

Classical Marxism, Ideology and Education Policy

Dave Hill

Volume 13, Number 1, 2022

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1085408ar>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v13i1.186658>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Institute for Critical Education Studies / UBC

ISSN

1920-4175 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Hill, D. (2022). Classical Marxism, Ideology and Education Policy. *Critical Education*, 13(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.14288/ce.v13i1.186658>

Article abstract

In this article I focus on the differences between social democratic and Marxist education theory and policy and proceed to distinguish between Classical Marxism and two-types of neo-Marxist analysis ('Culturalist' and 'Structuralist'). I then set out what I consider to be five key questions Marxists ask about education policy, relate to: (i) Curriculum and Assessment, (ii) Pedagogy, (iii) The Organisational Culture within the School/ Institution, (iv) Organisation of The Education System and of Students, that is, comprehensive schooling or selective schooling, and (v) Ownership and Control of Schools, Colleges and Universities. I conclude by setting out what is specifically Marxist about the various policy proposals put forward. These are, firstly, the belief that reforms are not sustainable under capitalism; secondly, that what is needed is a revolution and that Marxists need to engage in activist praxis, and thirdly, is the salience of class analysis and organisation as compared with other forms of structural oppression and discrimination and inequality. Marxists go further than criticizing (and acting against) social discrimination, oppressions, for example of sexism, homophobia, racism, into economic rights, and into the recognition that full economic rights cannot be achieved under a capitalist economic system, but only under a socialist or communist system.

© Dave Hill, 2022



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

Critical Education

Volume 13 Number 1

January 20, 2022

ISSN 1920-4175

Classical Marxism, Ideology and Education Policy

Dave Hill

Citation: Hill, D. (2022). Classical Marxism, ideology and education. *Critical Education*, 13(1), 70-82.
<http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/186658>

Abstract

In this article I focus on the differences between social democratic and Marxist education theory and policy and proceed to distinguish between Classical Marxism and two-types of neo-Marxist analysis ('Culturalist' and 'Structuralist'). I then set out what I consider to be five key questions Marxists ask about education policy. relate to: (i) Curriculum and Assessment, (ii) Pedagogy, (iii) The Organisational Culture within the School/ Institution, (iv) Organisation of The Education System and of Students, that is, comprehensive schooling or selective schooling, and (v) Ownership and Control of Schools, Colleges and Universities. I conclude by setting out what is specifically Marxist about the various policy proposals put forward. These are, firstly, the belief that reforms are not sustainable under capitalism; secondly, that what is needed is a revolution and that Marxists need to engage in activist praxis, and thirdly, is the salience of class analysis and organisation as compared with other forms of structural oppression and discrimination and inequality. Marxists go further than criticizing (and acting against) social discrimination, oppressions, for example of sexism, homophobia, racism, into economic rights, and into the recognition that full economic rights cannot be achieved under a capitalist economic system, but only under a socialist or communist system.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and *Critical Education*. More details of this Creative Commons license are available from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. *Critical Education* is published by the Institute for Critical Educational Studies and housed at the University of British Columbia.

Socialist and Marxist Education Policies

Broadly speaking, there are three major perspectives, policy directions, regarding formal education – education to conform, education to/ for to reform, or education to transform- Conservative, Social Democratic/ Democratic Socialist, and Marxist.

Conservatives want an education for *conformity*, ('centrist') social democrats want to *reform* education (to make it a bit fairer, more meritocratic, with some positive discrimination), while more Left, democratic socialists also want to reform education to make education, but to make it *much* fairer, with pronounced positive discrimination to help 'under-achieving groups'. Revolutionary Marxists, that is to say, Marxists who wish to replace Capitalism with socialism, want an education critical of Capitalism, an education for social, political and economic *transformation*. Into a socialist economy and society. My own writing, much of which is online¹ is from a Revolutionary Marxist and a Classical Marxist perspective, I argue for a Marxist education policy (e.g. Hill, 2010, 2015, 2019; Rasinski, Hill & Skordoulis, 2017; Edwards, Hill and Boxley, 2018). In this article I focus on Marxist education, differentiating it from 'centrist' social democratic and left social democratic, 'democratic socialist' education policy.

Social Democrats, Democratic Socialists and Education

Social democrats have advanced policies intended to make the system more 'meritocratic'. With 'equal opportunities' policies involving positive discrimination for under-represented groups (in particular, the poorer sections of the working class and particular ethnic groups). With academic and scholastic advancement and future positions in the labour market resulting from 'effort plus ability', that is, merit. For entry into what is a grossly unequal society.

However, sociologists of education over the last 70 years, and communists and socialists since before then (see Simon such as 1965, 1978, 2000); Floud, Halsey and Martin (1957); Halsey, Heath and Ridge (1980), and, more recently, Stephen Ball (2003), Jean Anyon (2011) and Diane Reay (2018), have pointed out the enduring myth of meritocracy in schooling systems. And Marxist reproduction theorists from early Soviet writers Bukharin and Preobrazensky (1922/1969) to contemporary Marxist theorists such as Glenn Rikowski (*passim*) and Dave Hill (*passim*) drawing to an extent on Bowles and Gintis, Bourdieu, (e.g. 1971), Anyon (e.g. 2011), have for many decades pointed out that the education system is purposefully and intentionally rigged in favour of the elite capitalist class, in favour of class reproduction.

Marxist theorists (and activists), together with social democratic theorists and activists also argue that within the working class, the 'middle class' strata secure 'positional advantage' – the 'better schools and universities' (better grades/ exam results), compared to the 'working class', the less advantaged, poorer strata of the working class, within which particular racialized ethnic and gendered groups achieve less than others and are subjected to far greater levels of oppression – racism, sexism, homophobia – than other groups.

So, traditional social democratic education systems are those such as in Sweden and Finland, and the reforms of the Wilson Labour government in the UK in the 1960s and 70s. Wilson widely (if not universally in the state system – private schools remained outside the state system) established comprehensive/ common schooling, and grants to help children from poorer families

¹ See: <http://www.ieps.org.uk/publications/online-papers-dave-hill/>

(such as me) stay on at school, and grants ('Maintenance Grants') to go to university, in an attempt at 'Compensatory Education'. Policies such as smaller class sizes for the lower attainers, and residential education centres, and 'cultural trips' were widespread, from all of which I benefited and recall. At the post-school level, free adult education was ubiquitous for leisure as well as vocational 'further education', and the Open University was set up whereby people from working class backgrounds who had left school at the minimum school-leaving age, or at the age of 18/19, could study for a degree (primarily by distance learning) while still at work.

And at various stages in various countries all types of socialists attempted, at various times, to make the schooling curriculum more inclusive, and 'relevant' to different communities and classes. The Community Schools movement, particularly strong between the 1970s and the 1990s, attempted to make schools more central to local communities, by developing Community Schools- to 'lessen the distance' between schools and their working-class communities. The community schools movement, 'seeks to obliterate the boundary between school and community, to turn the community into a school and the school into a community'. (Halsey 1972: 79). As did the much overlooked 'Hargreaves Report' into secondary education in the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA, 1984, summarised in Doe, 1984).

Such social democratic reforms, though usually focussing on pedagogy and curriculum, were advanced by very many Critical Pedagogues, such as Henry Giroux, and also by 'Marxian' educators' such as Michael W. Apple, Ken Saltman, Ken McGrew, who are not Marxist, but can be considered to be democratic socialist, wishing teachers to be 'transformative intellectuals' seeking a fairer society. Such Left social democrats, or democratic socialists, want *substantial* reform (of the wider economic, penal, political, welfare systems, and in education, more equal chances (provision, funding, attainment).

What they do *not* want is Marxist revolution, the replacement of Capitalism and Capitalist education by socialism. For a discussion between Marxist Educators and 'Marxian' Educators, who I typify as left social democrats/ democratic socialist (Anyon, 2011) calls the two groups/ schools, 'traditional Marxist' and 'neo-Marxist'.²

Bob Jessop (2020) summarises the related difference between these two types of Marxist, which he identifies as 'Reproduction Marxists' and 'Resistance Theory Marxists'. These can approximate to what Anyon labels as 'traditional Marxist' and 'neo-Marxist', and to what I term 'Marxist' and 'Marxian', or 'Structuralist neo-Marxist' and 'Culturalist neo-Marxist'. Reproduction Marxists can be approximated to Structuralist neo-Marxists, seeing the iron fist of Capital and its structures severely limiting resistant 'agency', punishing, restricting, illegalising, dismissing for example, trade union and Left political activists, and, their Left, anti-capitalist beliefs. The current Conservative government in the UK is seeking to expel, prohibit anti-capitalist and Marxist subject matter from the curriculum, and this is replicated by far-right governments across the globe, from Ukraine, Poland, India, Brazil, to more traditional right-wing. Conservative governments such as that currently in Greece.

As one example, In September 2020, schools in England were told by the Department (Ministry) for Education not to use material from anti-capitalist groups, with anti-capitalism

² See Banfield, 2011; Farahmandpur (2004); Rikowski (2006); Kelsh and Hill (2006); and Malott (2011) on the one hand and Apple (2006) and McGrew (2011) on the other.

categorised as an ‘extreme political stance’ equivalent to endorsing illegal activity (Busby, M. 2020). As left-wing Labour MP John McDonnell responded: “On this basis it will be illegal to refer to large tracts of British history and politics including the history of British socialism, the Labour Party and trade unionism, all of which have at different times advocated the abolition of capitalism.’ (Busby, 2020). It’s an attempt at thought control.

On the other hand, for Jessop, there are Resistance Theory Marxists, drawing from Gramsci, who may be termed Culturalist neo-Marxists, who see greater space for the autonomy of individuals, groups and institutions/ organisation (such as schools) to engage in resistant practices, anti-hegemonic praxis. However, Pedagogy and Curriculum now are far more strictly controlled than prior to the 1988 Education Reform Act. And, in teacher education and training, the curriculum is now heavily controlled into ‘standards’, a retheorized, decritiqued, curriculum. (Hill, 2001, 2004, 2005; Rasinski, Hill & Skordoulis, 2017).

In praxis, there is a dialectical, interactive relationship between the two types of theorist. Reproduction Theorists are very often activists in anti-neoliberal / anti-conservative activism inside and outside the classroom, aware of Marx’s dictum that ‘philosophers have only interpreted the world. The point is to change it’, (Marx, 1845/2002), and Resistance Theorists are only too aware of the structural impediments and prohibitions and sanctions against their resistant actions in school.

Classical Marxism and Neo-Marxisms

To return to an earlier – and important – argument, it is not just the Capitalist state apparatuses (and those apparatuses supporting the capitalist state, such as the media) that discipline the working class – it is also the economic warfare, the brute force and power of the Capitalist Class in the domain of labour, employment, wage suppression and repression, immiseration. This is one instance of where Classical Marxist analysis disagrees with neo-Marxist analyses. Where the barrel of the gun ordered by the capitalist class crushes the relative autonomy of resistance. Where Overdetermination is trumped by Economic Determination.

My critique of Althusser (Hill, 2001, 2005) was of Althusser's formulation that *Economic Determination in the Last Instance* means, ‘in the last “overdetermined” analysis (Althusser, 1962). Although Althusser did admit ‘economic determination in the last instance’, he added the important- and in my view, negating, qualification that, in overdetermined form, ‘*its bell never tolled*’ (my italics).

This unduly minimalist concept allows Resnick and Wolff (among others) to interpret Althusserian ‘overdetermination’ as giving *equal weight* (my italics) to political, ideological and economic factors:

Overdetermination offers a notion of base and superstructure as conditions of each other's existence... It permitted the construction of a theory of society in which no process – economic, political, cultural or natural – and no site of processes – human agency, enterprise, state or household – could be conceived to exist as a cause without being itself caused. All, whether human agent or social structure, became defined – within a web of mutual overdeterminations. (Resnick & Wolff, 1993, p. 68).

The ‘bell’, of economic determination, that (for Althusser) ‘never tolls’, is, at the current juncture of capitalism, now tolling – in terms of the nakedness in capitalist class/ governmental

discourse – and in terms of the brute force, repressive legislation, the mailed fist no longer cloaked in a velvet glove, wielded by the capitalist class and the governments and repressive state apparatuses that, ultimately, and increasingly clearly, serve them.

In Mandel's words (1976, p. 49, cited in Banfield, 2010, p. 131),

under capitalism, labour is essentially *forced labour*. Wherever possible, capitalists prefer hypocritically to cloak the compulsion under a smokescreen of 'equal and just exchange' in the 'labour market'. When hypocrisy is no longer possible, they return to what they began with: naked coercion.

While the (Althusser's) concept of 'overdetermination' represents a greater recognition of the role of force and of the repressive aspects and effectiveness of state apparatuses, than that held by the alternative Culturalist neo-Marxist analyses examined here, it is still deficient. The theory of 'economic determination in the last instance' is inadequate.

To repeat the phrase, (Althusser's) overdetermination is trumped by economic determination, by the Capital-Labour relation, by 'the determinacy of actual class relations and objective class interests (Banfield, 2015, p.11).

Thus, regarding these two apparently contrasting and disputed Marxist analyses of the role and functions of education in capitalist societies, Structuralist neo-Marxist Analysis and Culturalist neo-Marxist Analysis – while there are differences between them, they both differ from Classical Marxism in that they both, to different degrees, stress the relative autonomy of individuals and structures, and agency, from capitalist economic structures and relationships.

Marxist Education

Revolutionary Marxists, that is, Marxists who are anti-capitalist and wish to see Capitalism replaced by socialism, want an education system that is not only 'free' (from fees) from early childhood through life, but is a system with well-trained/ educated teachers who are well-paid and valued in society, with a Marxist school and higher/ university education curriculum that exposes capitalism and inequalities, argues for socialism, and values solidaristic as opposed to competitive individualistic school activities. In a Marxist education system all schools and universities, including private ones, would be brought under local accountable democratic control.

In contrast to the writing of many more liberal, or 'reformist', or social democratic Critical Pedagogues, Revolutionary Critical Pedagogues, (some would simply describe themselves as Marxist or Communist Educators) such as Grant Banfield (e.g. 2011, 2015); Peter McLaren (2010, 2013; McLaren and Farahmandpur (2005); Glenn Rikowski, Mike Cole, Paula Allman, Deborah Kelsh, Dave Hill, Ravi Kumar, Ramin Farahmandpur, Kevin Harris, Derek Ford, Curry Malott *are* Marxist, and do want to see not simply a fairer society, but to go beyond capitalism into socialism.

The Questions Marxist Educators Ask

In schools, colleges, universities, many radical and Marxist critical educators try, in addition to seeking dramatic increases in funding, to affect five aspects of learning and teaching, asking questions about (at least) five aspects of education. These relate to: (i) Curriculum and Assessment, (ii) Pedagogy, (iii) The Organisational Culture within the School/ Institution, (iv) Organisation of The Education System and of Students, that is, comprehensive schooling or selective schooling, and (v) Ownership and Control of Schools, Colleges and Universities.

These questions are common to many types of radical educator, from liberals to social democrats and democratic socialists, not simply Marxists. Below, therefore, I add what is *specifically Marxist* about these four aspects of education policy and praxis (see Hill, 2019).

(i) *Curriculum and Assessment*. A first question Marxist and other critical educators ask is what should be in the *curriculum*? A related question is, 'who should decide?'. Should the curriculum be a curriculum for conformity – to create conformist and dutiful workers and citizens, devoid of 'deep critique' (of existing society for example). Should it be 'a white, male, middle class curriculum', uninfluenced by decolonisation theory, Black Lives Matter, feminisms such as Titi Bhattacharyas's *Social Reproduction Theory*? Or, as Marxists propose and practice, should it be a curriculum for reform and revolution, where curriculum areas/ subjects (or cross-disciplinary projects/ themes) focus on inequalities, resistance, transformation, the collective good, not individualistic consumerism, environmentalism not capitalist ecocide. Thus, geography would include a focus on social geography, science on the social implications of science, and history and literature and the arts would encompass (white/ black, male/ female) working class history and novels/ plays exposing ('race', gender, social class, for example) injustice and promoting socialism and communism. The curriculum would be decolonized and revolutionized. It would be anti-racist, anti-sexist, environmentalist, Marxist. (It would also develop subject specific concepts, skills, knowledge).

Marxist educators, indeed critical educators in general, can, with students, look at the curriculum and ask, 'What do you/ we think should be in the curriculum that is currently absent?' 'Who do you think benefits and who loses from this curriculum?' 'Is there a different version or view of the past, the present, or the future'? What 'messages' come from this curriculum, about, for example, power, protest, individualism, collectivity/ collectivism, Black Lives Matter, Generation X and environmentalism, sexism and misogyny, sexuality, and class oppression and exploitation. Where Marxists and Revolutionary Critical Educators (McLaren, 2010, 2013, McLaren et al, 2010) differ from more social democratic, democratic socialist and liberal critical educators is in the emphasis placed on resistance, activism, and socialist transformation – and on social class analysis.

Regarding Assessment, what is assessed is usually what teachers focus on. It can be restricted to subject knowledge and skills, or it can go more widely. The (social democratic) Hargreaves Report (ILEA, 1984; Doe, 1984) for example, proposed that indices of pupil achievement include not only exam results but also pupils' achievements in areas such as problem-solving, personal and social skills, and motivation and commitment. Furthermore, it recommended that pupils/ students be given a real say in school policies such as the curriculum and exams.

(ii) *Pedagogy*. Many Marxist (and other critical) educators question the overwhelming teacher-centred *pedagogy*, the pattern of teaching and learning relationships and interaction, what Freire termed 'the banking model' of education. Instead, using Freirean perspectives and praxis they try to use democratic participative pedagogy which can break down, to some extent, patterns of domination and submission, and is a pedagogy that listens to children's, students' and local communities' voices. This is a pedagogy that bases teaching and learning on the concerns and issues in everyday life. Furthermore, it is a collaboration between teachers and students, teachers and pupils. Here, learning is collaborative, not individualistic and competitive. It is a pedagogic system – pattern of learning and teaching relationships – that is collective, collaborative, mutually supportive.

In addition to 'democratic participative collaborative pedagogy', Critical Marxist educators use different types of pedagogy in teaching, to engage in non-hierarchical, democratic, participative, teaching and research. Vygotsky (e.g. 1934), as a Marxist, was inspired by Marx's *dialectic* in that it rejects top-down and bottom-up accounts of the learning process – these unidirectional models originate in class-based societal relations which Marxists reject.

In England, pedagogy in primary (elementary) school teaching has become removed, to an extent, from the control of teachers. Following the 1998 National Literacy Strategy (NLS) (DfEE, 1998) a specific teaching and learning strategy was advised- and was surveilled and inspected for more than a decade, its prescriptions still felt. Across the subject curriculum, lessons followed a standard four-part pattern – introduction, lecture/ explanation/ teacher teaching, pupil/ student discussion/ work, plenary. No room for Freirean, Vygotskyan, or liberal-progressive child-centred teaching and learning, no room for the 'dead cat flying through the window' syndrome, whereby teachers and pupils/ students could seize upon a happening event, to explore.

Of course, critiques of over-dominant teacher-centred pedagogy are not restricted to Marxist educators. They are also made by liberal-progressive, child/ student-centred educators, anarchist educators, and by some conservative educators, concerned about teaching effectiveness and preparation for the workplace. And, following Gramsci, Marxist teachers, by virtue of their social and ideological *role* in actually teaching, in actually carrying out the role of teacher, should maintain an authoritative stance where appropriate. There is room for class teaching and lectures as well as dialogic and discussion-based learning, and learning based on an individual's or a community's needs.

Marxist educators differ between themselves, of course (as do conservative educators) on the degree to which education is or should be proselytising, for example praising 'the revolution', and the degree to which it is / should be 'critical' – (including 'auto-critique) criticizing / critiquing not just capitalism and inequality, but also the current and alternative ideologies, policies and praxis. There is a spectrum across different times and places from authoritarian to democratic pedagogy, from some Communist states in particular periods, to some insurgent movements.

My own Revolutionary Marxist analysis and praxis attempts a synthesis of Vygotskyan, Freirean and Gramscian pedagogy, my own early praxis as a young schoolteacher (at Stockwell Manor Comprehensive School in Inner London), took place during the relatively liberal-progressive, child-centred period of education in England of the late 1960s and early 1970s- before Labour Prime Minister James Callaghan's Ruskin College speech of 1976 started the process of yanking back education into fulfilling primarily economic and vocational aims, a process carried out to fruition and completion following the Thatcher and Major governments of 1979-87. The sheer hatred of both liberal-progressive and attempts at socialist egalitarian critical education is described in books by Ken Jones, (1989, 2003), Clyde Chitty, and in my own writing, such as the Hill, 1997.

(iii) *The Organisational Culture within the School/ Institution.* A third question for education relates to the social relations and power relations between management and shop-floor education workers, that is, between the school/ university head, principal, director – and the teachers and lecturers (and ancillary staff). It also concerns the 'hidden curriculum' of headteacher-teacher-pupil/student relationships, demands and expectations.

In a nutshell, is the school culture democratic and collegiate, or is it dictatorial and authoritarian? This also relates to the pay differences between those at the top and those in the

classroom. Prior to the diversification of state education into City Technology Colleges, Academies, teachers and headteachers were employed by local education authorities, the democratically elected local Councils. There were *national* pay scales, no individual pay bargaining and seeking Performance Related Pay, and no headteachers earning far more than the Prime Minister, as is the case with some headteachers of Academies and Directors of Academy Chains. As with other sectors of the quasi and part-state provision, with New Public Managerialism, the difference in pay and emoluments between those at the top and the shop-floor workers such as teacher and lecturers has ballooned.

Globally, and in the UK, where neoliberalism has triumphed in education, common results have been increased casualization of academic labour, increased proletarianization, increased pay and conditions differentials within education sectors, cuts in the wages/salaries (and also in “the social wage” of state benefits and rights), payment by results/ performance-related pay, cuts to school and further and higher education budgets, increased intensification of labour, with larger classes, decreased autonomy for school and college teachers over curriculum and pedagogy, being subject to the surveillance and rigors of “new public managerialism,” increased levels of monitoring and report-writing, and accompanying increased levels of stress, increased concern with timekeeping, and tighter and more punitive discipline codes. The terror of the ‘teaching walks’ by Principals/ Head Teachers and members of the SMTs, Senior Management Teams, able to walk in any lesson and observe for as long as they wanted. There is also the curtailment of trade union rights and attacks on trade unions as organizations that defend and promote working-class interests.

This is a far cry from the occasional more collegiate approach to school democracy and management of the more ‘progressive’, and in some schools, more socialist management. In my own experience of a First/ Infant school of the mid-1980s, the whole teaching staff would sit round to discuss school policy, such as reading schemes, the head teacher would act more as a chairperson than a dictator.

Part of this proletarianization has been an increased level of identification by teachers and their main unions such as the National Education Union in England and Wales, and “education professionals” with the working-class movement, workers’ struggle, and industrial action. That is, by increased working-class consciousness.

The managerialist school culture is also a far cry from a key feature of the Hargreaves Report (ILEA, 1984) which was to give pupils a say in the running of the school, with for example, school councils having powers not just over trivia, such as lavatories, food and litter, but also on issues such as school hours, extra-curricular activities, as well as (as previously mentioned in relation to the curriculum and assessment, the curriculum and exams, to give pupils/ students experience of democratic procedures.

(iv) Organisation of Students and of the Education System. A fourth question in education that critical and Marxist educators can and should ask is about *organization of the students*. How should children of different social classes, gender, and ethnic backgrounds be organized within classrooms, within institutions such as schools and universities, and within national education systems?

Marxists prefer and work for what in Britain is called ‘comprehensive schools’ and in India ‘the common school’. Socialists of various types argue that school should be a microcosm of society, that each school should contain a mixture of children/ students from the different social

classes and social class strata, and a mix of attainment levels. That is, children/ students should not be divided by selection into 'high achievers' and 'low achievers', or by social class. Furthermore, they should not be divided by wealth/ income – so there should be no private schools or universities, as noted below. No moneyed or relatively well-off sections of the population should be able to buy educational advantage, and thereby disadvantage others. It costs as much per week to put a child through Eton (Maisuria, 2020) as many families have to live on in a week.

Under the academic results based 'league table' competitive marketisation of schools children/ students as young as four years old are 'ability grouped' by able or by 'stream'/ class. This is very different from the mixed ability organisation of many schools in the 1960s to 1980s, and very different from the proposals of the Hargreaves and the Thomas Reports into Primary and Secondary Education in the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA 1984, Thomas, 1985, summarised, respectively, in Doe, 1984, 1985).

(v) *Ownership, Control and Management of Schools and Colleges and Universities.* A fifth question Revolutionary Marxists pose is 'who should own, control and govern schools, further education (vocational) colleges and universities? Should it be 'the people'? local councils/ municipalities? speculators and Hedge Funds? Churches and Mosques? '

Revolutionary Marxist educators (and others, of course) believe that schools, colleges and universities should be run democratically, with education workers and students, as well as elected representatives of local communities, having powers in and over those education institutions, within a secular, democratic national framework. There should be no private control of schools, colleges or universities, either by private companies/ shareholders, religious organisations, or private individuals. Commodification and marketization in education must end (Rikowski, 2019). Thus, there should be no 'Academies' in England, no 'Charter Schools', whether 'not-for-profit' or 'for profit' in the USA. (For attempts to address these various aspects of education, in developing a socialist policy for education, see, Hill, 2010, 2013, 2015; 2019; Ford, 2016; Edwards, Hill & Boxley, 2018).

What is Specifically Marxist about these Policy Proposals?

What defines Marxists is *firstly*, the belief that *reforms are not sustainable under capitalism*, they are stripped away when there are the (recurrent and systemic) crises of capital, such as the 1930s, 1970s, and currently, post 2008, and as they are likely to be post-Covid19 (for example with pay cuts, union rights, social budgets under renewed threat) The *second* point of difference between Marxist and non-Marxist socialists is that in order to replace capitalism, Marxists have to actually work to organize for that movement, for that action. Thus, a duty as a Revolutionary Marxist teacher is as an *activist*, and a recognition that political organization, programme development, intervention are necessary. *What is needed is a revolution* to replace, to get rid of, the capitalist economic system.

The *third* difference is an understanding of the *salience of class* as compared with other forms of structural oppression and discrimination and inequality. Marxists go further than criticizing (and acting against) social discrimination, oppressions, for example of sexism, homophobia, racism, into economic rights, and into the recognition that full economic rights cannot be achieved under a capitalist economic system, but only under a socialist or communist system. Formal and informal curricula should teach Marxist analysis of society, its class-based nature- in theoretical terms, the Labour-Capital Relation. The aim is to develop class

consciousness, or, as Marx put it, the working class as a 'class for itself', not simply a 'class in itself' (Marx, 1852/1999). What Gramsci called 'good sense', as opposed to 'common sense' (Gramsci, 1971).

These are three points of difference between Marxists and other socialists, between what is Marxist and what is not (Hill, 2019).

References

- Althusser, L. (1962). Contradiction and overdetermination. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1962/appendix.htm>
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>
- Anyon, J. (2011). *Marx and education*. Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2006) Rhetoric and reality in critical educational studies in the United States. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(5) 679-687
- Ball, S. J. (2003). *Class strategies and the educational market: The middle classes and social advantage*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Banfield, G. (2011). Looking for Marx: A review of *Marx and education* by Jean Anyon. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(2). <http://www.jceps.com/archives/671>
- Banfield, G. (2015). Marx and education: Working with the revolutionary educator. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 13(3). <http://www.jceps.com/archives/2792>
- Bhattacharya, T. (2017). *Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentering oppression*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications.
- Bukharin, N. & Preobrazhensky, Y. (1922/1969). *The ABC of Communism*. London: Penguin Books. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/works/1920/abc>
- Busby, M. (2020, September 27). Schools in England told not to use material from anti-capitalist groups. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/sep/27/uk-schools-told-not-to-use-anti-capitalist-material-in-teaching>
- DfEE Department for Education and Employment. (1998). The national literacy strategy: Framework for teaching, HMSO.
- Doe, B. (1984, March 23). Improving London's Schools. *Times Educational Supplement*.
- Doe, B. (1985, January 18). The Thomas Report. *Times Educational Supplement*.
- Edwards, G., Hill, D., & Boxley, S. (2018). Critical Teacher education for economic, environmental and social justice. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 16(3). <http://www.jceps.com/archives/49021>

- Farahmandpur, R. (2004). Essay review: A Marxist critique of Michael Apple's neo-Marxist approach to educational reform. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 2(1).
<http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/02-1-4.pdf>
- Floud, J., Halsey, A.H & Martin, F.M (1957). *Social class and educational opportunity*. Heinemann.
- Halsey, A.H., Heath, A.F., & Ridge, J. M. (1980). *Origins & destinations: Family, class and education in modern Britain*. Oxford University Press.
- Ford, D. (2016). *Communist study: Education for the commons*. Lexington Books.
- Halsey, A. H. (1972). *Educational priority, volume 1: EPA problems and policies*. HMSO.
- Hill, D. (1994). Teacher education and training: A left critique. *Forum for Comprehensive Education*, 6(3), 74-76.
http://www.wwords.co.uk/forum/content/pdfs/36/Forum_36_3.pdf
- Hill, D. (1997). Equality in primary schooling: The policy context, intentions and effects of the Conservative 'reforms'. In M. Cole, D. Hill, D. & S. Shan (Eds.), *Promoting equality in primary schools*. Cassell
- Hill, D. (2001). 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.
- Hill, D. (2005) State theory and the neoliberal reconstruction of schooling and teacher education. In G. Fischman, P. McLaren, H. Sünker & C. Lankshear (Eds.) *Critical theories, radical pedagogies and global conflicts*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hill, D. (2010) *A socialist manifesto for education*. Institute for Education Policy Studies.
<http://www.ieps.org.uk/media/1003/socialistmanifestofored.pdf>
- Hill, D. (2015) A socialist education policy. *Forum for Comprehensive Education*.
<http://www.wwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=forum&aid=6224>
- Hill, D. (2018). Education and social class: A Marxist response. In R. Simmons & J. Smyth (Eds.), *Education and working class youth*. Palgrave MacMillan.
<http://www.ieps.org.uk/media/1140/hill-2018-education-and-social-class-in-r-simmons-and-j-smyth-education-and-working-class-youth-pre-publication-proofs.pdf>
- Hill, D. (2019). Marxist Education and Teacher Education Against Capitalism in NeoLiberal/ NeoConservative/ NeoFascist/ Times. *Cadernos do GPOSSHE On-line*.
<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/CadernosdoGPOSSHE/article/view/1524/1275?fbclid=IwAR349OKt6lL5HRD1SiJK-6Iv7EwIQLoJpbNIVQqrjvH-LW89JHT5fAeXdFA>
- Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) (1984). *Improving secondary schools - a summary of the Hargreaves report*. London: ILEA
- Jones, K. (1989) *Right turn: The conservative revolution in education*. Hutchinson Radius.
- Jones, K. (2003) *Education in Britain, 1944 to the Present*. Polity.

- Kelsh, D., & Hill, D. (2006). The culturalization of class and the occluding of class consciousness: The knowledge industry in/of education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 4(1). <http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=59>
- Lenin, V. I. (1902/2008). *What is to be done? burning questions of our movement*. Marxist Internet Archive. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1901/witbd/>
- Maisuria, A. (2020, February 17). Labour need to commit to a comprehensive review of private education. *Private School Reform Policy*. <https://www.privateschoolreform.co.uk/opinion/labour-need-to-commit-to-a-comprehensive-review-of-private-education>
- Malott, C. S. (2011). Pseudo-Marxism and the reformist retreat from revolution: A critical essay review of *Marx and education*. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(1). <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=206>
- Mandel, E. (1976). Introduction. In K. Marx *Capital: A Critique of political economy, vol. 1*. Penguin.
- Marx, K. (1845/2002). *Theses on Feuerbach*. Marxist Internet Archive. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/index.htm>
- Marx, K. (1852/1999). *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/>
- Marx, K. (1875/ 1978). *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1875/gotha/>
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848/2010). *The Communist manifesto*. Marxist Internet Archive. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- McGrew, K. (2011). On being holier-than-thou: A critique of Curry Malott's "Pseudo-Marxism and the reformist retreat from revolution". *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(1). <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- McLaren, P. (2010). Revolutionary critical pedagogy. *Interactions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 6(2). <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/7qj2b570>
- McLaren, P. (2013). Critical pedagogy against capitalist education: A socialist alternative. *Global Education Magazine*. <http://www.globaleducationmagazine.com/critical-pedagogy-againstcapitalist-schooling-socialist-alternative-interview-peter-mclaren/>
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against imperialism and global capitalism*. Lexington Books.
- Macrine, S., McLaren, P., & Hill, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Revolutionizing pedagogy: Education for social justice within and beyond global neo-liberalism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rasinski, L., Hill, D., & Skordoulis, C. (2017). (Eds). *Marxist education against capitalism in neoliberal / neoconservative times*. Routledge.
- Reay, D. (2018). *Miseducation: Inequality, education and the working classes*. The Policy Press.
- Resnick, S.A., & Wolff, R. (1993). Althusser's liberation of Marxist theory. In E. Kaplan & M. Sprinkler (Eds.) *The Althusserian legacy*. Verso.

- Rikowski, G. (2012). *Life in the higher sausage factory*. Paper delivered to the Teacher Education Research Group, Cass Business School, University of East London.
<https://rikowski.wordpress.com/2012/08/>
- Rikowski, G. (2019). Education crises as crises for capital. *Theory in Action*, 12(3), 128-172.
<https://rikowski.wordpress.com/2019/08/25/education-crises-as-crises-for-capital-2/>
- Rikowski, G. (in press). The psychology of capital. In Institute of Political Studies (Ed.), *New understandings of capital in the twenty-first century*. The Institute of Political Studies of Belgrade.
- Simon B. (1965). *Education and the labour movement, 1870-1920*. Lawrence and Wishart.
- Simon, B. (1978). *The politics of education reform, 1920-1940*. Lawrence and Wishart.
- Simon, B. (2000). *Education and the social order, 1940-1990*. Lawrence and Wishart.
- Thomas, N. (1985). *Improving primary schools: report of the committee on primary education*. ILEA.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1934). *Thinking and speech*.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/vygotsky/works/words/Thinking-and-Speech.pdf>

Author

Dave Hill is a Marxist activist scholar, Managing / Chief Editor of the *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* (www.jceps.com) and Editor of the Routledge *Studies in Education, Neoliberalism and Marxism* series. He is Emeritus or Visiting Professor / Research Fellow / Honorary Doctor at universities in England, Greece, Chile and China. He has fought five European and UK general elections for the Labour Party and for Socialist and Trade Union coalitions, was Leader of a Council Group of Labour Councillors and a decade-long shop-steward / elected trade union representative.