

REFLEXIONES

■ Education in Contemporary
Capitalism Britain: Actual and Potential
Mike Cole

Resumen

Este trabajo comienza con unos breves comentarios sobre las sociedades capitalistas contemporáneas, centrándose en la mercantilización del conocimiento y la agenda capitalista *para y en* educación. Al adentrarse en el terreno crucial de la formación de maestros, el autor analiza la vigilancia estatal para luego hacer unas sugerencias sobre las posibilidades que brinda la educación para crear una arena eficaz en la cual se puedan tratar los asuntos globales y locales, donde los estudiantes se puedan conectar con las comunidades oprimidas, y donde puedan desarrollar su conciencia crítica sobre el mundo neoliberal e imperialista de la actualidad.

Palabras clave

Marxismo, capitalismo, pedagogía crítica, mercantilización de la educación, estrategias pedagógicas, conciencia crítica.

Abstract

In this paper, I begin with some brief comments on education in contemporary capitalist societies, focusing on the commodification of knowledge, and the capitalist agendas, *for* and *in* education. Next, concentrating my attention on the crucial terrain of teacher education, I look at state surveillance, before making some detailed suggestions on the possibilities within education in general of creating an arena where global and local issues may be addressed; where students may connect with oppressed communities; and where they may critically develop their awareness of pressing issues concerning our current neoliberal, imperialist, capitalist world.

Key words

Marxism, capitalism, critical pedagogy, commodification, pedagogical strategies, critical awareness.

Education in Contemporary Capitalism Britain: Actual and Potential*

Mike Cole¹

Introduction

In contemporary societies, we are in many ways being globally mis-educated. The Bush and Blair administrations' propaganda war about "weapons of mass destruction", aimed at masking new imperialist designs and capital's global quest for imperial hegemony and oil, is an obvious example. "Information warfare", whereby deliberate lies are spread as a weapon of war, is a key imperialist strategy, and, indeed, *modus operandi* of capitalism. This needs to be seen in the general context of what David Geoffrey Smith (2003) has referred to as "enfraudening the public sphere". But enfraudening the public sphere is only half the story. "Education" has become a key component in the profit-making system itself. In addition, in contemporary capitalism, relationships between workers and the state, and, indeed workers, and other workers increasingly take on a commercial aspect. In more general terms, the intense creative energy of the working class is being channelled into consumption: for example pubs/alcohol and drugs, clubs, pop music, chat shows, football, soaps, play stations, the internet and CDs/DVDs.

* Texto recibido el 23 de octubre de 2006, evaluado y arbitrado el 30 de octubre de 2006.

¹ Research Professor in Education and Equality and Head of Research at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, UK. He has published widely in the area of education and equality, and is well known for his research into issues of Marxism and Educational Theory. In October 2006, he undertook a brief lecture tour including the Bolivarian University of Venezuela in Caracas, the University of the West Indies in Saint Augustine, Trinidad, and Universidad Pedagógica Nacional in Bogotá.
mike.cole2@ntlworld.com

Commodification

The commodification of everyday life and, in particular, the commodification of knowledge, is an important tactic of neo-liberal global capital. The starting point for Marx in the 3 volumes of *Capital* is an analysis of commodities. In *Capital*, vol. 1, chapter 2, Marx makes a distinction between use value and exchange value (1965 [1887], pp. 35-83). Like every other commodity in capitalist society, knowledge has both a use value and an exchange value. What is significant about contemporary capitalist society is the extent to which, after it has been produced, knowledge is commodified and consumed in schools and universities like hamburgers (its exchange function both in schools and in the world of work has become hyper-dominant and its use-value of benefit to capital).

In the education system in general, we have moved to a situation where everything is judged by the finished product or commodity. Success in schooling, in Britain for example, is judged by Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs) and by league tables, rather than the acquisition of knowledge, let alone emancipatory knowledge (see below). Tied to the needs of global, corporate capital, “education” worldwide has been reduced to the creation of a flexible work force, the openly acknowledged, indeed lauded (by both capitalists and politicians) requirement of today’s global markets (e.g. Cole, 2005a). Furthermore, for those planning our schools system, the demands of globalized capital can never be satisfied once-and-for all. For example, as the 2005 New Labour White Paper on education in Britain put it: “Standards must keep rising in the globalized world in which we now live” (Her Majesty’s Government, 2005, p. 7).

Corporate global, national and local capital is in schools, both in the sense of determining the curriculum and exercising burgeoning control of schools as businesses (Allen *et al.*, 1999; McLaren and Farahmandpur, 1999a, 1999b, McLaren, 2003). Hatcher (2001, p. 1) has identified three agendas for neo-liberal capital with respect to schooling in Britain. He describes them as the “business agenda for *what* the school system should produce; an agenda for *how* it should do it; and an agenda for what business itself should do *within* the school system”, i.e. make profit. Hill (e.g. 2004a, 2004b, 2005) has renamed the first and third of Hatcher’s agendas as Capital’s agenda *for* Education and Capital’s agenda *in* Education, and applied them globally. For the purposes of this chapter, I will deal with these two agendas only.

The Capitalist Agenda for Education

This capitalist agenda *for* education relates to the role of education in producing the kind of workforce that is currently required by global capitalist enterprises. It is thus about making profits *indirectly*. In economic theory, this agenda is connected to *human capital theory*. In mainstream labour economics, human capital theory uses

a restricted account based on skills and knowledge: creating workers who are flexible and meet the requirements of capitalist enterprises at any given time. Marxists have long argued that personality traits and attitudes should be added to skills and knowledge (e.g. Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Frith, 1980; Rikowski, 2000, 2005). The Capitalist Agenda *for* Education is thus about creating the kind of workers that will “fit in” with capital’s needs. In practical terms, the Capitalist Agenda *for* Education means involving the private sector in the running of schools to ensure that government and institutional aims for education correspond to market needs. Not only do governments regulate this process, but so also do (relatively) new state apparatuses. In the case of Britain, for example, there is the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), policing schools and teacher education, the Training and Development Agency (TDA) regulating teacher education and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) as a general overseer. As Hatcher (2006, p. 600) puts it, control by teachers and Local Education Authorities (LEAs) has been displaced by two new categories of agents: OFSTED, the TDA, the QCA and the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, on the one hand, and private companies, on the other. The strategic function of the private sector in the school system “is to discipline and transform the old institutional sites of power” (Clarke and Newman, 1997, p. 29, cited in Hatcher, 2006, p. 600).

The Capitalist Agenda in Education

As Hill (2005b) argues, the capitalist agenda *in* education relates to the role of education in providing profits for capitalists *directly*. It centres on setting business “free” in education, extracting profits from privately controlled/owned schools (Ibid). This involves privatising either the schools themselves or privatising services to schools. Privatising schools is a particular feature of “developing countries” (e.g. Argentina, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Pakistan) (Hill, 2005a, 2005b). Hatcher (personal correspondence) has described this as “the educational dimension of imperialism”. Developed countries, in general, do not want to privatise their own school systems, relying instead on forms of public-private partnerships. However, “peripheral services” (catering, security, reprographics and consultancy fees) are privatised for profit. In addition, student fees or loans are run for profit by private corporations rather than by the local or national state.

With respect to commodification in universities and vocational further education, but equally prescient to the education system in general, Hill has argued that the language of education has been very widely replaced by the language of the market. Lecturers “deliver the product”, “operationalize delivery” and “facilitate clients” learning”, within a regime of “quality management and enhancement”, where students have become “customers” who select “modules” on a pick’n’mix basis. “Skill development” at universities has surged in importance to the derogation of the development of critical thought (Hill, 2004c; see also Hill, 2003).

State Surveillance: a Case Study of Teacher Education in Britain

All attempts to mobilize resistance to neo-liberal global capitalism and imperialism can invoke intense surveillance and persecution from the capitalist state. In Britain, for example, historically this has been particularly the case with teacher education. This is because teacher educators can have a major influence on future teachers, and thereby, in turn, the next generation. By way of example, between 1987 and 1993, during the Thatcher and post-Thatcher Tory governments in Britain, I personally was under general attack from the Right-wing educational establishment of the time (see Cole, 1990). This included allegations of “Marxist bias” in my teaching in the School of Education at Brighton Polytechnic (now the University of Brighton). The extent to which my work was perceived as a threat is evidenced by the fact that negative references to it are cited in *The Spectator* (15th October, 1988), by the then influential Radical Right Hillgate Group (1989, pp. 29-35) and in the first volume of Margaret Thatcher’s memoirs (Thatcher, 1993, pp. 597-598). It also involved a libel writ from a high-ranking Tory Peer (Cole, 2004, currently in press).

For Thatcher (who believed that there was “no such thing as society, only individuals and their families” and Thatcherites, attacks on less powerful individuals, such as isolated academics, was *par for the course*, and part of the ongoing assault on anything viewed as being not conducive to the neo-Conservative agenda—in this case, a (perceived) radical Left threat to schooling from within teacher education.

Like Thatcher, current prime Minister Tony Blair targets societal structures that impede “modernisation” (read “neo-liberal capitalism”) (see chapter 7) but he does not tend to personally attack individuals in academia. This is no longer necessary, since teacher education (and schooling) has been conformed to the neo-liberal agenda. Thatcherism achieved its main objectives in detheorizing teacher education (Hill, 2001b, 2004c, currently in press). At Brighton Polytechnic (now the University of Brighton), for example, core course units validated under the 1984 Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) Criteria, which had focused on contextual and egalitarian issues in education (set out in Hill, 1989) were replaced in the late 1980s. Their content and concepts became, under the 1989 and then the 1992/93 CATE Criteria, less visible in the successor BA Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) courses. Surveillance of teacher education under New Labour thus takes a different form; namely Ofsted inspections and the enforcement, set out in its various publications, of the Teacher Training Agency’s (later, Training and Development Agency) “national curriculum” for teacher education (Hill, 2001a, 2004a, 2004c, currently in press) (as far as schooling in general is concerned, this “national curriculum” exists partly as a result of increased surveillance in schools in the form of school Ofsted inspections, league tables, the literacy and numeracy strategies, and so on).

The Potential of Education

The Campaign for the Future of Higher Education (CFHE, 2003), referring to HE, but equally prescient to education in general, has commented on the inherent problems with commodification:

Students are neither customers nor clients; academics neither facilitators nor a pizza delivery service. Universities are not businesses, producing consumer goods. Knowledge and thought are not commodities, to be purchased as items of consumption, whether conspicuous or not, or consumed and therefore finished with, whether on the hoof as take-away snacks or in more leisurely fashion. Education is not something which can be “delivered”, consumed and crossed off the list. Rather, it is a continuing and reflective process, an essential component of any worthwhile life –the very antithesis of a commodity.

Arguing in a similar vein, John McMurtry has suggested that: “[t]he commodification of education rules out the very critical freedom and academic rigour which education requires to be more than indoctrination” (McMurtry, 1991, p. 2). Peter McLaren provides an alternative vision of education. Education should, he argues, following Paulo Freire, put “social and political analysis of everyday life at the centre of the curriculum” (McLaren, 2003, p. xxix). What then might appear on a critically reflective, academically rigorous and socially and politically aware education curriculum? First of all, students need to address the global.

Global Issues

Students would benefit from engaging in an analysis of the mechanics of capitalist production and exchange. Marxism would be an obvious starting point. Such an analysis should have as central a discussion of the Labour Theory of Value (LTV) since this most clearly explains exactly *why* Marxists believe that capitalism is *objectively* a system of exploitation (the teaching of the LTV was, in fact, compulsory in secondary schools in the former Yugoslavia). Students could consider the concept of globalization. Is it a new phenomenon, or is it as old as capitalism itself? Is it inevitable, as claimed by many, to what extent is the concept of globalization ideological? Does it hide more than it reveals? Students could also be introduced to theories of power (e.g. Marx and Foucault), and could be encouraged to investigate aspects of control, the process of commodification, as outlined above, the creation of violence in nation states (e.g. transmodern and Marxist interpretations; see Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapters 6 and 8, and destructive patterns in the earth’s ecosystems). Differing interpretations of the role of racism in the world (see Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapters 8 and 9) could be compared and assessed.

Ecosocialism

McLaren and Houston (2005, p. 167) have argued that “escalating environmental problems at all geographical scales from local to global have become a pressing reality that critical educators can no longer afford to ignore”. They go on to cite “the complicity between global profiteering, resource colonization, and the wholesale ecological devastation that has become a matter of everyday life for most species on the planet” (Ibid.) (See Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 7, for a discussion). Noting the wealth of ecosocialist scholarship that has emerged in recent years, McLaren and Houston, following Kahn (2003), state the need for “a critical dialogue between social and eco-justice” (Ibid., p. 168). They call for a dialectics of ecological and environmental justice to reveal the malign interaction between capitalism, imperialism and ecology that has created widespread environmental degradation which has dramatically accelerated with the onset of neo-liberalism (Ibid., p. 172; see Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 7 for a discussion of these interconnections). McLaren and Houston (Ibid., p. 174) then propose an educational framework, of which the pivot is class exploitation, but which also, following Gruenwald, 2003, interrogates the intersection between “urbanization, racism, classism², sexism, environmentalism, global economics, and other political themes”. The classroom is a good arena to discuss issues, ranging from what is happening in the immediate vicinity of the school, to issues at the national policy level, through to ecosocial issues connected to the global survival of the planet. Students could begin by discussing the issues outlined in Cole, forthcoming, 2007, Chapter 7: the destruction of resources; unhealthy food; genetic modification; and climate change, including the threat posed by nuclear power. They could then interrogate the causes, and assess the likely chances of changes under neo-liberal capitalism and the “New Imperialism” –for example, what can be done *now* to address these pressing issues, and how a world socialist system might do things differently.

Imperialism

Students also need to be critically aware of systems of imperialism. Transmodernism and Marxism, as argued in Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 8, can be important in facilitating this. If we are to return to the teaching of imperialism, past and present, with integrity in schools and universities, the syllabus must, I would argue, incorporate the following, *in addition* to a critical analysis of the actual events themselves.

² Classism refers to discrimination on the grounds of class. Marxists oppose classism, as they do all the other exploitative “isms” (see Cole, 2005b, pp. 13-16). However, they do not believe that class equality is possible under capitalism, since capitalism’s fundamental feature is the exploitation of one class by another (see Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 2).

First, there must be a thorough and critical analysis of theories of imperialism, classical, Keynesian, postmodern *and* Marxist (e.g. Barret Brown, 1976). This should include the connection between imperialism and modes of production. Second, as a case study, given its continuing historical legacy worldwide, there could be a discussion of the way in which British imperialism was taught in the past and why. Third, and allied to this, students need to be given the critical faculties and skills to deconstruct pro-British imperialist and/or racist movies and/or TV series, still readily available in the age of multiple channel, digital TV. Fourth, at a national level, students need a critical awareness of how British Imperialism relates to and impacts on racism and racialization, both historically and in the present (see Cole forthcoming, 2007, chapters 8 and 9), including the ability to make links with and understand current manifestations of nationalism, xenophobia, xenoracism and xenoracialization, discussed in Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapters 8 and 9. Fifth, at a global level, students will need skills to evaluate the New Imperialism and “the permanent war” being waged by the United States with the acquiescence of Britain. Boulangé (2004) argues that it is essential at this time, with the Bush/Blair “war on terror” and Islamophobia worldwide reaching new heights, for teachers to show solidarity with Muslims in schools today. For “this will strengthen the unity of all workers, whatever their religion” (Boulangé, 2004, p. 24), and this will have a powerful impact on the struggle against racism in all spheres of society, and education in particular. In turn, this will strengthen the confidence of workers and students to fight on other issues. I believe that equipping students with a variety of analytic tools to assess imperialisms, past and present, would be a most effective tool in increasing awareness of racism. The particular strengths of the Marxist concept of racialization would be the linking of forms of racism to modes of production. (See Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapters 8 and 9).

According to the neo-Conservative, Ferguson (2003):

Empire is as “cutting edge” as you could wish ... [It] has got everything: economic history, social history, cultural history, political history, military history and international history –not to mention contemporary politics (just turn on the latest news from Kabul). Yet it knits all these things together with ... a “metanarrative.”

For Marxists, an understanding of the metanarrative of imperialism, past and present, does much more than this. Marxists would argue that, such an understanding takes us to the crux of the trajectory of capitalism from its inception right up to the 21st century; and this is why Marxists should endorse the teaching of imperialism, old and new. For a number of years, British Imperialism was taught in British schools in ways that exalted the British Empire (e.g. Cole, 1992, 2004c; Cole and Blair, 2006). A critical and comprehensive study of British Imperialism, on the other hand, would enable students to make connections

between the treatment meted out to those in the former colonies and the experiences of Asian, black and other minority ethnic groups in Britain up to the 21st Century (see, for example, Cole, 1992, 2004b, 2004c; Cole and Blair, 2006; Cole and Virdee, 2006). Concepts of racism, racialization, xenoracism and xenoracialization would enable links to be made with the current demonisation of refugees, asylum seekers and 21st Century migrant workers, for example from Eastern Europe. Of course, the role of education in general, and teaching about imperialism in schools in particular, has its limitations and young people are deeply affected by other influences and socialised by the media (hence the need for media awareness: see below), parents/carers and by peer culture. There is a need to reintroduce an *honest* evaluation of imperialism in British schools, the choice being between a continued enslavement by an ignorance of Britain's imperial past, or an empowered awareness of it. Such awareness would also begin to facilitate the process of understanding new imperialisms. An obvious link between the new US Empire and environmental issues is oil (see Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 7, for a discussion of the significance of oil in environmental destruction and Cole, forthcoming, 2007, chapter 8, on the new US Empire)

Marxism most clearly connects old and new imperialisms with capitalism. It also provides an explanation for xenoracism and xenoracialization. Islamophobia, the "war on terror" and other forms of racism are necessary to keep the populace on task for "permanent war" and the accumulation of global profits.

With respect to current US Imperialism, education can either render it as "common sense", as inevitable, or even as benign, or education could put it under constant challenge. Education, by default, might aid its progress, or it could contribute to a critical awareness of US Imperialism's manifestations, and, from a Marxist perspective, the need for its demise, and replacement with a new world order.

Local Issues

Students need to be able to relate to shifting patterns of globalization and their effect on local communities. Students should connect their professional needs with local community struggles for better jobs, working conditions, health services, day care facilities, housing and so on. Such struggles may be connected with or mediated by local, national or international issues. For Marxists struggles are local, national and international, and are all underscored by developments in global, national and local capital, connected (historically) to modes of production.

Oppressed Communities

Fischman and McLaren (2005) stress the need to interact with local oppressed communities. What is required is reciprocal knowledge. This should involve moving beyond white, Anglo-Saxon, middle class and heterosexist educational norms,

and in Fischman and McLaren's (2005, p. 352) words, we should "explore the subjugated knowledges of women [and] minority groups". Oppression based on identities other than class is now acknowledged in recent and current Marxist analysis and practice³. The argument is that it is not just a case of *thinking* differently about oppressed communities, but also about interacting with reciprocity and mutuality. The Marxist concept of racialization is also most pertinent in connecting with oppressed communities, since it helps understand, in relation to different historical periods, and in relation to the changing imperatives of capitalism and imperialism, how and why certain groups are oppressed. A move beyond traditional educational norms would, by necessity, involve students in a number of struggles. For Marxists, local struggles would, of course, relate to national and international struggles. It would be important to make interconnections between them.

Media Awareness

A media literacy curriculum is most important in order to acquire the range of literacies required to engage critically with hegemonic discourses. Students need to be able to find ways of decoding these discourses. Given the ongoing process of commodification, in large part facilitated by multi-media capitalism, and the way in which the media has historically and contemporaneously racialized certain groups, media literacy remains an urgent priority. In addition to being able to decode 'the news' as it is presented in capitalist societies, students also need to be able to understand the full range of programmes available in the age of multi-channel television, including those meant to be primarily entertainment (the majority) as well as those meant to be serious. Decoding and understanding the internet is also an urgent task. Understandably, given their counter-hegemonic potential, media studies have traditionally been demeaned by ruling elites as non-academic.

Theoretical Sophistication

I would like to suggest that, at the heart of the education process, space is created for a consideration, both historic and contemporary, of the varying understandings of society, provided by *theory*, including postmodernism/poststructuralism, transmodernism, Critical Race Theory and Marxism (these issues are discussed in depth in Cole, forthcoming, 2007). This would not only stimulate debate about the nature of our world, it might encourage students to transcend "common sense" and to move towards a critical understanding of all that envelops them. It might also engender a belief that a different world is possible, that "history is always in the making" (Fischman and McLaren, 2005, p. 356). This could include a consideration of the economic and political systems in countries such as Cuba and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

² For Marxist and other Left socialist analyses of the relationship between education and gender, "race", sexuality, disability and social class, see Cole (ed.) (2006).

Finally, in the context of the relentless and ongoing “war on terror”, there needs to be an analysis of the various meanings and interpretations of “terror” and “terrorism”, and their relationships to global and national systems, past and present. For example, an analysis could be undertaken of the notion that “one person’s terrorist is another’s freedom fighter”. Examples could be drawn from the apartheid era in South Africa and the relationship between the British State and the IRA. Further work could assess how terrorism fits into recent and historical events, related in various ways to the concept of empire.

This model of education is to do with empowerment. As Antonia Darder (2002, p. 110) has put it: “Empowerment ... entails participation in pedagogical relationships in which students experience the freedom to break through the imposed myths and illusions that stifle their empowerment ... and the space to take individual and collective actions that can ... transform their lives.”

And, of course, the lives of others.

References

- ALLEN, M., BENN, C., CHITTY, C., COLE, M., HATCHER, R., HIRT, N. and RIKOWSKI, G. (1999). *Business, Business, Business: New Labour’s Education Policy*, London: the Tufnell Press.
- BARRET-BROWN, M. (1976). *The Economics of Imperialism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BOULANGÉ, A. (2004). The hijab, racism and the state, *International Socialism*, 102, Spring, pp. 3-26.
- BOWLES, S. and GINTIS, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- CLARKE, J. and NEWMAN, J. (1997). *The Managerial State*. London: Sage.
- CAMPAIGN FOR THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION (CFHE) (2003). Online Available <http://www.cfhe.org.uk>
- COLE, M. (1990). The Radical Right and Academic Freedom: A Personal Testimony. Paper presented to the annual conference of the Anti-Racist Teacher Education Network (ARTEN), Birmingham (available from the author: Mike.Cole2@ntlworld.com)
- _____. (1992). *Racism, History and Educational Policy: From the Origins of the Welfare State to the Rise of the Radical Right*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Essex.
- _____. (2004a). Rethinking the Future: the Commodification of Knowledge and the Grammar of Resistance. In M. Benn and C. Chitty (Eds.), *A Tribute to Caroline Benn: Education and Democracy*. London: Continuum.
- _____. (2004b). Rule Britannia and the new American Empire: a Marxist analysis of the teaching of imperialism,

- actual and potential, in the British school curriculum. *Policy Futures in Education* 2 (3 and 4), pp. 523-538. Online. Available Http: http://www.worldwords.co.uk/pfie/content/pdfs/2/issue2_3.asp#7 (accessed 8 August 2006).
- _____. (2004c). "Brutal and Stinking" and "Difficult to Handle": the Historical and Contemporary Manifestations of Racialization, Institutional Racism, and Schooling in Britain. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 7 (1), 35-56.
- _____. (2005). Introductory Chapter: Education and Equality - Some Conceptual and Practical Issues. In M. Cole (Ed.) *Professional Values and Practice: Meeting the Standards* 3rd edi., London: David Fulton.
- _____. (ed.) (2006). *Education, Equality and Human Rights: Issues of Gender, 'Race', Sexuality, Disability and Social Class* (2nd Edi). London: Routledge.
- _____. and BLAIR, M. (2006). "Racism and Education: from Empire to New Labour". In M. Cole (Ed.), *Education, Equality and Human Rights: Issues of Gender, 'Race', Sexuality, Disability and Social Class* (2nd Ed.) London: Routledge.
- _____. and VIRDEE, S. (2006). Racism and Resistance: from Empire to New Labour. In M. Cole (Ed.), *Education, Equality and Human Rights: Issues of Gender, 'Race', Sexuality, Disability and Social Class* (2nd Edi). London: Routledge.
- _____. (Forthcoming, 2007). *Marxism and Educational Theory: Origin and issues*, London New York: Routledge.
- DARDER, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: a pedagogy of love*. Cambridge MA: Westview Press.
- FERGUSON, N. (2003). Prince and empire are the key to history. *The Sunday Times*, July 6th.
- FISCHMAN, G. and McLAREN, P. (2005). Is there any Space for Hope: Teacher Education and Social Justice in the Age of Globalization and Terror. In G. _____, SUNKER, H. and LANKSHEAR, C. (Eds.), *Critical Theories, Radical Pedagogies, and Global Conflicts*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- FRITH, S. (1980). Education, Training and the Labour Process. In M. Cole and B. Skelton (Eds.), *Blind Alley: Youth in a Crisis of Capital*. Ormskirk: Hesketh.
- GRUENWALD, D. A. (2003). The Best of Both Worlds: A Critical Pedagogy of Place. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-12.
- HATCHER, R (2001). *The business of education: How business agendas drive Labour's policies for schools*. Stafford: Socialist Educational Association.
- _____. (2006). Privatization and Sponsorship: the re-agenting of the school system in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21 (5), 599-619.
- HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT. (2005). *Higher Standards, Better Schools for all: more choice for parents and pupils*. London: DfES.
- HILL, D. (1989). *Charge of the Right Brigade: The Radical Right's attack on Teacher Education*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.

- _____. (2001a). State Theory and The Neo-Liberal Reconstruction of Schooling and Teacher Education: A Structuralist Neo-Marxist Critique of Postmodernist, Quasi-Postmodernist, and Culturalist Neo-Marxist Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22, (1) 137-157.
- _____. (2003). Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1 (1) <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7>
- _____. (2004a). *The Hillcole Group*. Online Available Http: <http://www.ieps.org.uk/cwc.net/hillcole.html> (accessed 3 September 2006)
- _____. (2004b). Enforcing Capitalist Education: force-feeding Capital through/ in the repressive and ideological educational apparatuses of the state. In E. Wayne Ross and D. Gabbard (Eds.), *Education and the Rise of the Security State*. New York: Praeger.
- _____. (2004c). Educational perversion and global neo-liberalism: a Marxist critique. *Cultural Logic: an electronic journal of Marxist Theory and Practice*. Online. Available <http://eserver.org/clogic/2004/2004.html> (accessed 8 August 2006).
- _____. (2005a). 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*. Boulder, CO, Rowman and Littlefield.
- _____. (2005b) Globalization and its educational discontents: neo-liberalization and its impacts on access, equality, democracy, critical thought, and education workers' rights pay and conditions. *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*.
- _____. (Forthcoming, 2006). *Charge Of The Right Brigade: The Radical Right Restructuring of Schooling and Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales under The Conservative and New Labour Governments 1979-2004*. Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen Press.
- THE HILLGATE GROUP. (1989) *Learning to Teach*. London: The Claridge Press in association with The Educational Research Centre.
- KAHN, R. (2003). Paulo Freire and Eco-Justice: Updating Pedagogy of the Oppressed for the Age of Ecological Calamity. Online. Available <http://getvegan.com/ecofreire.htm> (accessed 8 August 2006).
- MARX, K. (1965) [1887]. *Capital*, vol. 1. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- _____. (1967) [1893]. *Capital*, vol. 2. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- _____. (1966) [1894]. *Capital*, vol. 3, Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- McLAREN, P. (2003). Critical Pedagogy in the Age, of Neoliberal Globalization: notes Sion history underside. *Democracy and Nature*, 9 (1), 65-90.

- _____ and FARAHMANDPUR, R. (1999). Critical Multiculturalism and the Globalization of Capital: Some Implications for a Politics of Resistance, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 15 (4), 27-46.
- MCLAREN, P. and HOUSTON, D. (2005). Revolutionary Ecologies: Ecosocialism and Critical Pedagogy. In P. McLaren (Ed.). *Capitalists and Conquerors: a Critical Pedagogy Against Empire*. Lanham MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- MCMURTRY, J. (1991). Education and the Market Model. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, 25, 209-217.
- RIKOWSKI, G. (2000). *That Other Great Class of Commodities: Repositioning Marxist Educational Theory*, BERA Conference Paper, Cardiff University, 7-10 September. Online. Available Http: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001624.htm> (accessed 8 August 2006).
- _____. (2005). *Silence on the Wolves: what is absent in New Labour's Five Year Strategy for education*. Brighton: University of Brighton, Education Research Centre, Occasional Paper, May (available from ERC, University of Brighton, Mayfield House, Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9PH; Education.Research@brighton.ac.uk)
- SMITH, D. G. (2003). On Enfrauding the Public Sphere, the Futility of Empire and the Future of Knowledge after "America". *Policy Futures in Education*, 1 (2), 488-503. Online. Available Http: http://www.worlds.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=pfie&vol=1&issue=3&year=2003&article=4_Smith_PFIE_1_3_web&id=80.3.64.11 (accessed 8 August 2006).
- THATCHER, M. (1993) *The Downing Street Years*. London: Harper Collins.