OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

There is considerable data globally on how, within marketised or quasi-marketised education systems, poor schools have, by and large, got poorer (in terms of relative education results and in terms of total income) and how rich schools (in the same terms) have got richer. Whitty, Power and Halpin (1998) examined the effects of the introduction of quasi-markets into education systems in USA, Sweden, England and Wales, Australia

² See Gillborn and Mirza, 2000; Carvel, 2004 for recent data on (racialised and gendered) social class inequalities in income, wealth and educational attainment in England and Wales and how much inequality has increased in Britain since 1979.

The racialised nature of the social class structure in the USA is extremely apparent. Lardner (2004) reports that white Americans enjoy an 11-to-1 wealth advantage over Hispanics, and an even higher 14-to-1 advantage over Blacks, according to a new study by the Pew Hispanic Centre. In both cases, disparities of wealth far exceed disparities of income, and they are worse today than they were before the 2001-02 United States recession. The statistics he reports show that 26 per cent of Hispanic, 32 per cent of Black and 13 per cent of White households had zero or negative net worth in 2002.

and New Zealand. Their conclusion is that one of the results of marketing education is that increasing 'parental choice' of schools, and/ or setting up new types of schools, in effect increases school choice of parents and their children and thereby sets up or exacerbates racialised school hierarchies³.

... the poor have less access to preschool, secondary, and tertiary education; they also attend schools of lower quality where they are socially segregated. Poor parents have fewer resources to support the education of their children, and they have less financial, cultural, and social capital to transmit. Only policies that explicitly address inequality, with a major redistributive purpose, therefore, could make education an equalising force in social opportunity (Reimers, 2000: 55).

Hirtt (2004) comments on the apparently contradictory education policies of capital, "to adapt education to the needs of business and at the same time reduce state expenditure on education". He suggests that this contradiction is resolved by the polarisation of the labour market. He suggests that, for neoliberal capital, from an economic point of view it is not necessary to provide high level education and of general knowledge, to all future workers: "it is now possible and even highly recommendable to have a more polarised education system.... education should not try to transmit a broad common culture to the majority of future workers, but instead it should teach them some basic, general skills" (Hirtt, 2004: 446).

THE GROWTH OF UNDEMOCRATIC (UN)ACCOUNTABILITY

Within education and other public services business values and interests are increasingly substituted for democratic accountability and the collective voice. This applies at the local level, where, in Britain, the USA, Pakistan and many other countries, for example, private companies- national or transnational- variously build, own, run and govern state schools and other sections of local government educational services. There is an important democratic question here. Is it right to allow private providers of educational services based outside India, or Brazil, or Britain? In such a case where is the local democratic accountability? In the event of abuse or corruption or simply pulling out and closing down operations, where and how would those guilty be held to account?

³ See, for example, Gillborn and Youdell, 2000; Hill *et al.*, 2006.

This anti-democratisation applies too at national levels. As Barry Coates, discussing the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has pointed out, 'GATS locks countries into a system of rules that means it is effectively impossible for governments to change policy, or for voters to elect a new government that has different policies' (2001: 28. See also Grieshaber-Otto and Sanger, 2002; Rikowski, 2001a, 2003; Hill *et al.*, 2006).

DETHEORISED EDUCATION AND THE LOSS OF CRITICAL THOUGHT

The increasing subordination and commodification of education, including university education have been well-documented⁴. One aspect is that, other than at elite institutions, where the student intake is the wealthiest and most upper class, there is little scope for critical thought. In my own work, I have examined how the British government has, in effect, expelled most potentially critical aspects of education, such as sociological and political examination of schooling and education, and questions of social class, 'race' and gender, from the national curriculum for what is now, in England and Wales, termed 'teacher training'⁵. It was formerly called 'teacher education'. The change in nomenclature is important both symbolically and in terms of actual accurate description of the new, 'safe', sanitised and detheorised education and training of new teachers.

'How to' has replaced 'why to' in a technicist curriculum based on 'delivery' of a quietist and overwhelmingly conservative set of 'standards' for student teachers. This has, of course, had a major impact on the teaching force, and thereby on schooling. Teachers are now, by and large, trained in skills rather than educated to examine the 'whys' and the 'why nots' and the contexts of curriculum, pedagogy, educational purposes and structures and the effects these have on reproducing capitalist economy, society and politics.

SECTION 2. SOCIAL CLASS EXPLOITATION

The development of ('raced' and gendered) social class- based 'labour-power' and the subsequent extraction of 'surplus value'- is the fundamental characteristic of capitalism. It is the primary explanation for economic, political, cultural and ideological change.

⁴ See, for example, Levidow, 2002; Giroux, 2002; Giroux and Giroux, 2004.

⁵ See, for example, Hill, 1991, 1999, 2001, 2005b.

Social Class is the:

- *essential form of capitalist exploitation and oppression*
- *dominant form of capitalist exploitation and oppression*

WHAT IS THE CURRENT PROJECT OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM?

The fundamental principle of capitalism is the sanctification of private (or, corporate) profit based on the extraction of surplus labour (unpaid labour-time) as surplus value from the labour-power of workers. This is a creed of competition, not cooperation, between humans. It is a creed and practice of (racialised and gendered) class exploitation, exploitation by the capitalist class of those who provide the profits through their labour, the working class.

THE STATE AND EDUCATION: LABOUR POWER, SURPLUS VALUE, PROFIT

In Britain and elsewhere, both Conservative and New Labour governments have attempted to ‘conform’ both the *existing* teacher workforce and the *future* teacher workforce (i.e. student teachers) and *their* teachers, the reproducers of teachers - the teacher educators. Why conform the teachers and the teacher educators at all? Like poets, teachers are potentially dangerous. But poets are fewer and reading poetry is voluntary. Schooling is not. Teachers’ work is *the production and reproduction of knowledge, attitudes and ideology*⁶.

Glenn Rikowski’s work⁷ develops a Marxist analysis based on an analysis of ‘labour power’- the capacity to labour. With respect to education, he suggests that teachers are the most dangerous of workers because they have a special role in shaping, developing and forcing *the single commodity on which the whole capitalist system rests: labour-power*. In the capitalist labour process, labour-power is transformed into value-creating *labour*, and, at a certain point, *surplus value* – value over-and-above that represented in the worker’s wage – is created. *Surplus-value* is the first form of the existence of capital. It is the *lifeblood of capital*. Without it, capital could not be transformed into money, on sale of the commodities

6 See, for example, Althusser, 1971.

7 See Rikowski, e.g. 2001, and his website at <http://www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=about&sub=Glenn%20Rikowski>

that incorporate value, and hence the capitalist could not purchase the necessary raw materials, means of production and labour-power to set the whole cycle in motion once more. But, most importantly for the capitalist, is that part of the surplus-value forms his or her *profit* – and it is this that drives the capitalist on a personal basis. It is this that defines the personal *agency of the capitalist!*

The State needs to control the social production of labour process for two reasons. First to try to ensure that this occurs. Secondly, to try to ensure that modes of pedagogy that are antithetical to labour-power production *do not and cannot exist*. In particular, it becomes clear, on this analysis, that the capitalist state will seek to destroy any forms of pedagogy *that attempt to educate students regarding their real predicament – to create an awareness of themselves as future labour-powers and to underpin this awareness with critical insight that seeks to undermine the smooth running of the social production of labour-power*. This fear entails strict control of teacher education, of the curriculum, of educational research.

THE SALIENCE AND ESSENTIAL NATURE OF SOCIAL CLASS EXPLOITATION WITHIN CAPITALISM

Social class is the inevitable and defining feature of capitalist exploitation, whereas the various other forms of oppression are not *essential* to its nature and continuation, however much they are commonly functional to this- and however obviously racialised and gendered capitalist oppression is in most countries. The face of poverty starting out from post-Katrina New Orleans was overwhelmingly black. It was overwhelmingly black working class. It was also poor white working class. Richer black and white car owners drove away.

Within the educational curricula and pedagogy, and within the media (and, indeed, wherever resistant teachers and other cultural workers can find spaces) the existence of various and multiple forms of oppression and the similarity of their effects on individuals and communities should not disguise nor weaken class analysis that recognises the structural centrality of social class exploitation and conflict⁸. In capitalist society this has consequences for political and social strategy, for mobilisation and for action).

8 See Cole and Hill, 2002; McLaren and Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, 2004, Kelsh and Hill, 2006.

As McLaren notes, 'the key here is not to privilege class oppression over other forms of oppression but to see how capitalist relations of production provide the ground from which other forms of oppression are produced' (McLaren, 2001: 31).

McLaren and Farahmandpur note that 'recognising the 'class character' of education in capitalist schooling, and advocating a 'socialist reorganisation of Capitalist society (Krupskaya, 1973) are two fundamental principles of a revolutionary critical pedagogy' (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001: 299. See also McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2005).

MARXIST AND POSTMODERNIST ANALYSES OF SOCIAL CLASS

Outside the Marxist tradition, it is clear that many critics of class analysis confound class-consciousness with the fact of class – and tend to deduce the non-existence of the latter from the 'absence' of the former, or, if not 'the absence', then the decline in salience in advanced capitalist countries. The collapse of many traditional signifiers of 'working-classness' has led many to pronounce the demise of class yet, as Beverley Skeggs observes:

To abandon class as a theoretical tool does not mean that it does not exist any more; only that some theorists do not value it. It does not mean ... [working-class people] experience inequality any differently; rather, it would make it more difficult for them to identify and challenge the basis of the inequality which they experience. *Class inequality exists beyond its theoretical representation.* (Skeggs, 1997:6; emphasis added).

Marx took great pains to stress that social class is distinct from economic class and necessarily includes a political dimension which, in the broadest sense, is 'culturally' rather than 'economically' determined. Class-consciousness, a 'cultural phenomenon, does not follow automatically or inevitably from the fact of (economic) class position. In *The Poverty of Philosophy* [1847] Marx distinguishes a 'class-in-itself' (class position) and a 'class-for itself' (class consciousness) and, in *The Communist Manifesto* (Marx and Engels, 1848), explicitly identified the 'formation of the proletariat into a class' as the key political task facing the communists. In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* [1852], Marx observes:

In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that divide their mode of life, their interests and their cultural formation from those of the other classes and bring them into conflict with those classes, they form a class. In so far as these small peasant proprietors are merely connected on a local basis, and the identity of their interests fails to produce a feeling of community, national links, or a political organisation, they do not form a class. (Marx [1852] in Tucker, 1974: 239).

The recognition by Marx that class consciousness is not necessarily or directly produced from the material and objective fact of class position, enables neo-Marxists to acknowledge the wide range of contemporary influences that may (or may not) inform the subjective consciousness of identity – but in doing so, to retain the crucial reference to the basic economic determinant of social experience.

The notion of an essential, unitary self was rejected, over a century and a half ago, by Marx in his *Sixth Thesis on Feuerbach*, where he stated:

'But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations.' (Marx, [1845] in Tucker, 1978: 45). Furthermore, in some specific contexts, 'resistance postmodernism' can have/ has had some progressive appeal and effects, for example in recognising/ allowing reofficial recognition of, for example gay/ lesbian sexuality, feminist /women's rights, for example in states emerging from religious, Stalinist or fascist/ quasi-fascist authoritarian dictatorships. The overall criticism, however, remains. The absence of class in postmodern theory actively contributes to the ideological disarmament of the working- class movement⁹.

The fundamental significance of economic production for Marxist theory integrates a range of analytic concepts, which include the metanarrative of social development and therefore the proposal of viable transformatory educational and political projects. In contrast, the local, specific and partial analyses that mark the limitations of postmodernism are accompanied by either a lack of, or opposition to, social-class based policy.

⁹ For Marxist critiques of postmodernism, see, for example, Cole, 2004; Hill *et al.*, 2002.

SECTION 3. THE EDUCATION AND MEDIA IDEOLOGICAL STATE APPARATUSES

Education and the media are the dominant Ideological State Apparatuses, though from the USA to Iran and elsewhere, religion is also assuming a more salient role. *Each Ideological State Apparatuses contains disciplinary repressive moments and effects.*

One of its greatest achievements is that capital presents itself as natural, free and democratic and that any attack on free-market neoliberal capitalism is damned as anti-democratic. Any attack on capitalism becomes characterised as an attack on world freedom and democracy itself.

But, the freedom of the Press and the media belongs to those who own that Press and media. Rupert Murdoch is more powerful than me, although the ideas he represents, ultimately, may not be so. The freedom of school choice across the neoliberalising world, despite the ‘naturalisation’ of ‘choice’ and ‘competition’ in the Mass Media and schools and Universities as ‘common sense’, is pretty much confined to those with the economic and cultural capital to be chosen.

The most powerful, restraint on capital (and the political parties funded and influenced by capitalists in their bountiful donations) is that capital needs to persuade the people that neoliberalism – competition, privatisation, poorer standards of public services, greater inequalities between rich and poor are legitimate. If not, there is a delegitimation crisis, government and the existing system are seen through as grossly unfair and inhumane. It may also be seen as in the pocket of the international and/or national ruling classes and their local and national state weaponry.

To minimise this delegitimation, to ensure that the majority of the population considers the government and the economic system of private monopoly ownership is legitimate, the state uses the ideological state apparatuses such as schools and colleges and the media to ‘naturalise’ capitalism – to make the existing status quo seem ‘only natural’ (of course, if and when this doesn’t work, the repressive state apparatuses kick in – sometimes literally, with steel-capped military boots).

The term ‘State Apparatus’ does not refer solely to apparatuses such as ministries and various levels of government. It applies to those societal apparatuses, institutions and agencies that operate on behalf of, and maintain the existing economic and social relations of production. In other words, the apparatuses that sustain capital, capitalism and capitalists.

Educators and cultural workers are implicated in the process of economic, cultural and ideological reproduction. The school or university is no hiding place. Nor is the newsroom or the studio or the knowledge industry (Kelsh and Hill, 2006).

IDEOLOGICAL AND REPRESSIVE STATE APPARATUSES

Althusser argues that the ideological dominance of the ruling class is, like its political dominance, secured in and through definite institutional forms and practices: the ideological apparatuses of the state. As Althusser suggests, *every Ideological State Apparatus is also in part a Repressive State Apparatus*¹⁰. punishing those who dissent:

There is no such thing as a purely ideological apparatus ... Schools and churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to ‘discipline’ not only their shepherds, but also their flocks. (Althusser, 1971: 138)

Ideological State Apparatuses have internal ‘coercive’ practices (for example, the forms of punishment, non-promotion, displacement, being ‘out-of-favour’ experienced by socialists and trade union activists/militants historically and currently across numerous countries). Similarly, *Repressive State Apparatuses* attempt to secure significant internal unity and wider social authority through ideology (for example, through their ideologies of patriotism and national integrity). Every *Repressive State Apparatus* therefore has an ideological moment, propagating a version of common sense and attempting to legitimate it under threat of sanction.

Governments, and the ruling classes in whose interests they act, prefer to use the second form of state apparatuses - the Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). Changing the school and initial teacher education curriculum, abandoning ‘general studies’ and ‘liberal studies’ and horizon-broadening in the UK for working class ‘trade’ and skilled worker students/ apprentices in ‘Further Education’ (vocational) colleges, is less messy than sending the troops onto the streets or visored baton-wielding police into strike-bound mining villages, or protests by the landless. And it is deemed more legitimate by the population in general.

¹⁰ See Althusser, 1971; Hill, 2001a, 2005a.

SECTION 4. CAPITALIST AGENDAS AND EDUCATION

Global neoliberal capital and its international and national apparatuses have an anti-human and anti-critical business agenda for education and the media.

Within education the agenda of capita for/in education comprises a:

- *Reduction in Expenditure on Public Education Services*
- *Capitalist Agenda for Schooling and Education*
- *Capitalist Agenda in Schooling and Education*
- *New Public Managerialism Mode of Organisation and Control*
- *Capitalist Agenda for Education Business - British and United States (and other leading local capitalist states') based corporations in the vanguard of privatisation and profit taking internationally*

THE CONTEXTS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AND THE NEOLIBERAL PROJECT

The restructuring of the schooling and education systems across the world needs to be placed within the ideological and policy context of the links between capital, neoliberalism (with its combination of privatisation, competitive markets in education characterised by selection and exclusion) and the rampant growth of the national and international inequalities.

The current crisis of capital accumulation – the declining rate of profit, particularly within the turn of the millennium US economy – has given an added urgency to the neoliberal project for education globally. Brenner (2002a) lucidly describes this crisis of capital accumulation (See also Brenner, 2002b, c; Kidron, 2002).

CUTTING PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

Not only have education and the media the function of creating and reproducing a labour force fit for capitalism, but capital also requires cutting public spending, cutting the social wage (the cost and value of the state pensions, health and education services) (Hill, 2001a,b, 2003, 2004), reducing the 'tax-take' as a proportion of gross domestic product. These are all subject to the variegations of short-term policy and local political considerations such as upcoming elections or mass demonstrations, the balance of class forces- the objective and subjective current labour-capital relation (relationship between the capitalist class and the working class and their relative cohesiveness, organisation, leadership and will).

CAPITAL AND THE BUSINESS OF EDUCATION

The Capitalist state has a Capitalist Agenda *for* Education and a Business Plan *in* Education¹¹. It also has a Capitalist Agenda *for Education Business*. The Capitalist Agenda *for* education centres on socially producing labour-power (people's capacity to labour) for Capitalist enterprises. The Capitalist Agenda *in* Education focuses on setting business 'free' in education for profit-making.

The first aim is to ensure that schooling and education engage in ideological and economic reproduction. National state education and training policies in the Capitalist Agenda *for* education are of increasing importance for national capital. In an era of global capital, this is one of the few remaining areas for national state intervention. It is the site, suggests Hatcher (2001), where a state can make a difference. Thus, capital firstly requires education fit for business – to make schooling and further and higher education geared to producing the personality, ideological and economic requirements of capital.

Secondly, capital wants to make profits from education and other privatised public services such as water supply and healthcare. The second aim – the Capitalist Agenda *in* Education – is for private enterprise, private capitalists, to make money out of it, to make private profit out of it, to control it, whether by outright control through private chains of schools/universities, by selling services to state-funded schools and education systems, or by voucher systems through which taxpayers subsidise the owners of private schools.

Thus, business firstly education fit for business – to make schooling and further and higher education subordinate to the personality, ideological and economic requirements of capital, to make sure schools produce compliant, ideologically indoctrinated, pro-capitalist, effective workers.

The third education business plan for capital, the Capitalist *for Education Business*, is to 'bring the bucks back home', for governments in globally dominant economic positions (e.g. the UK, the USA), or in locally dominant economic positions (e.g. Australia, New Zealand, Brazil) to support locally based corporations (or, much more commonly, locally based transnational corporations) in profit taking from the privatisation and neoliberalisation of education services globally (Hill, 2004, 2005c; Hill, *et al.*, 2006; Schugurensky and Davidson-Harden, 2003).

11 See: Hatcher, 2001; Hill 2001c, 2004a, b, 2005a.

SECTION 5. MARXISM AND RESISTANCE TO NEO-LIBERAL CAPITAL

Forms and Ideologies of Resistance to Neoliberal Capital should be critiqued from a democratic structuralist neo-Marxist¹² political and ideological perspective.

Non-Marxist and Anti-Marxist political forces fail to recognise and combat the essentially class-based oppressive nature of Neoliberal Capital. Such forces include Extreme Right Racist/Fascist, Extreme Right Populist, Conservative Neoliberal, Neo-conservative, Third Way/ Revised Social Democratic (e.g. Die Neue Mitte/ New Labour), Christian Democratic, Centre-Left Social Democratic, and religious fundamentalist movements and parties, whether they be Islamic, Christian, Jewish, Hindu or other religions.

Similarly, the ideological support systems for such forces within the Academy and the Media fail to recognise and thereby work to suppress Marxist analysis and programmes. Support systems for Capital include not only various of the above movements, parties and their political ideologies.

Support systems for Capital within Educational and Media and Cultural Studies include, to varying degrees, Critical Theory, culturalist neo-Marxist analyses and programmes. They also include ludic postmodernist and resistance postmodernist (non-) programmes where programmatic metanarratives are debilitatingly eschewed by postmodernists as oppressive.

THE RIGHT AND REVISED SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Social democratic advances of ‘the thirty glorious years’ of the 1940s to the 70s (the post-war boom in advanced capitalist economies) did succeed in some redistribution of life chances across a number of booming industrialised states. And what there was, was important – welfare states, pensions, state-provided social housing, minimum wages, trade union recognition and rights, rights for workers at work, equal opportunities legislation on grounds of ‘race’, gender, sexuality, disability. And sometimes, in some states, there were deliberate attempts to secure more meritocracy and sometimes more equal outcomes. These are not to be sneered at. They have improved the lives of millions.

¹² This phrase ‘neo-Marxist’ is used simply to differentiate it from the Marxism of the later Stalinist period commonly called ‘vulgar’ Marxism.

But so much more could have been done!¹³. And needs to be done. And, since the 1970s in particular, with crises of capital accumulation, these hard-won rights, the ‘social wage’, state comprehensive provision of services such as education, health, pensions, transport have been widely degraded, privatised, and/ or sold off to capital. This really is, as Harvey exclaims, “class war from above” (Harvey, 2005). This class war from above has been successful, other than where street resistance has numbered millions, stalling government neoliberalising plans.

The emphasis should be on challenging the dominant neoliberal and neo-conservative cultures, whether they are in their own colours or masquerading as “there is no alternative” ‘Third Way’ neoliberalising social democracy, reproducing and reinforcing inequalities of income, wealth and life. Radical Right and Centrist ideology on education serves a society aiming only for the hegemony of the few and the entrenchment of privilege, whether elitist or supposedly meritocratic – not the promotion of economic and social justice with more equal educational and economic outcomes.

STRUCTURALIST NEO-MARXISM, AGENCY AND THE STATE

The autonomy and agency available to individual teachers, teacher educators, schools and departments of education, journalists and other cultural workers is particularly circumscribed when faced with the structures of capital and its current neoliberal project for education.

The differences between the structuralist neo-Marxism I am putting forward here and culturalist neo-Marxism are that culturalist neo-Marxists, such as Michael Apple, overemphasise autonomy and agency in a number of ways. Firstly, they overemphasise the importance of ideology, of the cultural domain. Secondly, and connectedly, they rate too highly the importance of discourse. Thirdly, they lay too much store on the relative autonomy of individuals, on how effective human agency is likely to be when faced with the force of the state, without overall, major change and transformation of the economy, and society. Fourthly, they overemphasise the relative autonomy of state apparatuses

¹³ For Left critiques of New Labour education policy in Britain, see Cole, 1998; Hill, 1999; Rikowski, 2005.

such as education, or particular schools. Fifthly, they overestimate the relative autonomy of the political region of the state from the economic – the autonomy of government from capital (See Cole *et al.*, 2001). In Apple's case (e.g. Apple, 2001) they also underplay the salience of social class- racialised and gendered and layered though it is, as the primary and the essential form of exploitation in capitalist society (Kelsh, 2001; Kelsh and Hill, 2006).

To use concepts derived from Louis Althusser, the autonomy of the education policy/political region of the state from the economic has been straightjacketed. There are, in many states, greater and greater restrictions on the ability of cultural workers and teachers to use their pedagogical spaces for emancipatory purposes.

But historically and internationally, this often has been the case. Spaces do exist for counter-hegemonic struggle – sometimes (as now) narrower, sometimes (as in Western Europe and North America, the 1960s and 1970s) broader. Having recognised the limitations, though, and having recognised that there is *some* potential for egalitarian transformative change, whatever space does exist should be exploited. Whatever we can do, we must do, however fertile or unfertile the soil at any given moment in any particular place. But schools, colleges, newsrooms and studios are not the only place for resistance and transformation.

SECTION 6. CRITICAL EDUCATION FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Critical Education for Economic and Social Justice can play a role in resisting the depredations and the 'common-sense' of Global Neoliberal Capital and play a role in developing class-consciousness and an egalitarian sustainable future.

Critical Education for Economic and Social Justice is where teachers and other *Cultural Workers act as Critical Transformative and Public Intellectuals within and outside of sites of economic, ideological and cultural reproduction. Such activity is both deconstructive and reconstructive, offering a Utopian Politics of Anger, Analysis and Hope based on a materialised Critical Pedagogy that recognises, yet challenges, the strength of the structures and apparatuses of Capital.*

Such activity encompasses activity within different arenas of Resistant and Revolutionary activity. These arenas encompass:

- *Activism within the Cultural Sites of Schooling/Education and the Media within the workforce, within the curriculum/ knowledge validation systems, and within pedagogy/social relations*
- *Activism locally outside of these sites, exposing the Capitalist reproductive nature of those sites both per se, and Activism locally, linked to other sites of economic, ideological and cultural contestation, mobilisations and struggle*
- *Activism within Mass movements, United Fronts, and within democratic Marxist/ Socialist groupings, fractions and organisations.*

THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS AND THE POLITICS OF EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

What role can intellectuals such as educators and other cultural workers play in the struggle for economic and social justice? Support the current system? Ignore it? Play with the postmodernists in irony and pastiche, body performativity and transgression, textual and semiotic deconstruction, shorn of any solidaristic reconstructive urge or capacity (however enjoyable and individually liberating they can certainly be)? Or should education and other cultural workers organise in opposition to capital, seeking its modification, transformation and replacement?

Within classrooms critical transformative intellectuals seek to enable student teachers and teachers (and school students) to critically evaluate a range of salient perspectives and ideologies – including critical reflection itself – while showing a commitment to egalitarianism. Critical pedagogy must remain self-critical, and critique its own presumed role as the metatruth of educational criticism. This does not imply forced acceptance or silencing of contrary perspectives. But it *does* involve a privileging of egalitarian and emancipatory perspectives. It is necessary to be quite clear here. The aim is not egalitarian indoctrination. This *does* mean adhering to what Burbules and Berk (1999) have defined as 'critical pedagogy', as opposed to what they call 'critical theory', since 'critical thinking's claim is, at heart, to teach how to think critically, not how to think politically; for critical pedagogy, this is a false distinction' (ibid: 54).

REVOLUTIONARY CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

The current phase of Peter McLaren's work, (sometimes with others) is on developing 'revolutionary pedagogy', 'a rematerialised critical pedagogy' (McLaren, 2001:27). This embeds his work within the Marxist-

humanist theoretical tradition. The development from critical pedagogy to what he terms revolutionary pedagogy is part of his developing a Marxist analysis and programme for resistance to and replacement of neoliberal globalising Capital¹⁴.

McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005) ask, ‘How do we organise teachers and students against domestic trends [e.g. the deepening inequalities and exploitation under Capital] ... and also enable them to link these trends to global capitalism and the new imperialism? What pedagogical discourses and approaches can we use?’ They continue, ‘the foundational principles of a renewed and revamped approach to critical pedagogy that we adumbrate throughout this book [*Teaching Against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism*] parallels the five pillars of popular education articulated by Deborah Brandt (1991)’.

First, critical pedagogy must be a collective process that involves utilising a dialogical (i.e. Freirean) learning approach.

Second, critical pedagogy has to be critical; that is, it must locate the underlying causes of class exploitation and economic oppression within the social, political, and economic arrangements of capitalist social relations of production.

Third, critical pedagogy must be profoundly systematic in the sense that it is guided by Marx’s dialectical method of inquiry, which begins with the “real concrete” circumstances of the oppressed masses and moves towards a classification, conceptualisation, analysis, and breaking down of the concrete social world into units of abstractions in order to reach the essence of social phenomena under investigation. Next, it reconstructs and makes the social world intelligible by transforming and translating theory into concrete social and political activity.

Fourth, critical pedagogy should be participatory. It involves building coalitions among community members, grassroots movements, church organisations and labour unions.

Finally, critical pedagogy needs to be a creative process by integrating elements of popular culture (i.e. drama, music, oral history, narratives) as educational tools that can successfully raise the level of political

¹⁴ See, for example, McLaren, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2005; McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001, 2005; McLaren *et al.*, 2004.

consciousness of students and teachers. (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2005: 9. See also Chapter 2 in McLaren, 2005)¹⁵.

RADICAL LEFT PRINCIPLES FOR EDUCATION SYSTEMS

It is important to develop schools and education systems with the following characteristics¹⁶.

- To level up education workers’ pay, rights and securities rather than level down to a lowest common denominator. This applies both within countries and globally.
- To widen access to good quality education (by increasing its availability within countries and globally. Widening access to under-represented and under-achieving groups, can, with positive action and support, play a part in reducing educational inequalities between groups).
- To secure vastly increased equality of educational outcomes.
- To organise comprehensive provision (i.e. comprehensive, non-selective schooling with no private or selective or religiously exclusive provision of schooling).
- To retain and enhance local and national democratic control over schooling and education democratic community control over education.
- To use the local and national state to achieve an economically just (defined as egalitarian), anti-discriminatory society, rather than simply an inegalitarian meritocratic focus on equal opportunities to get to very unequal outcomes.
- To recognise and seek to improve education systems that are dedicated to education for wider individual and social purposes than the production of hierarchicalised, ideologically quiescent and compliant workers and consumers in a neoliberal/ liberalised world.

¹⁵ In *Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy Against Empire* (2005), McLaren develops this.

¹⁶ I have elsewhere (e.g. Hill, 1991, 1999a, 2002b) suggested a set of more detailed principles and proposals firstly for the education system, and secondly for teacher education. Together with co-writers in the Hillcole Group of Radical Left Educators in Britain, (Hillcole Group, 1991, 1997) we have suggested principles and policy in and for a socialist education system and society.

SECTION 7. ARENAS FOR RESISTANCE

ARENAS FOR CRITICAL TRANSFORMATIVE INTELLECTUALS IN EDUCATION AND OTHER CULTURAL SITES

ARENA 1: WITHIN THE EDUCATION AND MEDIA APPARATUSES

The first arena is within the sites of education and the media themselves. Critical educators can indeed recognise that ‘education has the potential to fuel the flames of resistance to global capitalism as well as the passion for socialist transformation.

Educators and cultural workers should develop ‘critical reflection’ and a commitment to critical action, to moral/ethical egalitarian action. Teacher education, for example, has to be about more than classroom abilities limited to passing out pre-set nationally approved ‘facts’, plus competence in crowd control. Teachers without the capacity to stimulate critical enquiry leave education always on the edge of indoctrination and quiescence. A course that limits teachers to a single view of one set of classrooms – with little theoretical understanding of the process or history of education – lacks intellectual rigour.

School and teacher education courses, film and other media need to present data on equality issues: on racism, sexism, social class inequality, homophobia, and discrimination/ prejudice/ regarding disability and special needs. Many teachers and students are simply not aware of the existence of such data in education and society or the impact of individual labelling, and of structural discriminations on the lives and education and life-opportunities of the children in their classes, schools and society.

Divorced from other arenas of progressive struggle, the success of critical pedagogy and intervention will be limited. This necessitates the development of pro-active debate both by, and within, the Radical Left. and with liberal pluralist (modernist or postmodernist) and with Radical Right ideologies and programmes, in all the areas of the state and of civil society.

However limited in any particular historical, spatial and political conjunction within capital, resistant and counter-hegemonic acts are possible and necessary, as is socialist utopianism (different from utopian socialism of Marx’s era) – the analysis of the present and the vision and planning for an egalitarian democratic socialist future. Recognition at any time/ place

of the contemporary limitations on the counter-hegemonic effectiveness of the actions of teachers or journalists need not lead to negativity and despair. It can lead to a realistic understanding that, where possible, broader alliances and other arenas of actions can be the appropriate strategy for socialist transformation of society.

ARENA 2: WORKING OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM: LOCAL ACTION

Using schools and educational sites as arenas of cultural struggle and education in general as a vehicle for social transformation is premised upon a clear commitment to work with communities (see Martin, 2005), parents and students, and with the trade unions and workers within those institutions. This is the second arena of resistance, working outside the classroom on issues relating to education and its role in reproducing inequality and oppression.

Working ‘with’ means ‘knowing’ the daily, material existence of the exploited class stata and groups. Ideally it means fulfilling the role of the organic intellectual, organically linked to and part of those groups. This also means working with communities – and their own despair and anger and hope and desire – in developing the perception that schools and education themselves are sites of social economic and ideological contestation, not ‘neutral’ or ‘fair’ or ‘inevitable’, but sites of economic, cultural and ideological domination, of class domination. It is thereby important to develop awareness of the role of education in capital reproduction and in the reproduction of class relations.

ARENA 3: MASS ACTION AS PART OF A BROADER MOVEMENT FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Globally and nationally societies are developing and have always developed, to a greater or lesser degree, critical educators, community activists, organic intellectuals, students and teachers whose feelings of outrage at economic and social class and racial and gender and other forms of oppression lead them/us into activism. Thus, the *third arena* for resistance is action across a broader agenda, linking issues and experience within different economic and social sectors, linking different struggles.

This arena is linked to the other arenas. It is being part of action, part of networks, part of mini- and of mass action. Ideological intervention in classrooms and in other cultural sites can have a dramatic effect, not least

on some individuals and groups who are 'hailed' or, in Althusser's (1971) terminology, 'interpellated' by resistant ideology. However, actualising that ideology, that opposition to oppressive law or state or capitalist action, the effect of taking part in, feeling the solidarity, feeling the blood stir, feeling the pride in action, the joint learning that comes from that experience, can develop confidence, understanding, commitment.

The protests in France, Germany, Spain, Belgium and other European states and in states from South Korea to India against (variously) the deregulation of labour laws, and the privatisation of public services from pensions to post offices, were a massive learning experience for the participants. The global protest marches against the 'War on Iraq', (with banners proclaiming 'No Blood for Oil' and 'Not in Our Name') too, are widely seen as marches against United States neoliberal capitalist imperialism. So too, of course, were the mass protests against the WTO at Seattle, Genoa, London and Barcelona, together with the various mass events associated with the WSF (World Social Forum). In election after election in Latin America people are voting out neoliberal Parties – in Venezuela, Bolivia, Brazil, Uruguay... and the Argentinian economic melt-down of a former beacon of neoliberalism is helping create an anti-neoliberal bloc of governments. These events are/ have been a learning experience for those who thought such mass actions, whether internationally or nationally, was a product of a bygone age¹⁷.

Through well-organised and focused non-sectarian campaigns organised around class and anti-capitalist issues¹⁸, those committed to economic

17 Many commentators on the Radical Left are hugely optimistic. John Pilger (2002) suggests that 'today, under countless banners, from the anti-globalisation movement to the Stop the War campaign, the new movement, drawing millions all over the world, may well be the greatest'. And the striking success and popularity of President Hugo Chavez in Venezuela is widely reported in the liberal and left Press internationally (e.g. Gott, 2005a. See also Gott, 2005b). So, too, are electoral successes of new alliances and forces of merged or allied Left political parties in Germany (the Linkspartei), Portugal (Bloco de Esquerda), UK (the RESPECT Coalition), and France (with the Union Communiste, the combined slates for elections in 2003-2004 of the two largest Trotskyite parties, the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire and Lutte Ouvriere).

18 Harman (2002) suggests that what matters now is for this (new) generation (of activists) to connect with the great mass of ordinary workers who as well as suffering under the system have the collective strength to fight it (p.40).

Moody (2002) concurs- 'By itself, and despite its ability to breach police lines, this 'movement of movements' lacks the social weight to carry out the very task it has set itself- the dismantling of the mechanisms of capitalist globalisation (p.293).

and social equality and justice and environmental sustainability can work towards local, national and international campaigns, towards an understanding that we are part of a massive force – the force of the international – and growing – (see Harman, 2002; Hill, 2003, 2004) working class – with a shared understanding that, at the current time, it is the global neoliberal form of capitalism – indeed, capitalism itself – that shatters the lives, bodies and dreams of billions. And that it can be replaced. □

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (2001). *Educating the 'Right' Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*. New York and London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and State Apparatuses. In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.
- Brandt, D. (1991). *To Change this House: Popular Education Under the Sandinistas*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Brenner, R. (2002a). Speech at the Conference 'Politics Culture Resistance: Globalisation and its Discontents 2, University of Brighton, UK, November 3.
- Brenner, R. (2002b). The Economy after the Boom: A Diagnosis. *International Viewpoint: News and Analysis for Socialists Worldwide*, 342, July/ August, pp. 24-33.
- Brenner, R. (2002c). *The Boom and the Bubble: The US in the World Economy*. London: Verso.
- Burbules, N. and Berk, R. (1999). Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy. In T. Popkewitz and L. Fendler (eds.) *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Carvel, J. (2004). Super Rich have Doubled their Money under New Labour. *The Guardian* (London), December 8, 2004, p. 9.
- Coates, B. (2001). GATS. In E. Bircham and J. Charlton (eds.) *Anti-Capitalism: A Guide to the Movement*. London: Bookmarks.
- Cole, M., Hill, D., McLaren, P. and Rikowski, G. (2001). *Red Chalk: On Schooling, Capitalism and Politics*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.
- Denny, C. and Elliot, L. (2002). 100m more must survive on \$1 a day. *The Guardian* (London) June 19.
- Gillborn, D. and Mirza, H. (2000). *Educational Inequality: Mapping Race, Class and Gender*. London: Ofsted.

Gillborn, D. and Youdell, D. (2000). *Rationing Education: Policy, Practice, Reform and Equity*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Giroux, H. (2002). The Corporate War Against Higher Education. *Workplace: A Journal of Academic Labour*, 5.1. <http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue5p1/giroux.html>

Giroux, H. and Searls-Giroux, S. (2004). *Take Back High Education: Race, Youth, and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Grieshaber-Otto, J. and Sanger, M. (2002). *Perilous Lessons: The Impact of the WTO Service Agreement (GATS) on Canadian Public Education*. Ottawa, ON, Canada: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Harman, C. (2002). The Workers of the World. *International Socialism*, 96, pp. 3-45.

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hatcher, R. (2001). Getting Down to the Business: Schooling in the Globalised Economy. *Education and Social Justice*, 3 (2) pp.45-59.

Hill, D. (1991). *What's Left in Teacher Education: Teacher Education, the Radical Left and Policy Proposals*. London: Tufnell Press.

Hill, D. (1999). *New Labour and Education: Policy, Ideology and the Third Way*. London: Tufnell Press.

Hill, D. (2001a). State Theory and the Neoliberal Reconstruction of Teacher Education: A Structuralist Neo-Marxist Critique of Postmodernist, Quasi-Postmodernist, and Culturalist Neo-Marxist Theory. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22 (1) pp.137-157.

Hill, D. (2001b). *The Third Way in Britain: New Labour's Neoliberal Education Policy*. Paper presented at the Conference Marx 111, Paris, September 2001, Universite de Sorbonne/ Nanterre, Paris. Online at <http://www.ieps.org.uk>

Hill, D. (2002a). Globalisation, Education and Critical Action. *EDUcate: A Quarterly on Education and Development* (The Sindh Education Foundation, Pakistan), 2 (1) pp.42-45.

Hill, D. (2002b). The Radical Left and Education Policy: Education for Economic and Social Justice, *Education and Social Justice*, 4 (3) pp.41-51.

Hill, D. (2003). Global Neoliberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1 (1). Online at: <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7>

Hill, D. (2004). Books, Banks and Bullets: Controlling Our Minds- the Global Project of Imperialistic and Militaristic Neoliberalism and its Effect on Education Policy, *Policy Futures*, 2 (3) (Theme: Marxist Futures in Education). Online at <http://www.triangle.co.uk/pfie/>

Hill, D. (2005a). Globalisation and its Educational Discontents: Neoliberalisation and its Impacts on Access, Equality, Democracy, Critical Thought, and Education Workers' Rights, Pay and Conditions, *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*.

Hill, D. (2005b). State Theory and the Neoliberal Reconstruction of Schooling and Teacher Education. In G. Fischman, P. McLaren, H. Sünker and C. Lankshear (eds.) *Critical Theories, Radical Pedagogies and Global Conflicts*, pp. 23-51. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hill, D. (ed.) (2006a). *Globalisation/ Neoliberalism/ Education and Resistance Vol 4: Rich Countries*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.

Hill, D. (ed.) (2006b). *Globalisation/ Neoliberalism/ Education and Resistance Vol 3: Low and Middle Income Countries*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.

Hill, D. with Anijar, K., Brown, C., Davidson-Harden, A., Gabbard, D., Gindin, J., Kuehn, L., Lewis, C., Mukhtar, A., Pardinaz-Solis, R., Quiros, B., Shugurensky, D., Smaller, H., Templer, B. (2006 forthcoming). Education Services Liberalisation. In E. Roskam (ed.) *Winners or Losers? Liberalising Public Services*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.

Hill, D., McLaren, P., Cole, M. and Rikowski, G. (eds.) (2002). *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Press.

Hillcole Group (1991). *Changing the Future: Redprint for Education*. London: Tufnell Press.

Hillcole Group (1997). *Rethinking Education and Democracy: A Socialist Alternative for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Tufnell Press.

Hirtt, N. (2004). "Three Axes of Merchandisation", in *European Educational Research Journal*, 3, (2) 442-453. Online at <http://www.wwords.co.uk/eeerj/>

Kagarlitsky, B. (2001) Facing the Crisis. *Links*, September-December 19, 2001.

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, pp. 9-13.

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

Kidron, M. (2002). Failing Growth and Rampant Costs. *International Socialism*, 96 pp. 87-103.

Krupskaya, N. (1985). *On Labour-oriented Education and Instruction*. Moscow: Progressive Publishers.

Lardner, J. (2004). Whiter is Wealthier. Online at http://inequality.typepad.com/newswatch/2004/10/whiter_is_wealt.html

Levidow, L. (2002). Marketising Higher Education: Neoliberal and Counter-Strategies. *Education and Social Justice*, 3 (2), pp.12-23. Also available at *The Commoner*, 3, January. Online at <http://www.commoner.org.uk/03levidow.pdf>

Martin, G. (2005). You Can't Be Neutral on a Moving Bus: Critical Pedagogy as Community Praxis. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 3 (2).

- Marx, K. (1974) [1852]. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. In *Surveys from Exile*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Marx, K. (1978) [1845]. Six Theses on Feuerbach. In Tucker, R. (ed.) *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Marx, K. (1978) [1847]. The Poverty of Philosophy. In Tucker, R. (ed.) *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels (1978) [1848]. The Communist Manifesto. In R. Tucker (ed.) *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paolo Freire and the Pedagogy of Revolution*. Lanham, MD and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (2001). Marxist Revolutionary Praxis: A Curriculum of Transgression. *Journal of Critical Inquiry into Curriculum and Instruction*, 3 (3) pp.27-32.
- McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy Against Empire*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. (2001a). The Globalisation of Capitalism and the New Imperialism: Notes Towards a Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 23 (3) pp.271-315.
- McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. and Scatamburlo-D'Annibale, V. (2004). Class Dismissed? Historical Materialism and the Politics of 'Difference.' *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36 (2) 2004.
- McMurtry, J. (1999). *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Moody, K. (2001). Unions. In E. Bircham and J. Charlton (eds.) *Anti-Capitalism: A Guide to the Movement*. London: Bookmarks.
- Pilger, J. (2002). *The New Rulers of the World*. London: Verso.
- Reimers, F. (2000). *Unequal Schools, Unequal Chances: The Challenges to Equal Opportunity in the Americas*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Rikowski, G. (2001a). *The Battle in Seattle*. London: Tufnell Press.
- Rikowski, G. (2001b). 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.
- Rikowski, G. (2003). Schools and the GATS Enigma. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1 (1). Online at <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=8>
- Rikowski, G. (2005). *Silence on the Wolves: What is Absent in New Labour's Five Year Strategy for Education*, Occasional Paper published by the Education Research Centre, University of Brighton, UK.

- Roskam, E. (ed.) (2005). *Winners or Losers? Liberalising Public Services*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Saunois, T. (2002). Radical Latin America. *Socialism Today*, 70, pp.6-7.
- Schugurensky, D. and Davidson-Harden, A. (2003). From Cordoba to Washington: WTO/GATS and Latin American Education, in *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1 (3) pp. 321-357.
- Skeggs, B. (1991). Post-modernism: What is All the Fuss About? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 12 (2) pp.255-267.
- Weissman, R. (2003). Corporate Globalisation and the Global Gap Between Rich and Poor. *Multinational Monitor Magazine*, 24 (7/8) July / August 2003. Online at http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Third_World/Grotesque_Inequality.html
- Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution and Choice in Education: The School, the State and the Market*. Buckingham: Open University Press. ●