

GLOBAL NEO-LIBERALISM AND THE PERVERSION OF EDUCATION

Dave Hill

**University College Northampton
The Institute for Education Policy Studies**

August 2002

In this paper I place the perversion of increasing inequality within education systems within the policy context of neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism is a global phenomenon- restructuring of schooling and education has taken place internationally under pressure from international capitalist organisations and compliant governments. I examine the effects of neo-liberal policies in increasing inequalities globally and nationally, and go on to make a critique of the theory of neo-liberalism, of how the marketisation of education has perverted the goals, motivations, methods, standards of excellence and standards of freedom in education. I conclude by looking at sites and arenas of resistance to the global neo-liberal perversion of education and by calling for cultural workers to work towards economic and social equality.

Key words: *Marxism, Socialism, Capitalism, Neo-Liberalism, Globalisation, Resistance, Education*

The Contexts of Educational Change

The current anti-egalitarian education system needs to be contextualised in two ways. Firstly, the ideological and policy context, and second, the global context. The restructuring of the schooling and education systems across the world is part of the ideological and policy offensive by neo-liberalism Capital. The privatisation of public services, the capitalisation and commodification of humanity and the global diktats of the agencies of international capital- backed by destabilisation of non-conforming governments and, ultimately, the armed cavalries of the USA and its surrogates- have resulted in the near-global establishment of competitive markets in public services such as education characterised. These are marked by selection, exclusion and the rampant growth of the national and international inequalities.

It is important to look at the big picture. Markets in education, so-called 'parental choice' of a diverse range of schools (or, in parts of the globe, the 'choice' as to whether to send children to school or not) privatisation of schools and other education providers, cutting state subsidies to education and other public services are only a part of the educational/ anti-public welfare strategy of the capitalist class.

National and global capitalism wishes to, and has succeeded in cutting public expenditure. It does this because public services are expensive. Cuts serve to reduce taxes on profits. In addition, the capitalist class has a Business Plan *for* Education and a Business Plan *in* Education. The former centres on socially producing labour-power (people's capacity to labour) for capitalist enterprises, the latter focuses on setting

business 'free' in education for profit-making. 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. Secondly, it wants to make profits from education and other privatised public services such as water supply and healthcare. Even where such privatisation and loss of tax/publicly funded clean water, clinics and schools results directly in death, disease and dumbing down.

The 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 co-operation, between humans. It is a creed and practice of racialized and gendered class exploitation, exploitation by the capitalist class of those who provide the profits through their labour, the working class.

John McMurtry's *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism* (1999) describes 'the Pathologization 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 (hence the 'cancer' stage of capitalism) small businesses, innovators, etc. that are potential competitors. Thus, opening education to the market, in the long run, will open it to the corporate giants - who will run it in their own interests.

Glenn Rikowski (for example in *The Battle in Seattle: Its Significance for Education*, 2001; *Globalisation and Education. A paper prepared for the House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs, Inquiry into the Global Economy*, 2002; *Globalisation, the World Trade Organisation and the National faces of the GATS. Information for Social Change*, (14) pp.8-17) argues that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and other 'global clubs for the mega-capitalists' are setting this agenda up in education across the globe.

Inequality and Globalisation

Global inequalities have been well described with the IMF/World Trade Organisation/World Bank inspired cuts in health and welfare budgets throughout the third world.

In Britain the increasing inequalities, the impoverishment and creation of a substantial underclass has also been well documented (for example in Dave Hill and Mike Cole, *Schooling and Equality: Fact, Concept and Policy*, 2001). For example, in Britain the ratio of chief executives' pay to average worker's pay stands at 35 to one. In the USA it has climbed to 450 to one (from around 35 to one in the mid-1980s). Inequalities both between states and within states have increased dramatically during the era of global neo-liberalism. In the USA, for example, the economic apartheid nature of capitalism has been widely exposed in the work of Peter McLaren (e.g. *Che Guevara, Paolo Freire and the Pedagogy of Revolution*, 2000). To give an USA example, the

top 1 percent of the richest people have wealth--financial wealth- equal to the bottom 95 percent.

As another example, Chile, hailed as a beacon of neo-liberal policies boasts one of the most unequal economies in the world in which only 10 percent of the Chilean population earns almost half the wealth and in which the richest 100 people earn more than the state spends on social services. Real salaries have declined 10 percent since 1986 and they are still 18 percent lower than when the democratically elected Marxist President Allende was in power.

In discussing the Market, as a part of neo-liberal ideology and policy, it is important to see how this impacts on people's lives, life chances and deaths, to become aware of the effects of what John McMurtry calls the *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism* (1999), and of market ideology in fiscal, social and educational provision.

What neo-liberalism demands

The difference between classic (laissez-faire) liberalism of the mid-nineteenth century Britain, and the neo-liberalism of today, based on the views of the neo-liberal theorist Hayek, is that the former wanted to roll back the state, to let private enterprise make profits relatively unhindered by legislation (e.g. safety at work, trade union rights, minimum wage), and unhindered by the tax costs of a welfare state.

On the other hand, *neo*-liberalism demands a strong state to promote its interests, hence Andrew Gamble's (1988) depiction of the Thatcherite polity as *The Free Economy and the Strong State: The Politics of Thatcherism*. The strong Interventionist State is needed by capital particularly in the field of education and training- in the field of producing an ideologically compliant but technically skilled workforce. The social production of labour-power is crucial for capitalism. It needs to extract as much surplus value as it can from the labour power of workers.

Neo-liberalism requires that the state establishes and extends:

1. Privatisation/Private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.
2. 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, prisons, policing).
3. Within education the creation of 'opportunity' to acquire the means of education (though not necessarily education itself, as McMurtry notes) and additional cultural capital, through selection.
4. Relatively untrammelled selling and buying of labour power, for a 'flexible', poorly regulated labour market.
5. 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 education, the world of business is also to supply a model of how it is to be provided and managed.
6. Suppression of oppositional critical thought and of autonomous thought and education.
7. Within a regime of cuts in the post-war Welfare State and low public expenditure.

Capitalism's Business Plan for Education

How, in more detail, do education markets fit into the grand plan for schooling and education? What is capitalism's 'Business Plan for Education'? Education as a social

institution has been subordinated to international market goals including the language and self-conceptualisation of educators themselves.

Richard Hatcher in his article 'Getting down to the business: schooling in the globalised economy' in the radical British education journal *Education and Social Justice* (2001) (Trentham Books) (and also in his 2002 Socialist Education Association booklet *The Business of Education: How Business agendas drive Labour Policies for Schools*) shows how Capital/Business has two major aims for schools.

The first aim is to make sure schools produce compliant, ideologically indoctrinated, pro capitalist, effective workers. That is, to ensure that schooling and education engage in ideological and economic reproduction. National state education and training policies in the business 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, where a state can make a difference

The second aim is for private enterprise, private capitalists, to make money out of it, to make private profit out of it, to control it: this is the business agenda *IN* schools.

The Business Agenda *for* Schools

Hatcher suggests that, The first agenda - what business wants schools to do - is a broad transnational consensus about the set of reforms needed for schools to meet employers' needs in terms of the efficiency with which they produce the future workforce. The business agenda *for* schools is increasingly transnational, generated and disseminated through key organizations of the international economic and political elite such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

In that global context there is a project for education at the European level, which represents the specific agenda of the dominant European economic and political interests. It is expressed in, for example, the various reports of the European Round Table, a pressure group of 45 leaders of major European companies from 16 countries, and it has become the motive force of the education policies of the European Commission and its subsidiary bodies.

The Business Agenda *in* Schools

In the USA the work of Alex Molnar (such as *Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialisation of America's Schools*, 2001), and work by Richard Hatcher and by Glenn Rikowski in Britain, highlights another aspect of what national and multinational capital wants from schooling and education- it wants profits through owning and controlling them. Thus privatisation of schools and educational services is becoming 'big business'. In the UK, the New Labour government is vigorously pursuing privatisation of public, welfare and education services through a variety of means (see Hill, 1999, 2001a-d, 2002) including the insistence on 'Best Value' in local authorities, by which local services, such as schooling, its subsidiary parts such as payroll provision, multicultural education service, and in some cases, the whole of

a local education authority's services are 'put up for grabs' for multinational (or British) companies to run and make a profit from.

Of course, responsibility within private company owned schools and colleges is not to children, students or the community- it is to the owners and the shareholders.

Increasing Inequality and Decreasing Democracy

Neo-liberal policies both in the UK and globally have resulted in a loss of

- Equity, Inequalities and Economic and Social Justice
- Democracy- as business values and interests are increasingly substituted for democratic accountability and the collective voice.

There is considerable data on how 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. Markets exacerbate existing inequalities. Governments in Britain, the USA, Australia, New Zealand have marketised their school systems. Racialised social class patterns of inequality have increased.

Neo-liberal Theory and Policy Perverting Education

I now want to look at one theoretical and academic aspect of some neo-liberal arguments and suggest where they fall down. Neo-liberals such as James Tooley (in *Reclaiming Education*, 2000) make a number of unwarranted implications or conclusions about the role of the state in education and about the role of the market in education. These relate to their assumption that the market/privatisation is compatible with education.

But education is not a commodity, to be bought and sold. One can buy *the means* to an education, but not the hard graft of autonomous learning itself. John McMurtry (1991), among others, has noted that education and the capitalist market in terms of their opposing *goals*, opposing *motivations*, opposing *methods*, and opposing *standards of excellence*.

The Goals of education and the Goals of markets

Firstly, *the goals of education*. McMurtry (1991) notes that private profit is acquired by a structure of appropriation, which excludes others from its possession. The greater its accumulation by any private corporation, the more wealth others are excluded from in this kind of possession. This is what makes such ownership 'private'. Education, in contrast, is acquired by a structure of appropriation that does not exclude others from its possession. On the contrary, education is furthered the more it is shared, and the more there is free and open access to its circulation. That is why learning which is not conveyed to others is deemed 'lost', 'wasted' or 'dead'. In direct opposition to market exchanges, educational changes flourish most with the unpaid gifts of others and develop the more they are *not* mediated by private possession or profit.

The Motivations of Education and Motivations of Markets

Secondly, *opposing motivations*. McMurtry notes that 'the determining motivation of the market is to satisfy the wants of whoever has the money to purchase the goods that are provided. The determining motivation of education is to develop sound understanding *whether it is wanted or not*' (my italics). 'The market by definition can only satisfy the motivations of those who have the money to buy the product it sells. The place of education, on the other hand, remains a place of education insofar as it educates those whose motivation is to learn, independent of the money-demand they exercise in their learning'. In addition, 'development of understanding is necessarily growth of cognitive capacity; wherein satisfaction of consumer wants involves neither, and typically impedes both'.

The Methods of Education and The Methods of Markets

Thirdly, *opposing methods*. 'The method of the market is to buy or sell the goods it has to offer to anyone for whatever price one can get...The method of education is never to buy or sell the item it has to offer, but to require of all who would have it that they fulfil its requirements autonomously'... Everything that is to be had on the market is acquired by the money paid for it. Nothing that is learned in education is acquired by the money paid for it'.

Standards of Excellence in Education and Standards of Excellence in Markets

Fourthly, *opposing Standards of Excellence*. 'The measures of excellence in the market are (i) how well the product is made to sell; and (ii) how problem-free the product is and remains for its buyers. The measures of excellence in education are (i) how disinterested and impartial its representations are; and (ii) how deep and broad the problems it poses are to one who has it'...the first works through 'one sided sales pitches...which work precisely because they are *not* understood', the second 'must rule out one-sided presentation appetitive compulsion and manipulative conditioning'.

In analysing the relationship between neo-liberalism and education, the last critical theoretical point I wish to make here is that the Market suppresses Critical Thought and Education itself.

Standards of Freedom in Education and Standards of Freedom in Markets

McMurtry concludes, powerfully, 'this fundamental contradiction in standards of excellence leads, in turn, to *opposite standards of freedom*. Freedom in the market is the enjoyment of whatever one is able to buy from others with no questions asked, and profit from whatever one is able to sell to others with no requirement to answer to anyone else. Freedom in the place of education, on the other hand, is precisely the freedom to question, and to seek answers, whether it offends people's self-gratification or not'.

McMurtry succinctly relates his arguments above to the 'systematic reduction of the historically hard won social institution of education to a commodity for private purchase and sale'. 'The commodification of education rules out the very critical freedom and academic rigour which education requires to be more than indoctrination. Much of my own work calls for critical education and for the development of teachers as critical transformative intellectuals. Big business and their

government agents now call most of the shots in University research- hence the potential importance of independent radical think tanks and research units such as the Institute for Education Policy Studies (www.ieps.org.uk) and radical groups such as, in Britain, the Hillcole Group of Radical Left Educators. Important, too are the collective efforts of radical egalitarian and socialist political organisations and their publications and demonstrations- their fight-back against exploitation and oppression.

Restraining and Resisting Neo-Liberalism

There are three major restraining forces on the activities of neo-liberalism- infrastructural, consumer-related regulation, and legitimation. The first is the need for an educational, social, transport, welfare, housing etc. infrastructure to enable workers to get to work, to be trained for different levels of the work-force, to be relatively fit and healthy. This restraint, though, is minimal- it can cope with extreme poverty and the existence of billions of humans at the margins of existence. It is a basic needs provision that says nothing. It has no implications at all for equality in society or in education.

The second restraint on capitalism is consumer dissatisfaction and consumer protection in the form of regulations. These, and inspectors of various sorts are criticised as 'red tape' and as bureaucrats. Yet without regulation, and enforcement in Britain, BSE and foot and mouth disease have flourished and been exported to continental Europe, and, following the privatisation of Railtrack in Britain, with its subsequent reduction of maintenance workforce and monitoring of safety, the number of dead in rail accidents has shot up.

State regulation operates against the freedom of capitalism to do as it pleases. Hence, in Britain, Conservative Party policy on schools and universities is to de-regulate them, to 'set them free', to allow them to charge what they want and run their own affairs. Similarly with the 'anti-bureaucracy' policies of the Republican Party in the USA and its demands for privatised 'public sector' education and for education vouchers.

The 'regulatory' model, of the state regulating standards can be weak or strong. It can demand only basic standards (perhaps failing to inspect regularly, and frequently open to corruption) or it can demand strong controls, including controls over profits. (It is interesting that in a number of states such as Britain, some of the most vigorously enforced standards are those in education- testimony perhaps to the crucial nature of the state apparatus of schooling).

Resistance

The third, and most powerful, restraint is that capital (and the political parties they fund and influence) needs to persuade the people that neo-liberalism- 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. The government and existing system, nationally and globally, may also be seen as in the pocket of the international and/or national ruling classes, impoverishing millions while 'fat cat'

bosses and their politicians consume the surplus value produced by sweat shop deregulated workers- indeed the working classes *per se*, throughout the world.

To stop this delegitimation happening, to ensure that the majority of the population consider the government and the economic system of private monopoly ownership is legitimate, the state uses the ideological state apparatuses such as schools and colleges to `naturalise' capitalism- to make the existing status quo seem `only natural'. Articles such as this one are written to contest the legitimacy of the legitimacy of government policy and its subordination to/ participation in the neo-liberal project of global capital. Clearly for the European and North American eco-warriors of what Rikowski describes as *The Battle of Seattle* (2001) and for various groups of socialists, trade unionists, social movements, greens, and groups such as the World Development Movement, Attac, and Globalise Resistance, the current system is not legitimate.

Nor is it so for groups of workers and others throughout the world, who see their governments bowing before the might of international capital, who see their national government elites and accompanying military cavalries and riot police seeking to ensure that all spheres of social life are incorporated within the orbit of global capital. Educators are implicated in the process, like everyone else. The school or university, and other areas of cultural and ideological reproduction (such as newsrooms and film studios) are no hiding place.

Increasingly, across the globe, educational debate is turning, in the economically rich world from debates about `standards' and `school effectiveness' to wider questions such as `what is education for? And in the economically poorer world to questions of free access to schooling and higher education- and why they do not have it any more where once it existed.

The Role of Critical Transformative Cultural Workers and Intellectuals in Education and other Cultural Sites

What is to be done? In brief, there are at least *three arenas* of activity for critical intellectuals and oppositional educators.

The first arena is, as Peter McLaren analyses powerfully (McLaren, 2000, 2002; Aguirre, 2001) within education, and, indeed, within other sites of cultural reproduction. Critical educators and cultural workers can indeed attempt, as Paula Allman (in *Critical Education Against Global Capital: Karl Marx and- Revolutionary Critical Education*, 2000) puts it, `education has the potential to fuel the flames of resistance to global capitalism as well as the passion for socialist transformation – indeed, the potential to provide a spark that can ignite the desire for revolutionary democratic social transformation throughout the world.

However, the question of how far this transformative potential can be realised is the subject of considerable debate, for contemporary theory as well as practice. The autonomy and agency available to individual teachers, teacher educators, schools and other educational institutions is particularly challenged when faced with the structures of capital and its current neo-liberal project for education (as I argue in Hill, 2001a, in *The British Journal of Sociology of Education*). It is necessary to highlight the phrase

'potential to fuel the flames of resistance' in Allman's quote above. Considerable caution is necessary when considering the degree of autonomy of educators (and, indeed, other cultural workers such as journalists and filmmakers) who fuel the flames of resistance.

I do not underestimate the limitations on the agency and autonomy of teachers, teacher educators, cultural workers and their sites, and indeed, to use concepts derived from Louis Althusser (1971), the very limited autonomy of the education policy/political region of the state from the economic. There are, in many states, greater and greater restrictions on the ability of teachers to use their pedagogical spaces for emancipatory purposes. The repressive cards within the ideological state apparatuses are stacked against the possibilities of transformative change through Initial Teacher Education and through schooling.

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 and newsrooms are not the only places.

Divorced from other arenas of progressive struggle, its success will be limited. This necessitates the development of pro-active debate both by, and within, the Radical Left. But it necessitates more than that. It calls for direct engagement with liberal pluralist (modernist or postmodernist) and with Radical Right ideologies and programmes, in all the areas of the state and of civil society, in and through all the Ideological and Repressive State Apparatuses.

As intellectual workers educating teachers, the ideological intervention of teachers and other educators and cultural workers is likely to have a different impact than that of sections of the workforce less saliently engaged in ideological production and reproduction. But, by itself activity of transformative intellectual cultural/ ideological workers, however skilful and committed, can have only a limited impact on an egalitarian transformation of society.

Local Action

Unless critical educators' actions within schools and education is linked to a grammar of resistance, such resistant and counter-hegemonic activity is likely to fall on relatively stony ground. Hence, using schools and educational sites as arenas of cultural struggle and education in general as a vehicle for social transformation needs to conservative/capitalist times is premised upon a clear commitment to work with communities, parents and students, and with the trade unions and workers within those institutions. This is the second arena of resistance, working outside of the classroom on issues relating to education and its role in reproducing inequality and oppression.

When I say working 'with', I do not mean simply 'leading' or 'talking at'. Working with means 'learning from' as well, from the daily, material existence of the exploited classes. Ideally it means fulfilling the role of the organic intellectual, organically linked to and part of those groups. This means also means working with communities- and their own despair and anger- in developing the perception that schools and education and the media themselves are sites of social and economic and ideological contestation. They are not 'neutral' or 'fair' or 'inevitable', but sites of economic, cultural and ideological domination, of class domination. It is thereby important to be aware of the role of education in capital reproduction and in the reproduction of class relations.

Glenn Rikowski's work, such as *The Battle in Seattle* (2001) develops a Marxist analysis based on an analysis of 'labour power'. 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 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!* Teachers are dangerous because *they are intimately connected with the social production of labour-power*, equipping students with skills, competences, abilities, knowledge and the attitudes and personal qualities that *can be expressed and expended in the capitalist labour process*. Teachers are guardians of the quality of labour-power! This potential, latent power of teachers why representatives of the State might have sleepless nights worrying about their role in ensuring that the labourers of the future are delivered to workplaces throughout the national capital of *the highest possible quality*.

Rikowski suggests that the State needs to control the 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 and training, of the curriculum, of educational research.

While I do not share Rikowski's view that educators are 'the most dangerous of workers', they/we can certainly be dangerous to capital and have effect in the struggle for economic and social justice.

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 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. Mike Cole, Peter McLaren, Glenn Rikowski and I discuss this in our *Red Chalk: On Schooling, Capitalism and Politics* (2001) (www.ieps.org.uk), as of course, do myriad articles and actions contesting capitalist hegemony.

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 dramatic effect, not least on some individuals and groups who are 'hailed' 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 two million strong protest over economic issues- the deregulation of labour laws- by workers in Italy in March 2002 and similar actions in 2002 in Spain and in the UK over proposed labour deregulation and over low pay, and recent mass workers' protests in South Korea were a massive learning experience for the participants. 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 ESF (European Social Movement) and WSF (World Social Forum) in Porto Alegre. And in the UK, the growing militancy of Trade Unions- not only over low pay but also against privatisation- has seen the re-emergence of the Socialist Campaign Group, the election of 'a new left-wing breed' of Trade union leaders, and levels of strike action unprecedented since 1979.

These events were a learning experience for that who thought such mass action- whether internationally or nationally, was a product of a bygone age.

Through well organised and focused non-sectarian campaigns organised around class and anti-capitalist issues, those committed to economic 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 working class- with a shared understanding that, at the current time, it is the global neo-liberal form of capitalism that shatters the lives, bodies and dreams of billions. And that it can be replaced.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguirre, L. C. (2001) The role of Critical Pedagogy in the Globalization Era and the Aftermath of September 11, 2001. Interview with Peter McLaren. *Revista Electronica de Investigacion Educativa*, (3) 2. www.redie.ens.uabc.mx/vol3no2/contenido-coral.html

Allmann, P. (2001) Foreword. In M. Cole et al. *Red Chalk: On Schooling, Capitalism and Politics*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.

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

- Cole, M., Hill, D., McLaren, P. and Rikowski, G. (2001) *Red Chalk: on Schooling, Capitalism and Politics*. Brighton; Institute for Education Policy Studies.
- Hatcher, R. (2001) Getting down to the business: schooling in the globalised economy. *Education and Social Justice*, 3 (2) pp.45-59.
- Hatcher, R. (2002) *The Business of Education: How Business agendas drive Labour Policies for Schools*. London: Socialist Education Association. www.socialsiteducation.org.uk
- Hill, D. (1999) *New Labour and Education: Policy, Ideology and the Third Way*. London: Tufnell Press.
- Hill, D. (2001a) State Theory and the neo-Liberal 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) Global Capital, neo-liberalism, and privatisation: the growth of educational inequality. In D. Hill and M. Cole (eds.) *Schooling and Equality: Fact, Concept and Policy*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hill, D. (2001c) *The Third Way in Britain: New Labour's neo-liberal education policy*. Paper presented at the Conference Marx 111, Paris, September 2001, Universite de Sorbonne/ Nanterre, Paris. (online at www.ieps.org.uk)
- Hill, D. (2001d) Equality, Ideology and Education Policy. In D. Hill and M. Cole (eds.) *Schooling and Equality: Fact, Concept and Policy*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hill, D. (2002) Global Capital, neo-liberalism, and the growth of educational inequality, *The School Field: International Journal of Theory and Research in Education*, 13 (1/2)
- Hill, D., McLaren, P., Cole, M. and Rikowski, G. (eds.) (2002) *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Press.
- McLaren P. (2000) *Che Guevara, Paolo Freire and the Pedagogy of Revolution*. Lanham, ML and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (2002). *Life in Schools: an Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education* (fourth edition) Arlington, MA, USA: Allyn and Bacon
- McMurtry, J. (1991) Education and the Market Model. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, 25 (2) pp.209-217.
- McMurtry, J. (1999) *The Cancer Stage of Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Molnar, A. (2001) (Second edition) (*Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialisation of America's Schools*. Westview: Harper Collins.
- Rikowski, G. (2001) *The Battle in Seattle*. London: Tufnell Press.
- Rikowski, G. (2002a) *Globalisation and Education. A paper prepared for the House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs, Inquiry into the Global Economy*. (see www.ieps.org.uk or rikowski@tiscali.co.uk)
- Rikowski, G. (2002b) Transfiguration: Globalisation, the World Trade Organisation and the National faces of the GATS. *Information for Social Change*, (14) pp. 8-17.

This paper develops from the following: Dave Hill's chapter, 'Global capital, neo-liberalism, and privatisation: the growth of educational inequality' in Dave Hill and Mike Cole, in *Schooling and Equality: Fact, Concept and Policy*, London: Kogan Page (2001); *Red Chalk: On Schooling, Capitalism and Politics*, written by Mike Cole, Dave Hill, Peter McLaren and Glenn Rikowski. Brighton, UK: Institute for Education Policy Studies (2001); from *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*, edited by Dave Hill, Peter McLaren, Mike Cole and Glenn Rikowski. Lanham, Maryland, USA: Lexington Books (2002); 'Global capital, neo-liberalism, and the growth of educational inequality', *The School Field: International Journal of Theory and Research in Education*, 13 (1/2), (pp.81-107) (2002).

Correspondence

Dr. Dave Hill
University College Northampton
Park Campus
Boughton Green Rd.
Northampton
NN2 7AL
UK
dave.hill@northampton.ac.uk
dave.hill@ieps.org.uk