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Abstract

This study uses primary texts to assess policymaking in reforming history curriculum across three high-profile education institutions in England, during 1976-1988. Set between the launch of the ‘Great Debate’ in education and the lately introduced National Curriculum the thesis argues that institutional and wider social cultures, ways of operation - within the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations in England and Wales [SC], the Inner London Education Authority [ILEA] and the Historical Association [HA] - impinged upon the author-historian consciousness to the extent that the institutional modus operandi is reproduced, variously, by using the social construct ‘race’ to serve assumed needs of a visually diverse school population substantively, beyond concern for fresh thinking. Texts are examined through two key research questions:

- How is the Black presence addressed in texts toward reforming history curriculum?
- What explains similarities, differences, institutionally?

Inquiry is advanced through historical interpretive analysis addressing nuances in the political power of language and questioning text-producers’ using ‘race’ and minority-ethnic group-representation as victims as negatively reproductive. Data indicate that the SC serving the wider national interest in enhanced teacher effectiveness promoted child-centred learning, ambivalent toward ‘race’. ILEA, turning from discourses, of a school/home community of the early 1970s to the early 1980s, followed a highpoint in confronting ‘race’ resolutely, post-1981 into 1983 progressively. The HA, early observing
historical tradition / convention ‘guarded’ subject-disciplinary pathways, ultimately advancing nationhood, inclusiveness and belonging invoking social responsibility. Contextualised between social political and educational events in the long-serving 1944 Education Act and the more prescriptive edicts of the Education Reform Act 1988, this study examines the prevailing Black-White constituency - the assumed dependency upon ‘race-thinking’, pivotal in shaping history curriculum, despite its questioned legitimacy in social-educational analysis. Effectively this study explores political power of language, productive learner outcomes, ‘capital-reciprocation’, toward culturally-interactive competency.
# Acronyms and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACER</td>
<td>African-Caribbean Education Resources (ILEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ed</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCS</td>
<td>Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (University of Birmingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Critical Language Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Critical Race Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG</td>
<td>Curriculum Study Group (Ministry of Education reconstituted into SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>Education Reform Act of 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>Educational Support Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESN</td>
<td>Educational Sub Normal / ESN Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE</td>
<td>General Certificate of Education (O level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC</td>
<td>Greater London Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>Historical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI</td>
<td>Her Majesty’s Inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMSO</td>
<td>Her Majesty’s Stationery Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILEA</td>
<td>Inner London Education Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>In-service Education of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Initial Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Local Educational Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWP</td>
<td>Multicultural Working Party (Schools Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS/UWT</td>
<td>National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCI</td>
<td>National Council for Commonwealth Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUT</td>
<td>National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Post Graduate Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Personal and Social Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHE</td>
<td>Personal Social and Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRI Act</td>
<td>Race Relations and Immigration Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations in England and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORRI</td>
<td>Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHP</td>
<td>Schools Council Humanities Project 8-13 / 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH Project</td>
<td>Schools Council History Project 13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>Social Learning Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEC</td>
<td>Secondary Schools Examinations Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key events of the Study: the educational, the social and the political

The institutions: The ILEA, The HA, The SC

1902 The Education (Balfour) Act

1902 Supervisor of schools for East London notes that ‘sixteen Board schools in the East End were practically run as Jewish schools’ – a significant development then

1903 The Education (Balfour) Act published by the Fabian Society, March

1903 London Education Act: all education transferred from the Board of Education to the London County Council [LCC] 1904-1965, in an extended scheme for the City’s secondary education

1905 The Poor Law passed - a “subtle signal” missed by the new HA months later.

1906 The Historical Association founded at a public meeting at University College London [UCL]. Its mission ‘guarding the discipline history’ and pursuing that mission ‘through the study of the past’.

1906 Professor Tout’s commitment that HA historians also make ourselves an Association of Students (scholars)
1907 Professors Firth, Lodge, Pollard and Tout, active in the founding of the HA, preferred as Doctors of Letters

1914 The Historical Association Council retains prime concern for issues surrounding teaching of the discipline / curriculum subject

1915 The beginning of the Education Library housed in County Hall - ‘toward achieving the best responses’ from teachers

1915 Education Library for Teachers carries volumes ‘at the disposal of teachers and education administrators engaged in London’s education and keeping teachers in touch with the latest developments of educational theory and pursuing other areas of knowledge useful in the training of future staff’.

1915 The LCC municipal Authority’s official publication The London Education Service rallies all its employees directly in texts

1917 The HA’s original purpose - promoting the historical profession - opens membership to ‘all persons interested in the study and teaching of history’, retaining an internationalist outlook, a global outreach and a continuing commitment to public service - features of continuing relevance in its responses to post-imperial change post-1945.
1920 An ‘objective’ / ‘scientific’ approach in history writing is pursued by the HA from this point

1956 Jubilee of the historic HA

1957 A Key Text, Historical Association, 1906-1956, Collected Papers, Jubilee commemoration, assembled by Balfour-Melville, E. W. M., HA

1959 Charles Webster (1886-1961), the HA’s international diplomatic historian, pursues his drive for a ‘scientific’ / ‘objective’ history

1963 The Greater London Act sees ILEA emerge as its stem, active from 1965, with sole responsibility for local education re-configured initially from the LCC into the metropolitan-based Greater London Council [GLC]

1964 Ministry of Education’s Curriculum Study Group of 1962 [CSG] becomes the SC

1965 The Greater London Council [GLC] active, until 1986

1965 September: National Advisory Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NACCI) superseded by the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants (NCCI)
1965 October: Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Committee [CIAC] is lapsed, produces its fourth and final report.

1965 White Paper reduces immigrant employment vouchers, abolishes the unskilled category and cut the skilled to 8,500

1965 Comprehensive reorganisation of schools: Circular 10/65

1965 Section 11 of the local Government Act, 1965: Local Education Authorities reminded of their duties in policy decisions, extending to the proper management of central funds, in reflecting the presence of minority pupils in schools

1966 Roy Jenkins, former Chancellor of the Exchequer and Home Secretary in Wilson’s re-elected Labour government, introduces his concept of ‘integration’ 1966.

1966 DES starts collecting immigrant statistics

1967 Sustained residence becomes a requisite in registration for British citizenship

1967 Political debate turns from immigration control toward the management of race relations
967 Start of SC Teaching of English to West Indian Children project [Ends 1973]; 1967 Plowden Report advocates setting up ‘education priority areas’ [EPA], a function of diversity

1968 The core subjects, mathematics and science feature together with modern languages, at the high-point of the SC initiation from 1964/5

1960s onward into 1968, SC policy of individuality is emphasised, more so than the sense of overall disciplinary collaboration and collegiality

1969 Teaching History the HA ‘bulletin’ established: John Standen becomes first editor, its mission guarding the interests of the discipline history and how that mission is pursued through the study of the past

1969 Coltham, Jeanette B., Department of Education, University of Manchester publishes Assessing History Textbooks, TH 1, April 1969, pp 213-218, making an early contribution to ‘objective’ history repeated at a conference on 27 March-1 April 1969, at C F Mott College of Education

1971 DES policy objectives include: to help create a climate in schools in which colour and race are not divisive and which would give all immigrant children opportunities for their personal development
1972 Jeanette Coltham’s further contribution to ‘skills-based history’
Educational Objectives and the Study of History published in Teaching History

1975-1977 ILEA Education Committee Meetings (Schools) discuss structures underlying the delivery of a multicultural curriculum

1976 SC Curriculum Projects reflect the new post-1940s to nineteen-sixties / nineteen-seventies demographic; immigration and ‘race’ as a prevailing concept enter the general vocabulary

1976 Labour PM James Callaghan declares school curriculum a matter of high public concern in his launch of the ‘Great Debate in Education’


1986 History and GCSE history available to 15- and 16-year-olds in schooling, with a choice of five syllabuses and emphasis on British components, from the Associated Examining Board [AEB]

1988 Earlier initiated by the SC, first national examinations for GCSE history become available the object of the Examination being to test candidates’
skills, evaluation for bias, meaning and with segmented (phased) questions on historical sources

c.1989 ‘Racialization’ becomes a broadly active concept led by proponent Robert Miles seemingly without the aversion earlier attached to ‘racism’ / anti-racism’ / ‘anti-racist’ discourse. The practice is claimed to have extended into central governmental policymaking regarding immigration, incoming ‘Black colonial peoples being negatively represented and ‘White kith-and-kin privileged in immigration law’ and other official policymaking contexts. ‘Racialization’ bears a long history; attributed to Frantz Fanon (1967), it was later expanded upon by Michael Banton (1977) proponent historian of ‘race’ and further expanded upon more recently by Robert Miles (1989)
Introduction

Toward a Multicultural Education

This introductory chapter outlines the course of the inquiry, the scope of the discussion, acknowledges my personal subjectivity in addressing the theme and explains related informing investigative applications. The core elements of this study the primary texts, produced during 1976-1988 were selected on account of their common, though not identical location. Derived from the field of education, all aspects coupled with their status nationally, are set in the educational domain. In assessing policymaking by teacher-authors, for the reform of history curriculum, I seek to determine the validity of my premise through the application of historical interpretive analyses. The interpretive analyses are subliminally supported by an understanding of how ‘the power of language, the nuanced nature of political language, contributes to the domination of others, by people’, suggested by linguistic analyst Norman Fairclough. In some accord with the power of language, this study advances an underlying concept informed by HA convention / tradition in the practice and teaching of history in terms of Revisiting historical skills toward a ‘scientific’ education beyond (national) boundaries.

Investigative-exploratory-applications

This whole is further supported by my underlying regard for ethnographic applications of social anthropology, while using the approach of a field worker, ‘participant-observer’, to heighten the investigation, ethically. My thesis is that
institutional and wider social cultures, ways of operation, within the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations in England and Wales [SC], the Inner London Education Authority [ILEA] and the Historical Association [HA] - have impinged upon the consciousness, of their constituent author-historians to the extent that the institutional modus operandi is substantively reproduced, by using ‘race’ constructs to serve the assumed needs of a visually diverse school population - beyond real concern for fresh thinking. It must be said, that despite mention of Wales in the broader working concept, little reference is made generally to Wales in the wider contexts of this study. It must similarly be stated that materially, the premise of my thesis is not intended to suggest any institutional pre-disposition in regard to ‘race’. The contingency of educational delivery is discussed against a backdrop of ‘race’-discourse -- reflecting the visually-diverse nation that post-Second World War Britain, has become. The research questions are:

First: How is the Black presence addressed in texts for reforming the History curriculum? Second: What explains similarities / differences across the institutions?

The ‘Black presence’ affirmatively refers to post-1948 post-colonial Black peoples arriving in Britain. To the extent that I sense connotations with the more distant past, its origins may otherwise be related, generationally, to familial discourse and lived-in resonances of a Black Caribbean literary repertoire, distinct from intimations of ‘race thinking’ / racialization. The Caribbean literary influence historically goes back to earlier generations, at least to Edgar Mittelholzer part-Dutch-Guianese part-European and born in 1929 died in 1965. A slightly earlier generation of writers included George
Lamming of Barbados, born 1927 and roughly a contemporary of my elder brother and whose early essay ‘My Mother who fathered me’, still lingers in my mind, fascinated at his turn of phrase, as does his second publication [Bildungsroman (G): novel about a person’s formative years] - ‘In the Castle of my skin’. Continuing from the above, the ‘field’, here, represents the institutional site-location of each case studied in the collective case-inquiry with the researcher, myself, portraying the role of a bona fide member independently and successively within respective institutions. This approach, solely through historical interpretive method is necessarily foregrounded – a standpoint commensurate with and relevant to the nature, purpose and orientation of this primarily historical research. The application is specific in terms both of the curriculum subject / academic discipline and the study’s exploration of the ‘institutional biographies’ and the impact of their past severally, upon each institution’s curriculum output, the texts, during the period 1976-1988. This approach heightens the scope of the discussion in the specificity of its past.

While a core of key concepts, ‘multicultural’ / ‘culture’ and ‘racialisation’ / ‘race’, are discussed at an early stage other relevant terminology and events in British educational history and wider contexts of this study are defined as the narrative proceeds. More than being an index of my interest in the social anthropological / ethnographical references above, this field broadly provides some background to the history and development in the general understanding of ‘culture’, as this became relevant increasingly, in post-1970s education overall and over time. Besides these elements, I explain
my use of the capitalisation of ‘Black’ at the earliest stage, beyond the evident modernisation of the grammatical form.

Inherent in the apparently lost convention currently, of using Capitals to signify perceived importance - as persists in names of capital cities, status group positions like central Government, World history and other such designations - the use of ‘Black’ and ‘White’ in this study implies something integral, holistic and broadly indicative of ethnicity though not of an assumed commonality. This brings to the discourse elements whether of cultural practice / traditions, personal, individual or group characteristics and / or, other recognised signifiers suggestive of factors beyond the issue of skin-colour. Overall, capitalisation of everyday signifiers brings to the discourse and to individuals some roundedness of stature, which is intended now, and potentially thereafter, to provide a sense of dignity, intrinsic quality and demonstrates a regard for our fellow-humans. Not altogether new, this practice has been used intermittently in the USA and elsewhere, albeit without a rationale, spasmodically over time and it may yet be re-popularised, as a norm. In drawing a line symbolically against the swell of lower-case representations regularly deployed in contexts such as this study, the use of ‘Black’, capitalised, serves as a timely moment to generate a more humane sense of discourse, debate, among proponents both for the presence, and similarly the absence, of Black peoples in England, at this time. Such a practice stands to de-sensitise everyday interpersonal interethnic and intercultural, discourses, similarly surrounding the White.
I make a further related calculation overall namely, such consideration stands ultimately, to draw unsympathetic approaches to ‘race’ even unwittingly, toward more positive directions. Change would more likely come through showing some awareness of the unthinkingly negative attitudes adopted toward Blacks, in the course of their day-to-day existence, with their reciprocation toward Whites. Somewhat reminiscent of the ‘Black-is-beautiful’ drive of 1970s USA, Black leadership here in re-stating the significance of the re-designated self, ‘Black’, capitalized, is intended both to attract notice to the (updated) signifier more widely afield even into official documentation. Starting, like the USA, with self-affirmation, securing the Black share of life’s opportunities, all interactions are invested with dignity and by inference, through extending similar respect for, toward and among, the global diversity of peoples. This would naturally extend to ‘Yellow people’ the Chinese, a group whom, before their contact with the West, were known to have considered themselves innately superior in terms of identity and ancestry, as indeed, territory and biology.\(^2\) In effect, historically, the Chinese scale of hierarchy existed before this was devised in the West – however, I signify no honours for this fact. I now move from definitions to setting out the scope of the inquiry.

Addressing themes toward my personal subjectivity

Reflecting the conceptual frame of this study, I draw upon my interest in social anthropology / ethnography to demonstrate what this study sees as the general approach to ‘multicultural’ curriculum. This approach was
adopted by that first unidentified but adventurous band of teachers, supported ultimately by variously appointed ‘multicultural’ LEA advisers. Such was the case before, and following, the 1977 Consultative Circular of Labour Education Secretary Shirley Williams’s suggestion that curriculum should reflect the diverse school intake and wider population. A propos of the longstanding absence of any official transmission of an understanding of the term ‘multicultural’, political and/or educational, local and central, up to the mid- to late 1970s, the prevailing understanding of ‘multicultural’ is testimony to the innovative capacities of respondent teachers. They sought to address the underlying absence of guidance on the part of the nation’s central policymaking education providers, in these regards. Whereas certain terms, titles/labels, were not delayed in being brought into service, for example ‘culture’, and ethnicity, as these related to ‘ethnic-minorities’. Despite this frequent signifier of the visually ‘different’ groups of migrated peoples, there was seemingly, little active sense of just who might constitute the majority ethnic group, the White appearing to be overlooked, interestingly, as even comprising one or more ethnic groups. Thus, needing to explain, to our better understanding, the largely definition-free status of ‘culture’ and hence ‘multicultural’, of the earliest period – not interchangeable with what once had generally been deemed elite ‘Culture’, this study brings to bear essential underpinnings, historically, in its more ethnographically-rooted, more distant affiliations.

Necessarily, this study briefly rehearses meanings invested in ‘culture’ as these evolved and more lately prevailed, as determined by British social
anthropologist / ethnographer, Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917), broadening somewhat to include ‘all those ways of life’. These extended further in representing Tylor’s ‘that complex whole’ which ranged more generally from ‘knowledge, belief and other capabilities and habits / customs acquired by humans as members of wider society. This whole followed through to aspects of art, moral behaviours and the law’. In this relatively broad portfolio of twentieth- and twenty-first century import, the latter parts of the Tylor definition are omitted for the purposes of the immediate present. These last, being involved with the scientific description of individual societies, methodologically, are broadly recognised in this study as having the ability to move emotionally from one realm of experience to one (qualitatively) higher, distinct from the collective study of humankind, insofar as:

What makes a reader take an account seriously is the ability of the researcher to capture, on paper, the experience of having been to a place, not just [the] ability to report facts. ⁴

Comparing the literary styles of Frenchman, Claude Levi-Strauss, Englishman, Edward Evans-Pritchard and British Pole, Bronislaw Malinowski, among others, the USA’s Clifford Geertz methodologically called upon ethnographers of his day and potentially beyond, ‘to enliven and substantiate their work by paying attention not only to what they write, but how they write as well.⁵ Just the same, received thinking of early inner-city school multiculturalists, of the broad research period, worked on lines taken, evidently by publishing house, Harper Collins and its reprint definition of
‘multicultural’, as ‘consisting of, relating to, or designed around, the cultures of different “races”’. This broad understanding applies, to greater or, lesser degrees across the institutional constituencies being investigated. At the same time, some contestation would arise from an extension of the term ‘multi-cultural’ by the suffix ‘-ism’. This generated a sense of imposition, a seemingly pejorative, disparaging, understanding of a potentially over-indulged practice or doctrine suggestive of coercion ideologically. Yet at this distance in time from the early use of the term ‘multiculturalism’, the ideological coercion appears to have diminished somewhat, decades after the latest initiatory phase of ‘mass’ immigration and ongoing demographic events. Indeed, the general mood has reached a point where the ideal of homogeneity appears to have lost its greatest momentum, or less negatively to have assumed a mantle of taken-for-granted-reality, in which this study looks toward even greater institutional and general inter-personal understanding. In essence then, this study is as much about a social phenomenon (mass immigration) as it is about ‘race’. And this position comes about as much by circumstance as this study’s determinacy of its historical political significance, insofar as ‘race’ ideological coercion hitherto, has intersected everyday life and discourse of the period, across many inner-city areas of Britain.

Therefore the phenomenon ‘race’ as presented, notwithstanding its non-scientific ascription, is pivotal in this study, taken at its more recent, heightened position in post-war demographic change. Some definition of ‘race’ / racialization, in terms of this study, is provided here. Taken as akin to
‘race thinking’, as is currently understood, racialization is a social process, which by its enactment becomes a ‘way of life’ with ‘race’ being, first, a characterising agency representative of ‘all who possess signify characterising phenotypical (physical and cerebral) attributes, assumed to be the province of all those sharing certain cultural characteristics’. Such characterization entails a ‘naturally’ acquired group-membership through a supposed collective commonality. As exponent on ‘race’, Robert Miles, put it more succinctly: ‘Racialization refers to a dialectical process by which meaning is attributed to particular biological features, [in] human beings, as a result of which, individuals may be assigned to a general category of persons which reproduces itself biologically’. The consequence of this process, to central governmental policymaking, for immigrants, was that incoming ‘Black colonial peoples were negatively represented [or even thus considered] within decision-making [policy] structures’. In such structures, ‘White kith-and-kin were given privileged status in immigration law’ and, ultimately, in other official policymaking contextual situations. It bears mention here, that first use of the term, ‘racialization’, is attributed to Franz (Felix) Fanon and later expanded upon by Michael Banton, proponent historian on ‘race’. I now turn to my prime focus in the study.

As taken in this study and potentially at some variance with the above, the focus, programmatically, is teachers’ policymaking within the context of historical documentary research and the ways in which teachers’ curriculum seemingly echo education officials’ actions. Effectively, teachers revisit politicians’ policy enacted, by reflecting such policymaking in texts produced
in reforming history curriculum. Aligned with educational policymaking and informed by the foregoing contextual narrative, the investigation is carried out against a body of post-Second World War, social-political and historical-contextual, commentary. In this process, the theme is further considered bearing in mind the impact of this latest phase of Black immigration upon education and wider society. Texts produced for reform in history curriculum are considered institutionally and against wider cultural practice. This whole is assessed through the study premise that institutional and wider social cultures, ways of operation within the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations in England and Wales [SC], the Inner London Education Authority [ILEA] and the Historical Association [HA] - have impinged upon the consciousness of respective contextual parties. Likely individuals include text-authors and advisory institutional and departmental [DES] representatives, to the extent that their modus operandi is substantively reproduced. This situation obtains insofar as perceptibly, the given actors’ perceived understanding of the Black presence appears routinely, though sometimes cautiously informed by ‘race’ and alienation and seeing particular ‘racial’ groups as a problem. Contentiously this practice also attaches to some an un-earned culpability, as may be seen.

Accordingly this study follows pathways that open naturally in society and the education system where substantive inputs to curriculum and practice derive from academics, teachers in schools, in institutions of Further and Higher education. Their occupational base provides a usefully broad, though not unwieldy constituency, across all phases, in a distinctively-composed
and originally-formed educational outreach. Inherent in this range of contexts are opportunities for informed comparative interaction, inductive and deductive thought, knowledge exchange / interchange, at a time of debate. Such circumstances both underscore the rationale underpinning the project and effectively extend upon the interpretive methodology. Philosophically, discursive historical approaches relate to knowledge obtained by reason and argument as opposed to intuition. Here, the approach is interdisciplinary and located on several levels, whether in the work itself, among teams, theoretically, or in practice. Yet, such theory as is included, methodologically, is eclectic\textsuperscript{12} and explanatory. This means that approaches / methodologies stand to include explanation and enhance understanding of materials being investigated / incorporated within my field-role of ‘participant-observer’.

At another point along the spectrum, documentary research, of particular interest in this study, would appear not to have attracted much attention of late, in terms of full-length historical inquiry into curriculum texts. However, whereas documentary research, in the discipline history and historical approaches of the more recent past might appear somewhat under represented, it may be said that documentary research across other fields of humanitarian interest and related concerns appears to be on the rise. And this ongoing research, despite its historical-educational bearing may be seen equally, as also being literally a (Collins / Harper-Collins) ‘qualitative analysis’ to the extent that the unfolding narrative represents ‘the decomposition of [constituents present in the discourses engaged] in order
to determine the [variant meanings encountered /] observed’. This process may be seen as serving to fill the breach which appears to have opened up, more recently, among postgraduate students in the study of history as a richly valued discipline, in teaching and learning.

Between the period 2006 and 2013, well up to some three hundred postgraduate (doctoral) studies have been undertaken at a London institution hardly a stone’s throw from the site of this present study. Over a similar period, some four or five researches only on history as discipline and / or its teaching, correspondingly, have been found institutionally. These last include: Barbara Caine’s ‘Biography and history’, of 2009, Miriam Dobson’s ‘Reading primary sources: the interpretation of texts from nineteenth- and twentieth-century history’, also of 2009; Sarah Barber’s ‘History beyond the text: a student’s guide to approaching alternative sources’, 2009 and Colin R. Chapman’s ‘The growth of British education and its records’, 1992. According to searches of UCL IOE Libraries and Archives, on history as discipline and / or its teaching, at the other end of the spectrum from those mentioned above, numerous studies fall within the category of humanitarian-driven inquiry, undertaken seemingly by current or prospective employees of given world-aid agencies. These occurred whether in Europe Asia Africa or other areas of conflict seeking guidance or informed assistance through reconstructive options in education, health and / or, security issues in post-conflict contexts. I move, at this point, to providing a broad overview of the texts central in this study, both conceptually and structurally.
While the institutions’ primary texts being examined are informed by the professional and wider social and educational interests of their creators, the institutional biographies / narratives bear significance in other regards, as the analyses demonstrate. These contribute richly to the discussion. Examined in the order of their textual analysis, the institutional sequence in the general conceptualisation runs, first, from the seemingly cautious SC stance toward multiculturalism and equivocal toward addressing ‘race’. These advance secondly, through ILEA’s later manifestations, of a potentially overstated executive response to the evils of ‘race-thinking’, with the need to confront ‘race’-discourses to their annihilation. Equally and third, the HA’s awakened humane concern for the accommodation of past and future generations heightens, through the 1970s historian-contributor David Edgington concept of ‘healing’ for past British, and wider European, misdeeds in racialisation. Of high significance today are expressions, repeatedly voiced surrounding general inclusion of the historically marginalised. I refer to historical atrocities like the Jewish Holocaust and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, in terms of which a position is adopted that policymakers of the day might consider discussing both groups, in recognition of some shared space in general school curriculum. Thinking need not extend to contentions of reparation beyond the affirmation of true and meaningful regard for the humanity of both ancestral groups.

As to the Black presence in England, discussed by Fryer in 1984, beyond references to slavery and the belief randomly voiced - the post-1948 immigration marks the first entry of Black peoples to Britain - the contrary
cannot be too often rehearsed. Black peoples have for long been living in Britain, and the commonplace of there being at least one Black Roman soldier among their cohorts has also been long recorded by Fryer as above, from the time of the Roman occupation of Britain. These circumstances heighten the rationale underpinning this project and the chosen methodology. This approach rings true, in and beyond the more recent concerns of twentieth-century Britain surrounding the demobbed Black servicemen returning from Jamaica, in June 1948. And that group, of some 294 veterans - slightly more than one-half of the numerical equivalent of the average cohort of 480 men in the reformed Roman Army (rehearsed in my later secondary school study in the Classics) carried out by Emperor Gaius Marius in 107 AD – was enough for general British Parliamentary concerns to be voiced in 1948. Parliament’s displeasure was sufficiently earnest for the matter to be pursued by the Privy Council, whose Memorandum to the Home Secretary (1948) among historical Parliamentary Papers requested that:

No special effort be made to help these people …otherwise it might encourage a further influx.

These historical reservations were raised notwithstanding post-Empire sensitivities and the colonial servicemen having been officially invited to help rebuild war-torn Britain, alongside other nations. These combined elements discussed, inform the unfolding narratives.

A propos of the structural range of institutional texts being examined, these comprise policy-bearing guides, handbooks or, digests, produced and used mostly by schoolteachers for the benefit of learners. As to the standard
school ‘textbooks’ sources of information on a given subject, this genre has been a topical interest as to purposes they served over time. John MacKenzie, Emeritus Professor at Lancaster University, 1984, bears this out speaking of the genre in terms of it having been a ‘growing awareness [over in excess of] the past quarter-century, of the value of school-texts in exposing the dominant ideology and objectives of those concerned with creating a degree of social conformity’. Necessarily this textual project, at hand, comprises a policy-dominant and -determined, mix of curriculum-oriented texts, not generally or exclusively the province of learners. Although linked together conceptually – inherent in the ‘collective’ case inquiry the institutions / the texts for the most part, are investigated individually. However, cross-references are made to any identified links, similarities or significant differences as the three narratives unfold, successively, in their given sequence.

Materially, the case-institutions all lived through the same social-political context of the research period. However their experience of this will unfold as their having been somewhat differently informed. And although the institutional HA is seen to have lived through a good generational span of some six decades ahead of the other two, longevity is not taken to constitute advantage or, indeed, disadvantage. Thus in reflecting upon the significance of Black colonial / postcolonial immigration and respective central governments’ contradictory prohibitive legislations, in light of the visibly changed society, this study seeks to uncover any impact of ‘race’ and related concerns reflected in given documented texts.
Of signal consequence here, insofar as ‘race’ has become the prevailing object in everyday discourse of diverse Britain, I establish the place of my subjectivity in this study as a given interest. In doing this, I provide some indication of the role of human agency and material circumstances of the environment in which I grew up. Then, I was among the majority ethnic group, supposed progeny of transported peoples and informed by my security in that position, shaped by the not wholly uncharted territory of this research. Years later and some distance on as a student, I would be included among Britain’s ethnic minorities. I make connections between my subjectivity, my Caribbean-lived experience, and the balanced approach taken up in carrying out this study. This constituent represents the source of my interest and sustained developmental experience and my having a sense of belonging and mutual understanding with productive interaction between peoples of a different ‘race’ and background, all being a product of my upbringing and early nurturing, in the inherently ‘multicultural’ colonial Caribbean. (And this sense in its turn has naturally passed on to one’s off-spring, generationally). This extended agency comprised a congenial minority of British / wider European representative expatriates, some in lately modified colonial roles, alongside an established majority of Blacks. The congenial sense prevailed, notwithstanding pockets of diffidence toward general interaction, in some areas of this diversely derived populated geographical terrain. Although a seemingly given naturally multicultural environment, it was not so defined then. In the circumstances, at my own analysis, it may also have been a matter of personal inclination arising from implicit familial example or similar
influence that ultimately prevailed in my working ethically, toward levels of balance in carrying out this inquiry. I reaffirm that my subjectivity and balanced approach to race, which does not exclusively identify tensions and problems, informs my wider approach.

My underlying ethical approach further means engaging the historical process and looking to tradition or, even convention, for evidence of any efforts toward mutual co-existence (of people and practices) being made manifest. Somewhat breaking with tradition, and seeing this more as ‘poetic licence’ than being problematic, I apply the established understanding of biography and personalize the institutions by engaging biographical method and directly investing the inanimate institutions represented, with 'details concerned with [their particular] life'. This is done as in the sense of someone having their own identity. This strategy serves aptly in the chosen collective case inquiry with its 'cumulative', successively heightening, capacities.

According to Australian author, David Tripp, in a paper published in 1985, case study is ‘an agenda for action – a cumulative process’. As such, a case-by-case inquiry allows the individual focus sites, themes, the case institutions, their texts and contexts, to be examined and appropriately compared / assessed, in all their complexities. Through such encounters, progressively across emergent themes, observers are able to witness the essence of each institution in its own right and as it were in the presence contextually, of the other two institutions.

Insofar as historical interpretive analyses involve language and to the extent that ‘language is a form of social practice’, connections are made between
language and the producers of language, whatever the given ‘social encounters’. Significant in their own light, these factors show that, as linguistics analyst, Norman Fairclough forthrightly put it, ‘not only has language become the medium of power and control’ but its importance becomes more evident in the extent to which research / researchers are increasingly engaging with language in critical methodology. In this way language, as part of the process toward initiating change is available to all institutions, the starting point of this unfolding cumulative approach being, importantly as Jenny Ozga put it, that ‘education policy is to be defined and understood broadly. It is not confined to the formal relationships and processes of government, or only to schools and teachers, and to legislation affecting them’. Indeed insofar as social policy, in this study, relates to ‘race’-thinking in post-war Britain, as will be seen, the focal issue in these regards is ‘race’ and its impact is manifest in matters of curriculum. Further, as Ozga put it, explanations of policy, and research on policy, are permeated with assumptions about partnership, in particular, and its desirability and its prevalence. I take ‘partnership’ as extending also to cooperation, methodologically, between certain representative disciplines. Ozga goes further, emphasising the point that ‘research on policymaking is itself shaped by assumptions that often reflect prevailing patterns of [policy] provision and the ideologies that sustain them’. In this light I look to opportunities to engage with defining moments in the narrative of policy created politically and / or enacted, in social and educational cooperation, particularly as these relate to ‘race’. ‘Provision’, here, is understood as policy arrangements for
teaching, which, in relation to texts produced by the case institutions are discussed primarily in terms of given state schools’ institutional delivery. This extends to political contexts, in terms of guidelines for action. These serve as a ‘resource for understanding the present’ in terms of the issues and related actions encountered through the medium of text and verbal communication, whether standard classroom, or official, discourse.

More, for clarity across this study, I make distinctions also between schoolteacher historians normally serving in schools but here working on projects alongside their supporting University counterparts. I also indicate that the status of some such actors stands to change where text-producing schoolteachers later become academics. While such distinctions are made clear at relevant points in the narrative, it is also expected that circumstantial change is taken on board as expressed in the relevant narrative. Where supportive collaborations are discussed, it is generally schoolteachers who bear responsibility for the outcomes – a point inherent in Alan Blyth’s recognition of the SC teachers’ responsibility for curriculum in some departure from reversals of the academics’ Teacher-support role. A reverse but less pressing position pertains in the case of ILEA, where a former teacher and text-producer has been known to have subsequently become a University School of Education academic.

Looking back to the influence of past policy as practice, broadly around 1944 and the impact of the new Education Act upon the present, the nature of education policy is revisited broadly from the mid-1940s, effectively 1943, into the 1950s and 1960s and for much of the period through the 1970s up
to the ERA of 1988. This relates to educational delivery, organisation and management. As Ozga confirms regarding this period of active teacher autonomy policy was largely ‘decentralised consensual and involving teachers, LEAs, and official representatives of central Government, with considerable autonomy remaining with the schools and teachers as [prime] participant stakeholders’. Key in this frame of thought is the impact of the given line of autonomous schoolteachers’ policymaking, on the reform of history curriculum, with echoes being found cross-institutionally in texts produced over the period, 1976-1988, under analysis. This perceptibly national process in policy development chimes, structurally, with local institutional policymaking and the underlying purpose and rationale, across the institutions. The broadly-based strands, in strategy, stand alongside the personal, professional, and institutional belief systems, of former and / or, current, schoolteacher historian-authors.

*The place of ‘numbers’ in immigration policy:* In attempting to discuss the nature of concerns abroad during the period when social and educational policy was being constructed, the scope of numbers informing the debates on post-1948 Black colonial immigration claim attention. The issue of numbers shaped the base of the first Immigration Control Act of 1962, quickly followed by the 1965 Commonwealth Immigration Act. These ‘toughened’ measures were offset (a decade later) by the equally deliberate if more ameliorative 1976 Act. Opportunities for more affordable long-haul affiliate-group travel were
welcome and Britain’s Black incomers reached a new mid-to-late-twentieth-century numerical high. This was not the general rule for all Western destinations.

Exceptionally the USA McCarran-Walter 1952 Act sealing the Caribbean-USA route, would be revised, reversed from its ‘racial’ / national basis of closure of this once-popular Caribbean-USA destination. In the 1960s climate of the Civil Rights Movement, it became a model for re-thinking immigration globally. The ending of the national-origins migration quotas was affected by ‘the U.S. legislative process, ethnic lobbying, and the civil-rights movement’:

Seismic geopolitical shifts ultimately created openings for reforms to the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act sharply reducing racialized laws in the United States and beyond. Indeed, other major Anglophone countries later followed suit in removing [or modifying] their race-based policies—Canada in the 1960s, Australia in 1973, Britain in 1981, and New Zealand in 1986’.23

*Britain’s Immigration-settlement numbers 1971*

Using the *Black New Commonwealth Immigration-settlement* numbers in 1971 as an index, of both the pattern and concentration, Peter Braham, contemporaneous creator of the Open University Education [E354] Course Units, unpicks numerical details and the conclusions based upon them. This was part of an exploratory process in the development of a diverse society and nation whether from an immigrant or a racial perspective. At the highpoint of New Commonwealth immigration to Britain it was discussed as ‘race’ - then defined as ‘colour and colour-prejudice - which differentiated
Britain from its counterparts in Europe’. Discussed by OU text creator, Peter Braham, this argument came with the requirement that ‘proper account be taken of the experience of “Empire,”’ citing Rex and Tomlinson (1979). Braham protested his reservations about the broader connections between the prevailing negativity towards Black colonials and the ‘long and unequal history of slavery and colonialism’, rehearsing the widely-shared view that:

The West Indian immigrant to Britain, like the black American migrant from the Deep South to the American cities, comes from a culture, a society and an economy which was historically based upon the slave plantation, and his image still carries the stigma of slavery.24

Yet Braham’s citing of the above, might have more closely reflected its authors’ meaning and sourced content had it strengthened the cited passage with the insertion of ‘his [“historically reported”] image’ before extending its rehearsal above finally adding ‘by lumping together’ the ‘coloured’ [Black] immigrant as one group’. Seemingly in oversight Braham appears to have potentially encountered the problem prompting Robert Miles’ concern regarding ‘racialization’, in which ‘meaning is attributed to particular human features’... (p. 16 above). Consequences of such attribution, for Miles, place Black incomers negatively against privileged White kith-and-kin. However in balance, Braham conceded the Jewish immigrants being ‘at least greeted with similar vitriolic hostility’.25 Thereafter Braham re-aligned, treating association of “blackness” generally as the trigger in the matter of immigration numbers. This is not to question the sincerity of Braham’s discourse otherwise. The fact is that practice in
reporting immigration statistics, then, had had some distance to travel to achieve the advance of later-twentieth and twenty-first century technicalities in the intricacies of numerical recounting. Proposing that ‘post-war migration did not really get underway until the 1950s’, Braham showed the 1951 census tally of ‘West Indian immigrants [to Britain] as approaching 30,000 per annum into the middle of the decade escalating sharply to almost 100,000 between January 1961 and June 1962 [when] the prospect of control of Commonwealth immigration grew larger’. Conversely immigration to Britain, from India and Pakistan, began later than that from the West Indies. And although there were ‘no official records between 1950 and 1955, informed estimates showed an inflow of less than 5000 per annum from India and less than 1500 per annum from Pakistan’. Yet, the ‘sharp escalation’ in numbers arriving detected among the West Indians in June / July 1961/2 were similarly reflected among the Indian and Pakistani nationals (distinct from East Africa Ugandan President Idi Amin’s later, 1968 expulsion of Asians) the former purportedly increasing fourfold to 24,000 and the latter tenfold to some 25,000 in 1961. The reported increase continued into the first six months of 1962, onto the passage of the Commonwealth Immigrants (Control) Act of that year. Notwithstanding rudimentary sourcing of immigration data initially, the Braham vision bears weight, gaining in later sophistication. Such benefit came widely in the eventual inclusion of ethnicity data in the census of 1991. This structural overview yields to the Chapter contents.
Chapter Two, Policy Context represents the unequal position existing educationally and socially prior to the return of post-Second World War demobbed colonial servicemen and later, their families. It highlights elements in the climate of ‘race-thinking’ prevailing across sectors of society, the political and social policy implementations officially responding to the Black presence in England, as these elements impact upon educational texts produced. The skin-colour, the high-visibility, blackness of colonial and post-colonial Jamaican immigrants, first assumed political significance, extending socially educationally and influencing ways in which, life-defining aspects of particular groups came to be addressed and variously served, among wider British society.

Chapter Three, Case Study One (The SC I), profiles the institution in the social-political and educational aspects of its mission and discusses the impact, of its operational styles, on the empirical outcomes. While providing background information on the origins of the SC, first of the sets of twinned chapters covering the three institutions, a majority of SC texts produced is explored. This first narrative reflects the institution’s unfolding ‘experimental’ approach (early ambivalent of ‘race’) and largely driven by its interest in ‘the new’ -- as yet philosophically undefined. This structure leaves the EMS Project scope for its discussion singularly, of ‘race’, in Chapter Four, SC II.

Chapter Four, Case Study One, SC II set against the given institutional profile continues in the conceptual “open” / ‘experimental’ approach while following new paths untrodden in SC I and unique institutionally. The chapter manifests some of the difficulties besetting the SC and this venture directly addressing
‘race’ in the explicitly entitled, ‘Education for a Multiracial Society’ Project. ‘Race’ was the chosen construct and concept adopted forthrightly and bearing testimony to the support both of the team’s conviction in its direction and of proposing institutions – NFER the since re-named dismantled NAME and the NUT. Notwithstanding its intentions to expose, if not eradicate, the evil of ‘race’-thinking, the Project seemed dogged from its start by a range of unscheduled events. First casualty was the resignation of one-half of the Project Team of two. Next, dissent and / or compromised understanding arose, allegedly between parents of school-children involved in the Project and with the Team. Worse was to come with its publication delayed. What followed was perhaps a credit to the determination of the remaining team member, who stayed the course, even writing its evaluation in 1982 following the Project Report’s delayed publication in 1981.

Chapter Five, Case Study Two ILEA I, somewhat unlike SC I, uncovers aspects of each of the two levels of information involved - its background history / biographical profile, and the analyses of texts for history curriculum. In reality, although the textual outcomes may be said to have been influenced, effectively in the manner that the human child - in the eighteenth-century English Romantic poet William Wordsworth’s view - ‘becomes the father of the man’, the textual influences would now appear to have occurred more involuntarily, than was construed initially. In profiling the institutions the study takes the inquiry through first, the institutional profile as a function of its history and second, explores other potential influences upon key history-writing-teachers in the curriculum texts produced.
Chapter Six, Case Study Two ILEA Two: Approaching Diversity, ‘Race’ through Text, examines materials produced by commissioned historians closely linked with the Authority and London’s academic life. These are informed both by the history of London’s education delivered and the scope of its curriculum engaged, relevant in the chapter.

Chapter Seven Case Study Three (HA I) revisits ‘the-guardianship-of history’ role, inherent in the institution’s mission from its foundation. This role, constituting a function of the historical process, exerted particular influence upon the nature of texts thereby produced in reforming history curriculum, over time and for the post-1948 diverse English society.

Chapter Eight, Case Study Three (HA II), treating text and historical education for the ‘common good’ follows historical pathways addressing ‘difference’ through texts. These manifest an innovative range of thinking and ideas, in strong relation to the institution’s remit and the extent to which both its long experience and present-day author-historians contributed to its up-to-date outlook, in advancing the colonial experience, as perceived, in the light of reconsidered history and the new post-colonial demographic.

Chapter Nine Conclusions, in examining the outcomes of investigations into case-institutional texts, plays the given role in this historical inquiry. It revisits prime pathways in the investigation, drawing together ultimate institutional outcomes, reasons for similarities / differences and finally determines whether opportunities were missed for updating approaches. Ultimately it points toward producing structures for transformational behaviours and envisions updated global interpersonal relations, understanding among
learners. ‘Conclusions’ highlights the gains to be achieved from widening approaches and grasping every opportunity for policymaking in history and its teaching by prioritising the adoption of ‘objective’ baseline historical skills, toward a ‘scientific’ history education beyond boundaries.
Chapter Two

Policymaking Context: The Prevailing Climate Underlying History

Curriculum Reform

In this chapter I highlight the prevailing social political and educational climate in which political policymaking in response to the Black presence, of the broad pre-and post-1948 period impacted upon curriculum materials, in state schools. I seek to identify indicate and concurrently explain my approach as the narrative proceeds and to discuss circumstantial aspects prevailing over time, their impact on the nature of texts individually or, collectively produced, across institutions at various levels of education and in respect of social-political policy. This approach, somewhat along lines of Janet Finch,¹ Vice-Chancellor of Keele University until her recent retirement provides opportunity to uncover how social policy has been pursued in and through state education in England, particularly since the end of the Second World War. By highlighting key factors, in the social / political climate, I try to indicate the nature of, and historically reconstruct a sense, of ‘race-thinking’ abroad and how this background is deemed to have influenced history curriculum. The course of pertinent events is episodic. These comprise a sequence of historical occurrences in the social-political milieus against which the narrative of texts, in history curriculum, is ultimately reconstructed.
Even as the War was being waged in 1943 the wartime Coalition Cabinet, under Winston Churchill was promoting the reconstruction of English and Welsh education as a significant contribution to the three-pronged approach to the improvement of national well-being, the first and second elements being the National Health Service and the National Insurance (Employment) Scheme. Despite the simultaneous work on the Welsh education system, little prominence is given to the Welsh education in this study. Importantly the Government’s White Paper of 1943, *Educational Reconstruction*, expressed significant sentiments as to the way forward. The principal recommendations reported were specific about the two prime aspects under deliberation. Foremost was that the definition of ‘secondary education’ therein should be enlarged to embrace:

> Three broad types of education - the grammar school, the technical school and the secondary modern school through which pupils should be accorded all the parity which amenities and conditions [could] bestow.  

The second concern was that the School Certificate Examination should become an internal matter with syllabuses and papers devised by teachers. Other related aspects discussed included full-time schooling and religious education - then of high importance in English schools; access to Universities; a Summary of principal reforms; Local Education Administration; Education in Wales and Financial implications. Also kept in focus were the medical inspection and treatment of children and young persons, schools and milk, boots and clothing and handicapped children. Indeed the White Paper,
Educational Reconstruction, formed the basis of the 1944 Education Act, which created the Ministry of Education and set the framework for the post-war education system in England and Wales. The principle, underlying this framework, was expressly that:

Upon the education of the people of this country the fate of this country depends.

Accordingly, the Government’s rationale and purpose in advancing these reforms had three determinants:

To secure for children a happier childhood and a better start in life; to ensure a fuller measure of education and opportunity for young people and to provide the means for all of developing the various talents with which they are endowed and so enriching the inheritance of the country whose citizens they are.

Clearly heightened by The Final Report of the School Board for London [LSB] together with the Minutes of the Board’s Meeting of 1904, the naturally common aspiration for achieving a ‘happier childhood and a better start in life’ for children was evidently further strengthened / impelled by the destitution endured by so many of London’s children then. The reference is to teacher, P. B. Ballard’s Introduction to Thomas Gautrey’s Lux Mihi Laus (Light is my Glory) – the Board’s motto, occupying a space over the entrance of the Board’s offices, significantly bearing the effigy of a child carved in stone on the frontal edifice. Founded in 1871, the LSB witnessed and subscribed to the needs of London’s inhabitants for one-third of a century when more than half of the inhabitants of London were partially illiterate. If they could read at
all, they read with difficulty; if they could write at all they could do little more than sign their name'.

Of the child population, ‘only 2 out of every 5 were in any sort of school; the other three were either neglected or vagrant or were engaged in some lamentable form of child-labour’. The Board’s first task was ‘to provide schools for unlettered boys and girls the second was to get unlettered boys and girls into schools’ - not an easy matter. Children ‘did not report in willingly nor were parents eager to drive [compel] them’:

Ignorant [Untutored] and unscrupulous, they were all too prone to regard their children as sources of income. As soon as they could children earned money in the streets and in factories. (At a scandalously early age put there to earn that money).

In this climate, as Gautrey saw it, schools and teachers were natural enemies to parents and children alike and new educational opportunities were not to be of a ‘single pattern’:

Schools and courses [would] be available to suit the needs and aptitudes of different types of pupil or student. It [was] just as important to achieve diversity as it [was] a closely knit society which [would] give us strength to face the tasks ahead to ensure equality of educational opportunity. Unity within the educational system [would] open the way to a more closely knit society which will give us strength to face the tasks ahead.

Yet, to achieve unity in any form of diversity was not an easy matter. Britons facing adversity needed to be adept in translating perceived misfortune into
the still considered ‘Dunkirk spirit’ called up on the evacuation of British and other Allied groups from France in 1940. This incident nobly rehearsed by the creators of the 1943 White Paper, was featured under the chairmanship of Sir Cyril Norwood a former public school headteacher. The War had had a profound effect on the attitudes of the British people, and led to certain changes in political ideology:

The war has revealed afresh the resources and character of the British people an enduring possession that will survive all the material losses inevitable in the present struggle. In the youth of the nation we have our greatest national asset. Even on a basis of mere expediency, we cannot afford not to develop this asset to the greatest advantage. It is the object of the present proposals to strengthen and inspire the younger generation. For it is deemed as true today, as when it was first said, that “the bulwarks of a city are its men”\[13\] [and today, women].

Early nineteenth century Britain was not the democratic country we know today, and the Churches bore the responsibility of providing for the poor until the mid-nineteenth century when the State began to take an interest.\[14\] Indeed, the administrative structures serving the various elements across the nation today were unknown. The three Rs, reading (w)riting and (a)rithmetic received most attention, followed by religion (reading from the Bible). This involved the churches, which, keen to extend their scope of operation, founded other organizations to deal with new ventures. And School Boards, like the LSB of 1870, were ‘Britain’s first LEAs’. However, they were rather ad hoc.

In London and other urban areas the Boards took their role seriously. By 1880, School Boards had built new schools and engaged new staff, with staff of
higher grades being taken up by the more affluent secondary style schools. By the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, the framework of what would become the hallmark of education today was set. As a token of renewal, the 1944 Act abolished the Board of Education system, replacing this with the central Ministry of Education, providing potential for the new Minister of Education to take initiatives previously the province of the Boards and other volunteers.¹⁵ In 1964, the Department of Education and Science [DES] took over from the Ministry.¹⁶ By 1999, England’s potentially autonomous, though indistinct, educational relationship with Wales was further clarified through successful devolution, similar to Scotland, thus providing greater scope for managing its own educational affairs. Consequently, the learning of Welsh language was made compulsory for all Welsh students.

Aiming to convey the prevailing climate of historical ‘race-thinking’ abroad, in statutory measures still being discussed to restrict subsequent entry to Britain, I reconstruct a sense of the re-working of the 1948 British Nationality Act – formerly carrying a longstanding ‘open-door’¹⁷ tradition for Commonwealth immigrants. (In parentheses, I leave aside the earliest significant attempts to halt the entry of Black colonials into Britain, for example the historical meeting of the Privy Council in 1948, and take a few moments to explain the interchangeability otherwise available to passport-holding Britons in terms of both meaning and intention). Thus, British passports designated their bearers as ‘citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies’, with the implication that every Commonwealth citizen was also a British subject and guaranteed the
right of entry to the United Kingdom. However, through a revision to the 1948 British Nationality Act, forming part of the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill of April 1962, temporary provision for the control of immigration of Commonwealth citizens was granted, meaning that deportation of those citizens convicted of offences and recommended for deportation by the courts was authorized.

In similar vein, prospective entrants needed to ‘demonstrate their ability to support themselves and their dependents without working’.\textsuperscript{18} Further, registration for citizenship ‘now depended on a residence qualification, and the qualification for citizenship required by Commonwealth citizens applying under the British Nationality Act of 1948’ was, by now, amended. Entry was limited to ‘holders of employment vouchers, issued by the Ministry of Labour, also students, members of the armed forces, and self-sufficient persons referred to above’.\textsuperscript{19} All told, a period of sustained residence would also be a requisite in registration for citizenship. The early operation of the 1962 Control Act, provisionally for eighteen months with scope for amendment, led to a practice of sections being added to immigration legislation throughout the 1960s, notably 1965 and 1968. The 1965 White Paper reduced the employment vouchers, abolishing the unskilled category and cutting the skilled to 8,500. It also tightened the regulations on students, dependents and visitors, ‘brought in health checks for new migrants, gave the Home Secretary the power to repatriate migrants, and introduced police powers over the registration process.’\textsuperscript{20} With all these measures in force, official thinking evidently considered better inter-group relations to be a concern. Thus, post-
1965 saw publication of the first Race Relations Bill and as Mike Phillips put it:

Political argument began to pass from immigration control to the management of race relations. However, there was one more significant piece of immigration.\textsuperscript{21}

As Phillips suggests, 1967 had significance for observers of the Black immigration phenomenon. I reiterate that ‘Black’ as the focus in this study relates primarily to ‘West Indian’ people of African descent, distinct from sub-Continental Asians. On it becoming clear that a number of British passport-holding Kenyan, if not Ugandan, Asians ‘were exempt from the provisions of the 1965 Act and were thereby entitled to enter Britain, steps were taken to breach that gap. Indeed until 1968 successive Labour and Conservative governments implemented policies apparently aimed at tackling the undesirable presence of both the West Indian and Asian communities. These actions led to the observation from Labour parliamentarian Richard Crossman that one or other of the later Immigration and Race Relations Acts was prompted by the ‘Labour Governments' need to out-trump the Tories’.\textsuperscript{22}

Indeed, the Statement on immigration and the publication of the White Paper confirmed the reduction of entry vouchers from 208,000 per annum to 8,500 despite the great shortage of workers. Similarly, some sense of the prevailing negative climate and related crises in education of this period may be gained from the Department of Education and Science [DES] document, \textit{The Education of Immigrants}, initially of 1965, and re-printed in 1971.
From non-belonging to new initiatives in education

Of some interest are incidental sentiments expressed by incumbent Education Minister, Edward Boyle, regarding the education of pupils aged 13 to 16 ‘of average and less than average ability’. Boyle’s open observations to Chairman John Newsom in the Foreword to Newsom’s 1963 report, *Half Our Future*, on the education of 13-16 year olds, provide some insight into the Minister’s sensibilities:

> The teaching profession, the local education authorities and central Government will need to consider, individually and jointly, the many recommendations that call for new initiatives, particularly in the fields of research and development. But I agree with the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council [CIAC] that there should be above all a need for new modes of thought, and a change of heart, on the part of the [education] community as a whole.\(^{23}\) [My emphasis]

Pertinent to Boyle then, as to others since, were the new modes of thought and a change of heart deemed important ‘in the task we undertake in schools as professionals and the best means of meeting obligations, though not without the backing of widely informed public opinion’.\(^{24}\) Yet, the Minister’s thinking on ‘widely informed public opinion’ appears to have been missing from the repertory of the DES staff responsible for producing the document, *The Education of Immigrants*, initially of 1965. This document incidentally demonstrates the ways in which incoming European groups were shown sympathetic understanding when driven from their countries, and the striking difference shown toward Black colonials experiencing not too dissimilar
circumstances. Indeed, the latter group-circumstances were met by the DES authors with apparent doubt / mistrust and scant understanding. It is unlikely that teachers and others involved in the education of immigrants found this intended DES guide helpful in any meaningful sense, in the preparation for educating the later, post-1960s rapid build-up in numbers of immigrant learners:

Some schools before 1960 had a cosmopolitan range of nationalities among their pupils but had found relatively little difficulty in absorbing and educating children of earlier post-war European immigrants. In the 1960s, however, the concentration and rapid build-up in numbers of children arriving from Commonwealth countries and entering the schools at different times throughout the school year began to create serious educational difficulties. (My emphasis)

Clearly, the DES preparation of teachers was not for the professional task. Rather, the aim was evidently to amplify difference, explained through national origins and with indirect connotations of colour. Yet, none of their teachers will have arrived in class as a ‘tabula rasa’, a blank slate. Thus the terms ‘European’, i.e. White, juxtaposed with ‘Commonwealth’, i.e. Black, would evidently serve to encourage if not heighten feelings of unease with a sense of acute differentiation. Taking the document at face value, ‘cosmopolitan’ and European in the pre-1960s context, in close relation to Black colonial ‘mass’ immigration, suggests a mix of European multi-national incomers, temporarily down on their luck but potentially well-travelled, even sophisticated and free from being the object of national prejudices. The rehearsed descriptor ‘before the 1960s’, applied to the 1940s onwards incoming groups comprising primarily Europeans, will have been victims of Hitler’s war and related
pogroms, for example the expelled Poles and other European-national Jewish
groups, for whom indigenous sympathies were more readily, even though not
generally, or whole-heartedly, expressed.
Notwithstanding the measured, nuanced, tone of the DES document, issues
of an unhelpful nature are arguably present and stood to have been taken as
sound advice, valid. Yet, the distinctions made between the hitherto more
settled Europeans and long-term unemployed Black Caribbean colonial
subjects do not constitute an equitable playing-field. No allowance was made
for their differential experience particularly the harsh climatic instabilities
arising from the natural tropical geographically destructive conditions. Rather,
the latter group appears to represent a calculated institutional challenge in the
mind of the Department and the more easily influenced sectors of wider
society. To allow for a better understanding of the context, I move ‘fast
forward’ into the research period.
Advisedly, I make connections between debates of the late-1960s, onwards
and rehearsals of historical failings in the education of Black learners, when
successive murmurings at large were finally brought together in the Black
Community worker, Bernard Coard’s 1970 speech, to Black parents. This
discourse attempted to alleviate parental concerns and achieve institutional
transformative action. The DES displeasure, evidently fuelled by Coard’s
hard-hitting essay published in 1971, triggered the re-launch of the DES
Guide, in seeming retaliation – a distracting line of defence.
Returning to the immigration control enactment and Richard Crossman’s observations on the perceived ‘need of his fellow-Labour parliamentarians to out-trump the Tories’, I revisit the political climate then:

Post-1968 [with] its attending preventive [measures through which] the 1968 Act had settled the major political arguments about immigration control - the next few years of political debate shifted more positively towards discussion about race relations.26

Consequently, education became the site of much controversy particularly in regard to what became known as ‘bussing’ – the policy enabling the dispersal of immigrant children from schools deemed to have too high a concentration of such pupils on roll, some 30 per cent, to schools with fewer. Momentarily, I return to the narrative’s real time and its broad continuation.

By the onset of colonial immigration to post-war Britain, the new 1944 Education Act had secured an education system serving the educational needs of all the nation’s children – ‘as part of a welfare initiative comprising a free education for all pupils, a National Insurance programme in employment, and the National Health Service, almost without educational change though not without mention of serious concerns, up to the 1980s’.27 Just then the new Conservative government of 1979, under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, announced considerable changes to education policy in the Education Reform Act of 1988 [ERA]. Structurally, the 1944 Act marked a change from the essentially ‘mixed’ system available up to September 1939. According to Michael Barber - marking the Act’s 50-year tenure for Cassell Education in 1994 - the education system in England and Wales, at
September 1939, was seen to be ‘in desperate need of reform’ evident in its lack of common availability and beneficial scope:

Eighty-eight per cent of young people left school by 14. And for those who grew up in the post-war period benefitting from the 1944 Education Act and free secondary education for all, the period 1945-1979 seemed an optimistic one.28

At its inception, policy in the 1944 Education Act did not derive from oppositional Party-political positions, but had a philosophical base and driven by consensus, was equitable and designed to counter the uncertainty of access among learners from poor families, in some contrast to the rich. According to Sally Tomlinson, the new system was based, ‘largely on a social democratic consensus that governments should regulate and resource education to achieve redistributive justice, and provide equal opportunity’.29 Yet, contrary to expectations, the beneficiaries of these developments turned out, for the most part, to be ‘middle class children’, with only a minority of their ‘working-class’ peers included. The opportunities opened up by the Act ‘did not extend to state-maintained schools’.30

Pertinently, for many offspring of immigrants into Britain from the New Commonwealth, the returns and experience of an English education expected by their parents proved far removed from the reality. Added to existing pre-war constraints, there were structural difficulties for schools into which numbers of newly settled children, from ethnic minority groups, arrived in 1964. Delivery of a ‘normal’ education proved difficult. I demonstrate something of the difficulty perceived to have arisen in classrooms through a
verbal snapshot of a much later and equally publicized dispute in the Metropolitan District of Bradford, of the mid-1980s, surrounding multicultural education. Involving the eponymous headteacher of Drummond Middle School, Ray Honeyford, the controversy was known as ‘The Honeyford Affair’. The impetus for this move was the further escalation in numbers of ethnic minority children in Bradford’s schools, in 1964. There as elsewhere in inner-city areas, the numbers of immigrant children arriving were considered sufficient to warrant the introduction of the policy of dispersal (“bussing”). This policy was introduced by Bradford’s Labour-controlled Council\textsuperscript{31} and approved by Minister of Education, Edward Boyle, mindful not to sanction outright segregation. Aiming to achieve assimilation - the process by which newcomers would supposedly, by being among the conceptually indigenous majority, naturally acquire ‘Britishness’ / ‘Englishness’ - the policy required that ‘no school should have more than 10 per cent of immigrant pupils’.\textsuperscript{32} The figure was subsequently raised to 25 per cent.

As demonstrated above, by 1965 twelve Bradford schools had reached their ceiling of 25 per cent, achieving a high of 33 per cent by February 1969\textsuperscript{33} - the twelve-fold overshot prompted a major review of the dispersal policy. The group entrants to Bradford schools were of Pakistani origin, but similar developments were occurring among other ethnic groups elsewhere, for example, West Indians, in inner-city areas like London and Handsworth, Birmingham. Following the General Election of May 1965, in order to counter remaining pockets of post-war White economic disadvantage and disquiet and so target the newcomers, the new Labour Education Secretary, Anthony
Crosland, (1965-7), observed that ‘for the first time in the history of public education, there was a real intention to educate the mass of young people to far higher levels than ever before.’ Indeed, Crosland decreed that ‘selection for secondary education should cease and that educating all young people to far higher levels should be a realistic goal’. To incoming Black colonial workers and their conceptually indigenous (English) counterparts the prospects for their children’s education appeared secure but they had inadvertently overlooked the saying: ‘One swallow does not make the Spring’.

Yet the 1944 educational structure - reputed to be ‘a framework within which change [could] take place and through which the education system (of England and Wales) be expanded and incrementally developed‘ did not bring effectual change for the better to all children.

For West Indian parents arriving, primarily from dependent countries still under the protection of the ‘Mother Country’, Britain, with high expectations of employment, good education and improved standards of living, Britain’s post-war economy and employment opportunities were disappointing. As if to endorse hearsay reports, hard evidence came in the records of White sectional attitudes through a survey of indigenous attitudes to race, E. J. B. Rose and Nicholas Deacon’s *Colour and Citizenship: a Report on British Race Relations*, of 1969. Significantly, emphasizing the need for assimilation, or other response in some form of interpersonal accommodation, the parliamentary Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration [SCORRI] similarly published a report, in 1969, *The Problems of Coloured*
School Leavers. Subsequently replaced by ‘Black’, the term ‘coloured’ was accepted terminology then. Coincident with the SCORRI report, the North London West Indian Association had also lodged a complaint with SCORRI, on racial discrimination in ESN schools, for the so-called “educationally sub-normal” learners. Indeed in 1969, Black prospects were grave and in need of reparatory action.

Indicative of the wider issues, not least of employment opportunities, related inquiries were carried out. Various catalogued, some four documents are mentioned here as further instances of the ‘immigrant problem’ within the geographical scope of the newcomers’ settlement, for example, Huddersfield and Oxford, including first, as already mentioned, *The problems of coloured school-leavers*: Minutes of evidence taken at Oxford, by Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration, Sub-Committee A, Wednesday 26th and Thursday 27th February, 1969, session 1968-1969 Vol.1, Report and proceedings of the Committee identified here as I (a). Secondly, strangely identified at source as IV, are minutes of evidence taken at Huddersfield by SCORRI’s Sub-Committee C, of Wednesday 19th and Thursday 20th, March, 1969, session 1968-1969. Third, identified here as IV (b): *Problems of coloured school-leavers*: Report, session 1968-69, identified at source as Vol. 4, with Appendices to the minutes of evidence, 1969. Fourth and finally, identified here as IV (c), *Problems of coloured school-leavers: Observations on the Report* [evidence of the above as perceived] by SCORRI, and dated 1970.
Seemingly, for pockets of West Indian pupils from relatively less-affluent, often less-accessible, rural Caribbean districts entering English schools, policy issues were language-based, not as a second-language matter but in terms of the Creole-driven dialect-mix of English. This Creole-English was used by an increasing number of children post-1948 into the 1960s / '70s, and optionally by some (bi-lingual) parents in the home. So distinctive was this tongue to listeners, that it apparently threatened children's potential for assimilation. With difficulties at home and school, a crisis-point was reached between West Indian learners, the local communities of parents, their supporters, and teachers / schools. With their cause espoused in Coard's speech to Black parents, in 1970, the Black activist-community-leader, knowledgeable on the British education system, brought the issue of Black ethnic minority education centre-stage. Coard's platform was the publication of his ground-breaking essay, *How the West Indian Child is Made Educationally Subnormal [ESN] in British Schools*, 41 (1971). This new mood carried over from the Race Relations and Immigration Acts of 1971 well into 1976, the formal beginning of this study, jointly marked by the 1976 Act and Prime Minister Callaghan’s newly launched ‘Great Debate’ in education.

*Toward defining pertinent racisms - testing policymaking*

As stated in the introductory chapter, this study draws upon the concept of power as a function of language, advocated and defined by linguistics proponent and analyst, Norman Fairclough. The understanding, here, is that power is exercised subtly and expressly in political and central Governmental
transactions and similar agencies. The express approach indicates that the ways / means of carrying out the investigation of relevant texts is just that, in opposition to any deeper meaning / understanding of action taken in relation to ‘race’ / ‘race’-thinking. Indeed, the subtle definitions / demonstrations of ‘race’ means that ‘race-thinking’ is not always readily appreciated – particularly by unwary perpetrators. This is evident in the ease of references made, as-it-were to underscore their positivity often revisited in rehearsal of the mantra of the supposed ‘different races’ that comprise British society. The approach adopted in this study, particularly toward texts, reflects discourses of ‘race’ as foreshadowed in the Introduction to this study and in close relation to educational sociologist Jenny Ozga’s representation of ‘race’-informed ‘policy arrangements’ as a ‘resource for understanding the present’.42 Inasmuch as ‘race’ is among the policy arrangements active in this study, in terms of the particular position taken by Jenny Ozga, its discourse is expected, necessarily, to contribute to our understanding of the present time. Insofar as texts are discussed in terms of the institutions’ reading of ‘race’, it is fair to assume that questions arising would be discussed in some relation to discourses of the given author-historians’ commentary. This could uncover the “impulse” behind their writing, the institutional ethos and wider contextual circumstances. Thus I provide an example of how the RR Act of 1976 would affect the Sikh and Jewish populations, insofar as this Act did not cover religion. Contentions like ‘race’ would be considered in light of practices surrounding ‘colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin’43 directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally as ‘racial’ groups in these contexts. Proposals
were invited to extend the existing law to protect groups defined not only by ‘race’, colour, ethnic or national origins but by religious belief or absence of belief which relevant bodies welcomed receiving.

Correspondingly, critical ‘race’ theory, of whatever persuasion for example ‘whiteness as supremacy,’ is not considered in current contexts of this study, textually. Whereas theory of whiteness has been actively studied in the USA over time, it is only relatively recently that this strand has come into the lexicon of ‘race’ typologies in Britain, unlike the longer-lived ‘everyday’, ‘common-sense’ and / or ‘unthinking’ emphases in Britain. Indeed, insofar as blackness constitutes a prevailingly international / global theme, I draw upon an amalgam of commonly discussed metanarratives through one or other of these three more pervasive strands. Take first ‘everyday racism’, as mooted by senior researcher, Philomena Essed, of the University of Amsterdam, this and others similar are operative in potentially less hard-bitten terms than those featured in the USA. Engaging with the ‘everyday’ concept as a rationale in the understanding of ‘race’-phenomena in her curriculum texts, Essed’s model of ‘everyday racism’ requires some appreciation of its underlying subtleties.

Everyday racism is the integration of racism into everyday situations through practices (cognitive and behavioural) that activate underlying power relations. This process must be seen as a continuum through which the integration of everyday practices becomes part of the expected, of the questionable, and of what is seen as ‘normal’ by the dominant [more generally indigenous] group.44
For Essed, the secret in countering this ‘normal’ strand, of racism, is to adopt an extreme hypocritical stance, arguably a challenge for anyone of a natural forthrightly cooperative inclination. Whether these kind of occurrence surface in discussions of institutional texts may depend upon the text-authoring historians’ / significant others’ particular standpoints hitherto adopted.

Topical during the period following the murder of Black teenager, Stephen Lawrence in south London in 1993, allegedly by local racists, institutional racism was discussed in terms of the police officers on duty at the time of Stephen’s murder. Its prominence was heightened by the Chair, of the belated Inquiry into Stephen's murder, Sir William Macpherson. Somewhat unconvincing, Essed’s distinction between the ‘individual’ strand of racism in relation to the ‘institutional’ appears to be just short of the total negation of the individual strand of the phenomenon. To Essed, the individual strand is problematic - ‘a contradiction in itself insofar as racism’ per se of whatever persuasion is, by inference, ‘the outcome of group-power activation’.45 I counter this last, to the extent that racism in British terms does not have to be collective to be recognized.

The British definition of institutional racism - arrived at historically following the murder of Stephen Lawrence – necessarily foregrounded the collective element in strong contrast to the individual form. This was achieved through the determination of the Inquiry Chair that ‘institutional racism’ was:

the collective failure of an organization to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin and seen in processes, attitudes and behaviour which
amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority groups. The ‘individual’ British conceptual counterpart, long acknowledged, is therefore not discussed at length here. More closely aligned with recent British legal scholarship, ‘institutional racism’ was an item in USA popular discourse, of the late 1950s and 1960s, originating through young Black activist Stokeley Carmichael and his separatist associates, in their over-enthusiastic drive to advance the Civil Rights cause. This was followed, with interest, by young Black Britons and their counterparts globally.

Ahead of Essed’s ‘everyday racism’ in Amsterdam, a new British construct of racism, distinct from an already recognised strand took form, working its way from ‘the organic crisis of British capitalism and race’, headed by John Solomos, Paul Gilroy et al. This ranged through to ‘common-sense racism’ emerging from the intellect of Errol Lawrence during the 1970s / 1980s, among the CCCS collective at the University of Birmingham. This broad group worked under the directorship of polymath sociologist Stuart Hall, sometime of the Open University. Actively reinforcing their scope of operations the shape and status of ‘common-sense racism’ were furthered through the elemental, substantive, constituencies of Gilroy et al. At its developmental stage, in the early 1970s, the ‘common-sense racism’ of Solomos et al embodied a subtle, yet deeply-rooted character. Its prime significance being, then as now, the developing narrative of race relations discourse, of 1970s Britain. Its importance lay in the historical perspectives brought to the
sociological field in the Higher Education [HE] domain. This shared thinking was acknowledged in a statement by members of the CCCS collective, with whose contextualization of ‘race’ this study bears some resonance in its historical applications. In explaining the significance of their contextualization in ‘the wider structures and relations of British society [then]’, the 1970s, the collective voice declaimed that for the present day, ‘racism [could not] be treated simply from a sociological perspective’. Rather, as inherent in this study, ‘it (racism) has to be located historically and in terms of the wider structures and relations of British society’, which it duly reflects, through social class and otherwise, contextually. Indeed:

The (historical) roots of racist practices have been conditioned if not determined by the historical development of colonial societies … which was central to the reproduction of British imperialism. They [the roots of racist practice] go deep and cannot be reduced to simple ideological phenomena.48

The sociological-collective took the phenomenon to another level of discourse engagement. And insofar as discussing this conceptual construct requires greater scope than this chapter affords, I refer selectively to the salient points prefacing the prime discourse. Lawrence’s colleagues provide a subtle opening link, to which Lawrence adds further detail. For Lawrence, there should be little surprise at history repeating itself at discord arising from imported workers from less advanced and less productive economies, to be placed among their more developed counterparts – this is to be expected and not greeted with alarm. Indeed, ‘the reproduction of racial and ethnic divisions has been a central feature’ in the postwar period ‘precisely because of the
requirement of labour from the colonies and other peripheral economies being used to reorganize the prime industrial sectors of advanced economies’. And thus the co-authors’ view, against the more light-weight of charges of racism at the most basic level, is that ‘common sense approaches’ in structuring society are needed. These would go beyond directly addressing ‘the complex ways in which state racism works while looking closely at the ways it is reproduced in British society inside and outside state apparatuses’. Of Caribbean ancestry Errol Lawrence, among others of the CCCS collective, speaks with the ‘sense’, intuitively, of an insider actively engaged on an informed level.

There are resonances, here, with some two guises of ‘race’-representation discussed by Roy Lowe (1997), in his discussions of the academically- / intellectually-rooted, potentially eugenicist hereditary- and hierarchically-informed model, on schooling in post-Second World War Britain’s reform-eugenicist rump of the British Eugenicist Society. These were active from 1964, projected by post-war parliamentarians at the onset of Black mass immigration to Britain in 1948. As history then showed, this stance, followed by the introduction of a series of potentially unwarranted racialized legislations, worked in the society’ or ways in which ‘race’ is reproduced inside it. First, this concept held in the control of non-White immigration into Britain and was pursued along contentious lines of misinformation, as was subtly evident in the DES document above, of 1965, reprinted in 1971. Second, it took the form of a more nuanced, seemingly reflex response to ‘difference’,
arguably modelled upon lines informed by proponents of a preferred (monochrome) homogeneity.

These strands may be seen as less “direct”, but no less earnest in meaning than some hard-edged representations of ‘race’ discussed by members, for example / some authors among the University of Birmingham CCCS collective. Whether these are manifest through the ‘complex ways in which state racism works inside or outside state apparatuses’, discussed by Gilroy et al (1984), above⁵⁰ is not considered here.

Yet, whether the foregoing strands of ‘race’ discussed above are reflected in any of the given social structures, and through into texts produced, will have been a point of interest for those like Coard (pursuing the interests of the Black disadvantaged minority) in the unhappy educational situation marked by ‘[assimilation-based policies of] streaming, banding, bussing, and ESN schools’. These interests were reportedly compounded by ‘racist news media, a middle-class curriculum, and by totally ignoring the Black child’s language, history, culture, and identity’.⁵¹ Inherent in Coard’s understanding was his contention that through the choice of teaching materials ‘the society emphasizes who and what it thinks important – and by implication and omission, who and what it thinks is unimportant, infinitesimal, or irrelevant’. The inference surrounds Coard’s perceived omission of what he believed should be a ‘multicultural’ / ‘intercultural’ curriculum. But Coard’s thinking, in this, was predictable: His perceived (official) alienation, ‘othering’, of West Indians as a group, ran apace with a further battery of limits imposed upon Commonwealth members’ entry to Britain, excepting ‘persons holding [the
soon-to-be rationed] work vouchers and dependents of those already in the U.K.\textsuperscript{52}

In terms of controlling mechanisms against ‘easy’ entry to Britain, vouchers were different from work permits and hitherto issued to aliens, an earlier category not [then] including West Indians’.\textsuperscript{53} Of the three kinds of voucher, Category ‘A’ were allocated to those immigrants for whom jobs were already arranged with UK employers, ‘B’ referred to applicants with special skills, usually professionals, for whom jobs were arranged in their countries of origin. Category ‘C’ applicants were scheduled for the unskilled. Despite a change of central government, in 1964, the White Paper on Immigration, of 1965, tightened existing rules and ‘C’ Vouchers were abolished altogether. But this would not be the end of this event. As a further mark in the rising points-of-crisis, in 1962, some 5,120 holders of vouchers entering the Country were West Indians; the corresponding figure in 1963 was some 30,130 artificially raised by allegations of pending limits which many sought to beat. In 1974 some 14,705,\textsuperscript{54} comprising displaced Asians, fell victim to the looming East Africa Asians crisis, created both by control in the 1962 Immigration Control Act and Ugandan President, Idi Amin’s foray into their expulsion, of 1968.

Post-1971, seeking to address policymaking in its immediate political educational and social aspects, the House of Commons Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration, looking into minority experience, published a group inquiry Report, of 1977, ‘The West Indian Community’. The majority of, Coard’s concerns were discussed there. In due course, a robust outcome of the specially convened Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children
from Ethnic Minority Groups, ‘West Indian children in our schools’ - the Rampton Report, 1981, emerged. This was an interim publication of the latterly requisitioned, learner-oriented inquiry, the Swann Report, with the original Rampton remit bearing additions potentially reflecting some of Coard’s concerns, to which this study returns later. One concern was the impact of the assimilationist policy on the Black child in schools, which was expected to work toward the child’s acquisition of ‘Britishness’ / ‘Englishness’, while acquiring ‘two fundamental [attitudinal beliefs] from their experience of the British school system: a low self-image and correspondingly low expectations in life’. By 1968, in broad parallel with aspects of the social and educational climate, discussed above, political debate and commentary on immigration continued to shape the context overall. The then Labour government, of some two years, advanced policymaking with a seemingly more ameliorative tone toward colonial immigrants - a post-hoc gesture aimed to secure a spirit of community, through ‘integration’ - the intended absorption of the newcomers into British / English society and culture, but still holding to their own ways of life, not expected to be ‘flattened’.

*Toward a cohesive society?*

Arising evidently at Cabinet level, it was Roy Jenkins, former Chancellor of the Exchequer and then Home Secretary in Wilson’s re-elected Labour government, who publicly introduced his concept of ‘integration’ – ‘not a flattening process of assimilation but equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance’. ‘Tolerance’, notwithstanding its connotations of enduring something otherwise
unpalatable, was considered an advance upon the earlier drive toward assimilation. Yet, to the majority Black majority “community” their concern was less about, though not against “integration” however defined they has “numbers” safely on their side. What did concern them, however, thanks to Coard, was the standard of education being delivered to their children even if they had not been so well endowed themselves.

Two elements stand out in Coard’s educational critique: first, that all meaningful guidance on Black pupils’ background and history were not only absent from the curriculum being delivered, but will have encountered prevailingly negative attitudes in other general regards. Second, and potentially a consequence of the first is the flawed self-image and lowered expectations imposed upon the Black child as his / her ‘true’ identity. These experiences ring true for many, though not necessarily all the Black colonial immigrant families among the earlier imported, economically challenged, work-force. Yet, arising from Coard’s initiative, there would be light at the end of the tunnel, though not immediately.

Among the more constructive explanations of Black learners’ underachievement in schools, Coard’s reference to ‘culture clash’ would provide another rung in the ladder of immigration woes. This was aggravated by what the volunteer community leader saw as racist behaviours / assumptions, and teachers’ inadequate response to Black children, faced with their quite ordinary needs. Coard may have had in mind such negative commentary as those made in the official DES publication, *The Education of Immigrants*, referred to above, particularly the less than complimentary
generalization on local “family” cultures, particularly poorer Caribbean classes, stoking up fears of unmarried Black Caribbean women having their children and potentially arriving in English classrooms as “problematic” learners. The deficit principle, foremost in early post-Second World War theoretical thought, appears to have crept generalized into the wider indigenous impulse. Such types of practice would more likely be demonstrated among eugenicist inclined followers of Hans Eysenck, active in post-second World-War England, and Arthur Jensen in the USA. Generalizations came, for example, in a form of ‘stereotyped or patronizing behaviour / attitudes, toward West Indian children’ and potentially others, as identified in the Rampton report. There, Rampton speaks in terms of ‘racism [existing] among a minority of school teachers’.

Necessarily in relation to all the above, I make connections with, and draw distinctions between the broad conceptual counterpart racism, and ‘racialization’ (thinking ‘race’) interpreted and discussed in these contexts by author-historian inclusion-proponent, Ian Grosvenor (now Professor of urban educational studies at the University of Birmingham). In these contexts discussed earlier, the pitfall is that groups which broadly share visibly common characteristics are often mistakenly / imperceptibly perceived negatively with inappropriate outcomes.

Other (assimilation-minded) characterizations, similar to those about West Indians, made their way into the personal domain of Asian mothers. A largely unsubstantiated body of opinion about this group as characterized in The Education of Immigrants, portrayed them collectively as having ‘a tendency to
live a withdrawn life and not making outside contacts, many [being] shy at the thought of mixing with White parents with whom they have little or no contact out of school'. In such claims about both incoming communities, this document fails to serve the educational interests of pupils entering the system. Compounding the DES text-authors’ short-sightedness toward West Indians, the document portrays Asian women’s retiring, ‘shy’, attitudes negatively, without giving thought to language constraints or how the learning of English might be fostered.

Hard on the heels of educational concern, among Black learners and parents, wider society was visited by further periods of disquiet, everyday social unease, unsettled by two periods of economic strain - challenges to any society seeking cohesion. In the early 1980s the joint effects, of the preceding decade’s oil crisis and the attending remnants of economic instability led to a full-scale recession. By 1981, inner-city areas of England were marked by running disquiet, activities attributed to young Black men, many of whom, according to reports, may well have been subject to the belittling experiences discussed by Coard. In this sense, these incidents may just as likely be claimed to have derived from the majority sense of Black youth not seeing themselves as stakeholders in British society. Prime among related concerns was their regular subjection to the policing policy of ‘stop and search’. This assimilation-driven practice was deployed against Black youth who, in the 1960s / 70s as teenagers, were repeatedly targeted, allegedly, by police officers. This was a policy, through which suspicion was sufficient reason for police to stop anyone, more usually young Black men, and search their person
for evidence of intended criminal activity. Whatever the rationale surrounding these eventualities, particularly in the contexts of multiculturalism, the multicultural society, or education generally, rationalization of policing activity does not constitute a part of this study. Rather, it now serves as a lead into extended thinking, upon what some proponents see as a missing element of the multicultural ‘ideal’ evident among wider social practice.

**Anti-racist ‘multicultural’ education: revisiting accustomed critique**

I register awareness of the discursive line in the policy-context element of this process, by touching briefly on a broad critique of ‘multicultural’ education popularly understood and broadly referred to above. This constitutes the sort of challenge levelled against ‘multicultural education’ as practiced and critiqued by Barry Troyna, longstanding proponent of an antiracist education as a rightful component in, if not a freestanding precursor to, his less comfortable acquaintance with a British version of a ‘benevolent multiculturalism’. Associated with a more benign form of multiculturalism, ‘benevolent multiculturalism’ is discussed by Margaret Gibson, proponent in this area as entitled but more inventive in approach, resourceful, in the USA reading of the theme, evidently, in this article. Among Troyna’s later essays, just preceding his subsequent passing, Troyna discusses the ‘disquiet among African-Caribbean communities over the institutionalized inequalities in education’, exactly the type of event which led to Coard’s thesis, discussed above. Troyna reminds readers of his colleague, Sally Tomlinson’s co-incidental statistic of Black pupils, on their somewhat hasty placement in ESN schools - their seemingly inevitable, ill-considered, destination. Indeed,
‘misplacement [in these institutions] was four times as likely in the case of Black immigrant children and [among whom] methods and processes of assessment constituted major reasons for inherent discrepancies’. 61

I use Troyna’s rehearsal of Tomlinson’s (1981) unearthed discrepancies as but another statistic surrounding the placement of Black learners in ESN schools - which stood to serve little, or otherwise be served similarly, in advancing the cause of an anti-racist ‘multicultural’ education, discussed by Troyna. It seemed likely that all that remained to uncover was Troyna’s lately acknowledged potential failure of his much favoured ‘anti-racist’ cause. In this light, however, my anticipation would prove to be somewhat premature. And thus, I finally find myself seeking still to engage with the significance of Margaret Gibson’s USA “benevolent multi-cultural” thinking pejoratively mentioned by Troyna months earlier. Here, I cite Gibson, allowing her as-it-were the scope to relate the narrative herself. First, I provide an outline of her aim and intention, from her paper as a whole. Gibson’s aim was (a) ‘to increase conceptual clarity of just what was meant by ‘multi-cultural’ (in USA thinking) and (b) to make explicit a number of assumptions which underlie each of the five conceptualizations advanced’. 62

Sub-titled Approaches to Multi-cultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumptions, Gibson’s paper delineates some five approaches to multi-cultural education, ‘each of the first four being programmatic’. She attached basic assumptions to these, altogether, in terms of: ‘underlying values, changed strategies, intended outcomes and given target populations all in respect of multi-cultural education’. 63 Taken from an anthropological
perspective, the fifth conceptualization attaches significance to both ‘education and culture, and without equating [either] education with schooling or, viewing multi-cultural education as a type of formal educational program’.  

Finally drawing upon her Conclusions, reached in her paper, Gibson’s experience is recounted in terms of the USA, but arguably appropriate to the UK also:

Spurred initially by minority-group pressure for equity in educational opportunities and greatly accelerated by federal legislation for bilingual and ethnic studies programs, *multicultural* education had become, in a few short years, one of this decade's fastest growing educational slogans. In reviewing the literature on *multicultural* education, we find that program proponents [had] provided *no systematic delineation* of their views, and that all too frequently program statements [were] riddled with vague and emotional rhetoric.  

Gibson’s overall intention was first, to convey the multiplicity of cultures at hand, (multi-cultures), and in so doing ‘to promote conceptual clarity and to bring some order to the field’s broad scope’. Thereby she decided that ‘extant programs [could] be organized into four separate approaches’: Benevolent Multi-culturalism would be one of the four forms likely to serve as a standard, whereby both formal and out-of-school education may be considered ‘in relation to the formal school programmes’.  The other three approach categories, Cultural Understanding, Cultural Pluralism, and Bicultural Education ‘would serve as a basis for analyzing the implications of each
category in school reform. These program proponents [are needed] for defining key concepts and to explicate their assumed relationships'.

A second focus was indicated by way of detailed processes involved in the undertaking. Gibson closely rehearsed the requisite ‘to consider both informal and out-of-school education and their relationships to formal school programs’. Third was a cautionary note requiring ‘proponents to be more realistic about the ability of multi-cultural education programs to solve social problems’.

Indeed, it was argued that ‘if proponents [were] seriously concerned with changing the existing social structure, through school programs, they must investigate more fully the economic, political, and social forces which impinge upon the formal educational processes’. As an alternative to the four given approaches to multi-cultural education, a fifth conceptualization was provided. This was structured upon anthropological definitions of both education and culture, providing one basis for the evaluation of the other four approaches.

Each of these first four approaches tended to restrict its view of culture to the culture of an ethnic group. As Gibson found, this practice ‘led to unintentional pigeonholing amid stereotyping of students’. The fifth approach, usefully, recognized that:

There may be a culture shared by members of an ethnic group. Indeed, it is this shared competence which provides members with a common sense of ethnic identity. But members of the ethnic group would also acquire competence in the cultures of other sets and clusters of people.
The acquisition of competence in others’ cultures in this way arguably is the mark of a meaningful multicultural education. While taking up such a position, it followed that differences were also likely to surface and these could serve as a useful teaching / learning point in the given contexts. However, inasmuch as this reference to Gibson is made largely as a signal to different approaches in dealing with ‘multi-cultural’ education as prime theme between the USA and UK, no consideration will be given to possible uses / usefulness, in dealing with such differences, in some contrast to similarities. Gibson put it cogently:

Given that individuals can and normally do develop competencies in multiple cultures, the question for educators is how best to create learning environments which promote rather than inhibit the acquisition of multi-cultural competencies.\footnote{71}

But little of this purpose was considered by the ‘race’-construct adherents. Rather than think constructively and in terms of the relevance to the school population of their competence as “learners of others’ cultures”, the British approach in teaching placed the interest in the potentially irrelevant political minutiae of ‘race’. Expressing her appreciation of the need for specialist input in these regards, Gibson suggested that:

Social scientists can help to respond to the issue by studying the relation between the maintenance of (ethnic) group boundaries and the development of cultural competence across such boundaries. [Indeed] …

‘by focusing on school situations, such an avenue for research may yield important insights for promoting multi-cultural education as part of our formal [USA] education policy / process’.\footnote{72} As Gibson further suggested, ‘this finding
could be useful where multi-cultural programs are seriously provided in the “formal” in-school, educational curriculum", particularly where this thinking does not constitute a sop to placate ‘race-thinking’. This review of the broad 1976 USA conceptualization and experience of the [hyphenated] ‘multi-cultural’ ideal provides useful and potentially rewarding opportunities for insights, a form of intellectual stock-take of the process ongoing during the corresponding period in Britain. Clearly, it is not just the concept of ‘multicultural’ that is differently approached in Britain. It is very much a way of life and thought which gave rise to the differences perceived. At the time when the USA was actively engaged in their conceptualization of the ‘multi-cultural’ role and experience for learners, the interest of Britain’s educationists - regarding learning and learners in schools - was directed short-sightedly more to the human diversity as a potential threat to Britain’s supposed longstanding homogeneity.

This means that rather than consider how learners’ development overall might be enhanced intellectually, for life in the diverse society of which they formed a part -- discourses of antiracist proponents were set against any constructive thought on future achievement -- by enhancing learners’ development through truly multi-cultural approaches. In this way, the divide which few sought to breach would remain, with hardly any intellectually transformative collaboration achieved meanwhile.

The outcome of this divide has been the clear absence of intellectual rigour being directed to UK multiculturalism, except from early contenders like Maurice and Alma Craft alongside others who managed to be heard over time,
all telling of their particular structures for ‘multicultural’ education, with hardly any meeting of minds. Anti-racists like Troyna, Carrington and others retained their banner for antiracist multicultural learning and teaching and holding this position in their literature, over time. What seems certain about the Gibson USA thinking, even without reference to anti-racist education, is that this appears to have ruled out scope for thinking in terms of ‘race’ through their higher intention of achieving sound multi-cultural understanding. Necessarily I attempt a further review reflecting that of Gibson herself, rehearsing in sum the evident pragmatism and theoretical inclinations / interests, which she so clearly demonstrates:

First, was the holistic, the comprehensive, theoretically- and developmentally-driven purpose that Gibson brought to her version of both the ‘multi-cultural’ ideal and inherent principles. Second was her demonstration of how best teachers might create learning environments and the capacities which promote, rather than inhibit, learners’ acquisition of the multi-cultural competencies she espouses, within the “formal” in-school, educational structures. Third and fourth, as-it-were collapsing twinned competencies, is Gibson’s sense of how educators might influence their fellow social scientists to participate in fostering learners’ responses anew to different cultures, by studying the relation between the maintenance of group boundaries alongside the development of cultural competences across such boundaries. This constitutes a real achievement in learners’ overall development, the benefit of which is that it overcomes the weaknesses of the assumed cultural deficit approach.
Revisiting the deficit principle here means looking again at the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (SCORRI) inquiry into ‘The West Indian Community’ (1977) and responding to Coard’s prime concerns for meaningful education in Britain. Their inquiry on schools was undertaken in 1981). This was followed by the more broadly based and fuller second-stage report, from Michael Swann, FRSE, The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups, of 1985. Answering to the concerns of the assembled interest-group representatives, the Select Committee concluded that West Indian children were failing in our schools, and that urgent action was needed to counter this. Among reasons suggested for Black learners’ underachievement - all substantiated and carrying implications for future policy - prime focus was given to paragraph 3 of the Report which once read culminated in the interim publication, the Rampton Report (West Indian children in our schools):

In the eyes of many West Indians the major cause of their children’s underachievement is racism and its effect in school and society. Although there are some teachers who hold explicitly racist views, they are very much in the minority. We did however find evidence of what we have described as unintentional racism in the behaviour and attitudes of teachers. This may take the form of stereotyped or patronizing attitudes toward West Indian children.74

Inherent in the above passage is an underlying sense of negativity. Interestingly, ‘unintentional racism’ foreshadowing ‘institutional racism’, the latter was found to inform operational thinking of British police, highlighted in the previously-mentioned Macpherson Report (1999) in the now historical
inquiry on the death of Stephen Lawrence. This report also indicates the summary injustice being dispatched, so readily to Blacks, seemingly as everyday practice.

Attempts to trace meaningful development in multicultural education often reveal references to a need for its practice, without any authoritative statement on its general implementation. Realization in these regards was left largely to teachers, with technical support from LEA Advisers in whatever areas of curriculum. This was a fast-growing aspect of homegrown teacher training through INSET (In-service education of teachers) provided by and based largely in LEA Teachers’ Centres. Schools’ subject departments sometimes acted as hosts to occasional one-day events. Following the trail of activity, I continue this summary rehearsal at the Conclusions point of SCORRI’s (the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration) response, to charges by community activist, Bernard Coard, surrounding schools’ and teachers’ failure, in providing a meaningful education to Black learners. Inasmuch as a majority of the Black immigrant (child-rearing) workforce was at the lower end of the economic scale, a major part of the Select Committee’s deliberations was devoted to parents’ difficulties in accessing (social) services. Problems arose either from the fact of inadequate provision, or parental inability to draw on any such service which existed. Thus, among recommendations highlighted by SCORRI were firstly Pre-school education, a topic which became an issue both for Black women (needing to hold a job to enhance the low wages of their male counterparts), and ‘indigenous’ working mothers. The fact is that women were often unable to give the attention required to their pre-
school children’s early development. Emphasizing the significance of child-
care for these groups, the Committee recommended measures relating to
both primary and secondary education, with high priority given to improvement
in the pre-school domain.

With regard to the West Indian Creole dialect often cited as disruptive, in these
children’s progress, the Committee concluded that ‘these linguistic factors
have been unduly emphasized and mask the more complex underlying
causes of underachievement’.75 This finding supports conclusions reached
by the SC, in one of their independent researches on children’s learning of
languages - *The teaching of English to West Indian children* (1970) - which
considered the prevailing refusal to recognize that ‘for the vast majority of
British-born West Indian children in our schools today, language plays [little
or] no part in underachievement’.76 This was reassuring. Indeed, the Select
Committee took the view that the negativity in the mind of teachers and others,
toward learning and other everyday situations involving Black students, was
not non-existent, but may have a pre- eminent part among the catalogue of
related causal factors influencing the under-performance of these learners:

> Attitudes toward West Indian children’s language held
by some teachers, especially combined with other
attitudes towards and expectations of these children,
may have an important bearing on their motivation and
achievement.77

It would take a resolve beyond any achievable by young learners to prevail
and thrive against such attitudes and thus, the Select Committee’s
requirement of those delivering the education service was that the negativity be reversed to the benefit of those they served, potentially unthinkingly:

Within both primary and secondary schools the inappropriateness of the curriculum and the books and teaching materials used to serve the needs and backgrounds of West Indian pupils has been cited as a cause of their lack of motivation and commitment to the work and their consequent underachievement.78

The underlying lack of thought bears connotations with polymath sociologist, Stuart Hall’s, ‘unthinking racism’ (discussed in a video-gram interview, Antiracism in Action, structured on a talk to teachers in the 1980s, in north London, with the Director of the African Caribbean Education Resources, sponsored by ILEA). This concept followed through into the examinations system – seen by Rampton as ‘narrow and inflexible’ in its approach to a diverse school population – in its ‘failure to take account of the nature of society of today’. Revealing what may well be described as the Rampton vision of ‘multiculturalism’ as policy, it was therefore recommended that:

A multicultural approach should be adopted for all children toward broadening the curriculum and examination system and improving standards and educational provision for all pupils, as well as encouraging West Indians to fulfil their true potential.79

Combining the above with more commentary in a similar vein, the Committee drew together their conclusions:

We have identified no single cause for the underachievement of West Indian children but rather a network of widely differing attitudes and expectations
on the part of teachers and of the education system as a whole, and on the part of West Indian parents.\textsuperscript{80}

The differences between these parties’ understanding of the issues involved had long required resolution. Expanding on this, the Committee highlighted the gulf of trust and understanding existing between many teachers and West Indian parents, and the indirect but nonetheless important bearing which this must have on the child’s achievement.

Commentary was raised on the need for teachers to ‘reach out’ to parents, and of schools ‘doing more to prepare pupils for adult life’, and of teacher training, initial and in-service, needing ‘to inform and sensitize teachers’ to the particular needs and backgrounds of ethnic minority groups, giving them an understanding of the theory and practice of a multicultural approach to education. This occupied the heart of the (Rampton) Report. Agency for change would come from a range of institutions and organizations associated with education. Here again, attitudes had a part to play. Thus, the Committee strongly believed that:

\begin{quote}
Central government has a duty to give a positive lead in bringing about a change in attitudes on the part of the community at large and in securing a greater acceptance of the ethnic minorities in our society.\textsuperscript{81}
\end{quote}

Local Education Authorities were similarly reminded of their duties in policy decisions, extending to the proper management of central funds, in reflecting the presence of minority pupils in schools authorized in Section 11 of the local Government Act, 1965. It was felt that LEAs should take a lead in fostering the development of a ‘multicultural’ approach to education in the geographical areas they served. However, bringing their concerns immediately to the door
of the DES, the Committee was of the view that the needs of ethnic minority children are too often seen ‘only as an aspect of educational disadvantage or in some cases even as just a form of handicap’, as expressed in the ‘Programme for Action’ section of conclusions, of the Rampton Report.82 Meanwhile, the education system continued its delivery with an evident lack of concern over shortcomings in its policymaking. As manifested in the more utilitarian-minded education debates of the early 1970s beyond the philosophical, and indeed the psychological, aspects of the field, a prime question, from no less a politician than the Prime Minister was ‘how education should be managed and organized, and what curriculum, methods and assessment were most appropriate to prepare young people for the world of work’.83 This agenda was indicative of the underlying disquiet, the mismatch even, between given ideals of respective proponents and the ambitions of learners and parents, not only in the educational domain but among wider society as indeed among the political classes. Thus, by the mid-1970s, before teachers had had time to fully forge the comprehensive ideal into a meaningful and effective system, experienced teachers were being condemned on charges that educational standards were low, and that schools were ‘failing to produce a literate and compliant workforce’.84 Sentiments of this nature were expressed by Prime Minister James Callaghan in the 1976 launch of his generally considered disappointing opener to his personally-designated ‘Great Debate’ in Education. Yet, Callaghan’s script-writers’ incongruous decision to attach the issue of learners’ non-compliance to teachers, just when issues of compliance were largely outside their responsibility - and particularly
when ‘accepted’ values within society at large had been steadily eroding – all this would need re-thinking beyond being merely designated a matter of contention.

More disturbing for a proud majority population, beyond the presence of former colonial subjects, was their witness of the steadily eroding hegemony across the nation. Indeed differences, among the population that once were only heard of, provided a constant irritant reminder of the country’s more general monochrome past. For the time being, all the nation appeared to have was a ‘crisis in the national identity’\textsuperscript{85} characterized by Britain’s waning influence in the world, with no sign of a new role to assume. According to one political analyst’s interpretation, until the early 1960s, Labour’s leadership ‘consistently pursued a version of meritocracy in education that carried policies of selection as a norm’. As Sally Tomlinson determined it, despite strong recognition that comprehensive education ‘was neither producing egalitarian ideals, nor a modern work-force\textsuperscript{86} such policy was pursued. And political leadership became defensive and consequently blamed teachers for failings of the system, over which respective governments of the day had presided, thereby ‘indulging in a scapegoating of the education service’.\textsuperscript{87} Clearly such divisiveness would not lessen the prevailing sense of social disquiet, alienation or anxiety. And even so, the calls for antiracist measures did not serve to alleviate nor somehow heal these fractures.

And whereas Troyna appears to have acknowledged that the antiracist mission thus far had failed, he seemed not to be ready to fully accept that efforts may have been in vain. Yet, while the outcome envisaged was not
realized, the means (such as Troyna and associates deployed) toward achieving gains had no benefit from well-needed revision. Therefore, other routes would need to be found to achieve given ends. A start may be made in questioning the appropriateness of earlier negative practice, as exemplified by Troyna and like thinkers, insofar as such approaches may have appeared judgmental, even emotive, in their emphases. Some advantage may be gained from using the seemingly less censorious call-to-action of ‘racialization’ set against antiracism transformative. Less directly incriminating than ‘racist’, ‘racialization’ will be returned to in later pages of this study.

Still with official action on the ‘multicultural’ agenda, a remaining concern of the Select Committee was that children from minority ethnic groups are very often discussed ‘only as an aspect of educational disadvantage’ or ‘even as suffering just a form of handicap’. This remaining concern led to the SCORRI sense that ‘Central government has a duty to give a positive lead in bringing about a change, in attitudes, on the part of the community at large, and in securing a greater acceptance of the ethnic minorities in our society’. In a further positive learner-oriented stance, toward a frequently overlooked concern in these regards was the proposal that:

Pupils need to have an understanding of the theory and practice of a multicultural approach to education.

This observation, pertinent to learners’ awareness of the purpose underlying the work they do, appears to go some way beyond Education Secretary, Shirley Williams’s brief rationale for a changed curriculum ‘reflective of the
diverse society’. For some time, the 1977 consultative recommendation appeared to have been taken in its most literal sense, stopping well short of any deeper readings that may have been intended in the Minister’s proviso, that ‘the curriculum appropriate to our Imperial past cannot meet the requirements of modern Britain’.\textsuperscript{90} Expressing what may be seen as the prevailing understanding of the multicultural project, and ultimately defining the operative period, the Rampton Report concluded with the pressing, albeit still limited, observation – the Committee’s commitment to a multicultural education for all.\textsuperscript{91} With some expectation of the foregoing being implemented, this recommendation would follow through from the Rampton Report (1981), later surfacing among observations representing something more than a footnote, in the awaited Swann Report (1985).

\textit{Postscript to ‘Multiculturalism MK 1’}

Inasmuch as multicultural curriculum, post-1948, is believed to be a direct outcome of Black colonial immigration and the entry of immigrant children to British schools, the demographic event may also be seen as having set the agenda, for introspective debates raised in various quarters across the nation. Some exploratory thought is now given to these areas, by referring briefly, to Troyna’s longstanding critique of what is seen to comprise the prime constituency of this educational genre, post-1948 onward. I revisit Troyna’s summary observations of 1990, representing a pivotal reference point, in his attempt to assess responses to what may be seen as his understanding of a behaviour-reforming (transformative) multicultural and antiracist education. This relates to the wider ‘multicultural’ agenda relevant in this study. Troyna
locates his revelation in a robust emergent rhetoric on multiculturalism, while expounding discourses on racial equality as being at their peak between 1970 and 1990. These narratives were delivered with increasing vigour, despite his conceding a fading urgency, more latterly, in proponents’ calls for antiracist approaches in reforming schools’ curriculum. This notwithstanding, Troyna’s review represents an acknowledgment that the achievements, of the period - among which he appeared to count his own contribution - were rather less than the rhetoric suggested:

Looking back on the period [from] the publication of Coard’s pamphlet [1970 to 1988 and into 1990] we see that this comprised the liberal moment in the politics of racial equality in the UK. These years witnessed the emergence of a powerful rhetoric on multiculturalism with, in the more recent past, antiracist conceptions of reform. [But], the achievements of this period in expediting racial equality were less than the rhetoric had us believe’.92

The above observation suggests an initial shortsightedness toward the reality of ineffectual antiracist discourses during the operative period. Clearly Troyna admits, albeit lately, to the failure of the wider antiracist project, the rhetoric arguably not having been of a sufficiently balanced or discursive nature to persuade a majority to its support. Yet, while the anti-racist rhetoric was being met with a mixture of scepticism and resentment, the lack of any impact deriving from its practice was becoming clear. I bear in mind the contention accompanying exchanges, from well-meaning antiracist proponents. Yet, the broadly non-negotiable tone of much of the expression carried suggestions that no other approach was acceptable nor, indeed, worthy of consideration.
Whereas ‘multicultural’ curriculum as generally conceived was deemed insufficient in its scope, even to its proponents, antiracism as it stood was similarly disinclined to achieve its educational purpose, in advancing and promoting social cohesion. Some measure of consensus would be required toward achieving a ‘race’-friendly constituency overall, both in retrospect and prospect. A productive outcome might be achieved from Gibson’s approach. Similarly, something of the conceptual climate then prevailing may be uncovered from an exchange between proponents on both sides of the immigration divide. The scene is set out briefly below.

Responding to the diehard charge of Black inferiority as undisputed fact in the E. B. Rose Report on attitudes to Black people in Britain, 1969, eminent sociologist of Warwick University, John Rex, offered a notable riposte, in 1972:

The only convincing evidence would be to subject a group of White Americans and Europeans to slavery for two hundred years in West Africa, downgrade White culture and language deny them education and then, following their limited emancipation compare their educational performance on tests standardized in West African countries.93

Rex’s observation ended with the wry remark that ‘no funding had been forthcoming for that study’.94 Rex’s approach above seems equally likely to counter the challenges of racism, through history teaching, as discussed in forthcoming pages.

This chapter indicated the nature of, and historically reconstructed a sense of ‘race-thinking’ abroad and how this background is deemed by this study to have influenced history curriculum. The chapter revisited historical episodes
which this study suggests impacted upon policymaking decisions in using ‘race’ as a construct in curriculum texts for history teaching, produced in the post-1948 research period. The aim was, first, to demonstrate the extent to which political events stood to influence everyday behaviours, ultimately characterizing thinking among everyday society and reflected in the education domain. Second, the account attempted to show the extent to which social political and historical events shaped educational concerns in close relation to political and social policy-events arising. Third, the chapter explored the part and paths of the historical past believed to have influenced approaches in history curriculum, evident in the institutional texts. The whole was seen as being located in a theoretical framework of the-past-informing-the-present, in terms of given historical contextual events.

Reflecting on the significance of Black colonial immigration to England and its part in defining ‘multicultural’ curriculum, post-1948, such demonstrations were dependent on first, political thinking and the nature of related prior events and second, the readiness of text-producers to adopt the thinking to which they bore witness. It is of interest that while the USA used educationally-grounded theory to guide their action / decision-making discursively, the British approach was politically-driven / -informed, potentially reflective of their longstanding role in colonialism and Empire. Trenchantly expressed, the critiques (1970s to early-1980s) of West Indian community activist, Bernard Coard discussing the education and schooling delivered to Black learners and, as he saw it, the paucity of input of Black culture and identity, reflected these factors as prime concerns.
Indeed, in terms of policy as social action taken in shaping social concerns, and its impact in texts for the reform of history curriculum in state schools, the overall nature of the texts developed, grounded upon central governmental policy for structuring society followed concepts of assimilation, integration and multiculturalism. These concepts, according to Black commentator, Maureen Stone, served successively as “measures for the newcomers’ containment”, not means through which their interests might flourish. Revisiting the climate in which policy for history texts emerged, the study looked back to the 1944 Education Act with its supposed availability to all children of school age and for whom, at its introduction, education was part of the three-pronged welfare initiative characterizing Britain today. Ground-breaking as the defining developments were in the early post war period, developments following Thatcher's first woman Prime Ministerial premiership represents the farther end of the spectrum, of these historical events. The impact was felt overall socially, educationally and politically, with some unease in the realization. This notwithstanding, concerns surrounding the educational impact of successive central governments’ contradictory promotion and control of Black colonial immigration to Britain would wane, though not cease overall. And the perceived pressures upon the education budget would fade or even be overtaken by more pressing concerns. And the reality of the Black presence in everyday Britain, realized over time, would gain some accommodation, notwithstanding variously staged surveys spasmodically appearing to the contrary.
Chapter Three

Case Study One: The Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations I

Toward a Multicultural Education: Preamble / Preview

This chapter represents the first in a sequence of documentary events which were pivotal in informing materials for history curriculum, during 1976-1988. Reconstructed historically, against the social-political milieus of the pre- / post-1940s period onward, discussed in Chapter Two, this account constitutes the beginning in a series of two linked interrelated investigations. Representing each of the three institutions, the data arising form the core of this inquiry is structured into six prime chapters. Each set of two chapters variously provides, first a brief biographical and / or, operational profile outlining the institutional mission determined at its foundation. The second provides analyses of key texts historically produced by each institution. The data collected represent a significant body of evidence informing across the three institutions. Although the organizations have features in common, among which is an inherent interest in education and history teaching, each has its own unique character. Each is interpreted and represented, through its particular background and institutional history.

Accordingly and first, this chapter seeks to determine, through texts produced, by the SC, what drives the interests of author-historians in developing history curriculum during 1976-1988. Second, the chapter seeks to uncover whether and how their influences overlapped with ‘race’, considering the on-going debates and commentary surrounding the post-1948 diverse society that England had become.
The narrative begins with a brief historical recognition of the SC as heir to the position formerly held by the SSEC of 1917. Established by the Board of Education, when the School Certificate / Higher School Certificate of Education were established, the new body undertook to ‘perform the functions of a co-ordinating authority for secondary schools examinations’.¹ This role included responsibility for the ‘day-to-day’ work and required the Board to keep informed on ‘possible programme studies and methods in the schools’.² As to the latter-day history of the SC initiation into its 1964 reconstitution, this took the form of a Curriculum Study Group [CSG] based at the Ministry of Education in 1962. This was the brainchild of Education Minister David Eccles. Despite the SC remit ‘to find ways of reviewing and reforming [all-embracing] school curriculum in England and Wales’, progress was ‘most conspicuous in the core subjects, mathematics and science, alongside modern languages’,³ from the earliest point of the ‘present-day’ SC initiation (1964/5). Insofar as history-humanities held less priority in the National Foundation for Educational Research [NFER] it was during the early to mid-1970s that the development of history-humanities curriculum -- intended to better provide learners with skills for learning and purposefully interacting in school, the world of work and in the society -- that the SC gained the attention in the National Foundation planning cycle. In its drive for enhancing teacher effectiveness, teachers seconded to the SC, won through in the determination of the Constitution. A direct quotation from the Lockwood Committee supported the appointment of the SC and declaring that the
objects of the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations were being supported upheld and interpreted through the principle that:

Each school [and potentially by inference its constituent institution] should have the fullest possible responsibility for its own work, with its own curriculum and teaching methods based on the needs of its own pupils and evolved by its own staff: and to seek, through co-operative study of common problems, to assist all who have individual or joint responsibilities for, or in connection with, the schools curricula and examinations to co-ordinate their actions in harmony with this principle of collaboration and collegiality.⁴

Seen in today's terms this understanding may be taken in different ways. Potentially it portrayed a ‘new’ departure from what had been a collective schools outlook underlying educational organisational structures from the 1944 Act onward. In a broader historical development over time, it may otherwise be connected to separatist tendencies among independently-minded schools. Nor was it clear where such a move stood in relation to the LEA politically-driven autonomy afforded teachers, at the time of the SC initiation and still burgeoning, as was the case in the broadly contemporaneous ILEA, prior to the edicts of the National Curriculum.

In terms of the internal institutional SC organization, this was determined by the Lockwood Committee but as Trenaman also recorded, the structure suggested was complicated in its design, hierarchical, the Governing Council was too large – 91 members. The emphasis was on innovation. By the 1970s the key aspect of external criticism was that dissemination of material was weak.⁵ Thus a new Constitution was called for in 1978.
While the new Constitution materially altered ‘the organisation of the SC’, particularly its hierarchical formulation the review of 1977/78 calling for liaison groups gained no effective result. Pertinent to this study-in-progress a funded research was carried out on the ‘impact and take-up’ of the SC’s work aimed to determine the effectiveness of its work on curriculum. This inquiry was based at Sussex University in 1978-1980. Findings stated:

(i) Expectations of what could be achieved were too high.
(ii) Teachers found complete courses more helpful than the ‘ideas’ and ‘chance materials’ offered.
(iii) Working papers and such like were valued outside school for fostering debate and setting standards – a starting point for advisers from some LEAs.
(iv) Practising teachers were lukewarm toward the SC, although the attitudes expressed improved the higher up the school age range one went.6

Of interest here the Conclusions to the Trenaman report bear out some of the more general criticisms / charges made against the SC. Like:

The multiplicity of interests reflects the complexity of the would-be rivalry between groups and power politics of a kind. The root of SC criticism lies in the manifestation of power politics to such an important matter as schools education. If the SC survives it will never command wide public acceptance as a large part of its work deserves unless it can make considerable further progress in the direction of a less abrasive atmosphere. [This means without the manifestation of power politics and persistent rivalry].7

Indeed while Trenaman, by her own counsel, determined the issue most damaging to the survival of the SC to be ‘power politics’ in relation to this most
‘important matter of schools education’ the problem did not appear to have been sufficiently significant to require from herself some preventive advisory proposal. This sense is even more pressing as she had herself determined the issue sufficiently damaging to threaten the very existence of the institution: It is the nature of this particular controversial aspect of the Council [SC] which [was] so damaging.⁸

It seems likely that the existing executive institutional preference for the much-favoured individualist structure of management had informed the Trenaman decision to prolong its institution, notwithstanding her call for ‘curriculum development on a national basis’.⁹ Whatever the causes of historical friction and or grievances across the SC institutionally it is not the role of the present study similarly, to enter into detailed discussion as to the ultimate cause, of the institutional demise. The historical fact of the institution’s past history of ineffectiveness, uncertain purpose and a seeming inability to put the nation’s education before factional interests was clear. Indeed, it was probably sufficient for the Prime Minister Thatcher to approve her Education Secretary Keith Joseph’s decision to disband the institution, notwithstanding the Nancy Trenaman Review recommendation, for its continuation. This move was made evident in the DES published ‘Review of the Schools Council’, in London 1981.

Proceeding with some indication of SC processes informing their thinking in the reform of history-humanities curriculum, I manifest the express determination of the Council’s commitment. Such effect would be evident in
the nature of the constitution active at the time of the given\textsuperscript{10} undertakings, of the still emerging operational structures. I demonstrate the institutional functions by their outline reflective of the period of the given SC Constitutional development, 1964-1978.

Present in what Trenaman described as a fundamental approach, in her investigative understanding of SC Constitution around 1978 was the sense of there being a need for ‘curriculum development on a national basis’. Indeed, Trenaman’s interest / purpose and qualifications in this regard were not based on ‘qualitative concerns’\textsuperscript{11}. In this she was dependent upon advice. Nor was it her place to determine the value of any curriculum event.

In terms of curriculum development, the focus of this history-humanities curriculum inquiry rested exclusively upon disciplinary texts produced for schools in the contexts of a diverse society. In these regards, inasmuch as this study sees institutional policy as substantively informing roles in SC author-historian texts institutionally, this chapter seeks to uncover the impact on history curriculum of the SC Constitution of this broad era into 1976-1988. This chapter and study assesses whether how and to what extent, the momentous decisions of the SC political climate of that significant period impacted upon the post-1948 visibly-diverse society may have involved ‘race’. This account will be pursued according to the measure of its standing in the Constitutional detail.

It enters where the School Certificate / Higher School Certificate of Education were established. Its role delegated responsibility for the every-day workload
and required the Board to keep informed on ‘possible improvements in the examinations ‘especially the development of new studies and methods in the schools’.

However, what with the Constitution being revised early in the SC tenure, the institution was unhappily preoccupied on matters of its overall effectiveness.

According to Trenaman, as far as curriculum was concerned ‘the SC took over from the CSG a substantial body of work in progress and rapidly generated a good deal more’. The nature of such projects reflecting the early structure / disposition of the institution, the Council responding both to suggestions from outside its membership, while commissioning material. These commissions came from practising teachers, universities or bodies like the Nuffield Foundation where some SC initiating members were based. At an early stage, the Council could boast the publication of some one thousand projects in print. Other changes proposed by the SC in its schools examinations system included new O-level syllabuses and by the tenth year of its tenure, the six main areas of its operations were listed as: (i) the primary school curriculum; (ii) the curriculum for the early leaver; (iii) the sixth form; (iv) the English programme; (v) GCE and CSE examinations; and (vi) the special needs of Wales, evidently as a protectorate / principality. As described in ‘The first ten years’, a major undertaking was that all service areas would keep in touch with ‘the requirements and priorities of serving teachers’ through ‘subject committees covering all areas of the school curriculum’. Thus history curriculum 5-13, for example would be discussed broadly, in terms jointly of primary and secondary teaching, insofar as history-
humanities straddled both age-ranges. Overall projects selected for investigation relate to the broad school age-range 5 - 16 years and are discussed chronologically and comparatively within the learner developmental and contexts for which they were devised.

The Texts

First being considered is the integrated history-humanities (early years / middle-school) Project guide, the Teachers’ Handbook, Man in Place, Time and Society (PTS 1976) [1975], Humanities Curriculum Project 8-13 (HCP), directed by University of Liverpool, Alan Blyth, and published by Collins ESL for the SC. Second, People on the Move: a study of Migration (1976), examines two contrasting peoples from different backgrounds, both having the common experience of immigration: Bio-pic 1: The Irish in Liverpool and Bio-pic 2: A West Indian Family Moves to Britain. Third are selections from the three-year history Course for secondary-age learners: What is History, Schools Council History Project [SCHP] 13-16. Despite the range of Projects within the scope of ‘history’ / ‘history-humanities’, these are understood, broadly, as bearing similar defining principles. This pack contains (a): A Teachers’ Guide, Holmes McDougall Ltd. of Edinburgh, 1976 and (b), Introductory Unit: People in the Past. Fourth is a companion SCHP 13-16 Project: A Course Handbook, SC 1979. Fifth is Modern History Series, 1979, largely for information purposes. Also, for information only and prefacing the main work is SC Working Paper 50 [WP 50], Multi-racial

Among the earliest projects mentioned the bio-pic, The Irish in Liverpool demonstrates the degree to which / ‘ways in which constructions of the past have changed’. History teacher-researcher Paul Bracey draws to general notice the relatively recent inclusion of the Irish, among the more widely designated minorities as a mark of new interest: Bracey’s writing, in 2006, followed upon his 2005 History of Education Society Conference presentation. The paper reflects what had earlier been indicated by Blyth and since become a truism ‘that the Irish dimension within the English History curriculum of circa 1970 onward [inclines toward] diversity’ and how this is explored within contexts of multicultural Britain, within debates over ‘ways in which the past has been constructed and ways within which the history curriculum changed’.\textsuperscript{21}

Each project is analysed discursively and descriptively, with reference to its related textual constituents’ wide conceptual purpose. Some cross-references are included. Across the texts selected the intention is foremost to yield information on the institution’s approach in addressing the Black
presence, through the given texts. I note differences or similarities, between the case-institutions, often suggesting potential reasons. This broad interest extends to interpreting the role of practising teachers, educationists, in producing materials across levels in the education system. Any relevant absences perceived in the institutional output, their relation to prevailing discourses of ‘race’, for example opportunities for transformational thinking in learners’ development, are identified. These may include policy strategies or principles for enhancing learners’ attitudes and behaviours toward ‘difference’ / ‘race’; diversity. In terms of ‘race’, individual Project teams seemed evidently determined that their response, to ‘race’, in the context of a diverse school population, would be non-specific, indirect – potentially measured, broad. Accordingly, texts like the Place, Time and Society Project based at the University of Liverpool School of Education, represented cultural difference more broadly in terms of ethnic group-practices and cultures globally, rather than ‘race’ as a human signifier. This signifier has latterly begun to be understood by observers more particularly as ‘racialization’, standpoints in which will become clearer with each Project. Barring the EMS Project, some reserve toward ‘race’ is found among the SC output, all having incorporated world countries and peoples’ cultures consistently, but with heightened degrees of reserve / caution toward directly addressing ‘race’. Such reserve was sustained across the SC Projects team-membership, with the exception of the self-descriptive Education for a Multiracial Society [EMS] Project. Thus, this chapter seeks to uncover indications of the underlying influences upon SC author-historians,
educationists at various levels, schoolteachers, academics, local education authority personnel and others, their decision-making in working through ‘race’, in reforming state school history curriculum. Across the majority of SC institutional texts and Projects examined, the overall emphasis was placed metaphorically and or euphemistically, upon culture. Additionally, but less strictly, this chapter seeks to explain the more conservative potentially non-specific non-transformational nature of early SC projects in relation to learners’ broadly generalised, expected behaviours. This stands alongside the otherwise thematically informed, historical work emerging more latterly, as in the SC History Project. Necessarily, providing responses to questions regarding similarities and differences - across the given institutions means that for at least one case location, particularly this first, the SC, a broad analytic rehearsal of some of the more everyday introductory operational procedures engaged is inevitable. One issue to determine is whether different modes of addressing ‘race’ generally, represented a function of collaborative groups. Or indeed, whether these otherwise stood opposed to individual enterprise or overall derived from particular types of institution, their given role and purpose, forms of remit / requirements otherwise being met. In this I provide, by way of an introduction to the texts being studied, an overview of the process toward historical interpretive analysis. Alongside the mainly analytic procedures, I address matters in, or absent from the existing textual content. This whole sets in motion the review process, the underlying argument informing the textual analyses as these progress. The first question, surrounding how ‘race’ is addressed across the institutions in
terms of the Black presence, is followed by the second, seeking explanations for similarities and differences institutionally.

Among the highly successful institutional outcomes of the 1976-1988 projects, the Leeds Project Team’s History Course for adolescent learners aged 13 to 16 (the Schools Council History Project, SCHP 13-16), was directed to the interests both of the discipline and of those delivering and following history curriculum in state schools. This Project, of Sylvester, expanded into a corporate handling of ‘race’, in an unheralded and coherent regard for assessment, in various readings of ‘diversity’. This position is informed by the insights of Denis Shemilt, sometime Evaluator simultaneously of SC History Projects. One such manifestation equally, reliably and demonstrated ‘five ways in which History could prove a useful and necessary subject for adolescents [and by extension, learners of all ages and backgrounds], to study’:

(a) as a means of acquiring and developing such cognitive skills as those of analysis, synthesis and judgement; (b) as a source of leisure interests; (c) as a vehicle for analysing the contemporary world and their place within it; (d) as a means for developing an understanding of the forces underlying social change and evolution; (e) as an avenue to self-knowledge and awareness of what it means to be human.

These elements apt in the teaching of History are similarly so in the contexts of a demographically changed society such as England, Britain, had become. Thus, in the particular contexts of this study these cognitive skills are borne in mind as the unspoken figurehead in the wider SC institutional understanding of History, 1976-1988. The institutional teams -- author-historians, academics,
educationists, school-teachers, local education personnel -- are seen to have turned, to greater or lesser degrees, to achieving an updated outlook on the ‘race’-construct used. This schema effectively enables universal understanding being gained substantively by learners, both in their cognitive development and attitude transformation. This latter aspect evidently, yet unsurprisingly, somehow received lesser focus than the author-historians’ accustomed interest in their learners’ cognition. Differing ways and means of approaching ‘diversity’, ‘race’, stand to become apparent as the study proceeds.

An introductory alert to teachers in dealing with younger learners’ expressions / ideas, (explicitly of inexplicitly voiced), and effectively in language appropriate to learners, bears reference here. This thinking was prompted by an observation made about dealing with multiracial learners. The idea floated was that once learners in multiracial classrooms were invited to suggest ideas and those ideas were under consideration those learners and ideas should be treated ‘in the same way’. This meant ‘without bias or favour’ toward any one individual / group or whatever. A problem with emphasising undifferentiated treatment is that it may have led to overlooking significant differences that in fact warranted an educational response. A strong response suggested that ‘intervention of a multiracial kind need not be seen as counterproductive or a-political’24 – the point being made that an opportunity for learners’ further development might similarly be missed. Indeed, strategies as yet unidentified may be adopted among learners in different cultural practices, toward realising aspects of their personal development, or
otherwise, in terms of curriculum. This could come about through making content accessible ‘spirally’ to all - after Bruner, in heightened intensity progressively. The learning process, stages and phases onto the place of assessment and examinations, the pros and cons, are discussed by Alan Blyth, Director, Ray Derricott, Associate Director, Team specialists: Gordon Elliott, Geography; Alan Waplington, History; Hazel Sumner, Social Science, in the closing pages of their text. This text, published by Collins/ESL Bristol, for SC was reprinted in 1979. The overall concept is to use the disciplines, history, geography and social science respectively, in interrelation\(^{25}\) - one, or another, active / interactive with the others in different ways, without suggestions of their merging into a synthesised whole. Here, the attention is directed to historical aspects only, while contextually engaging methodologically, in this inter-disciplinary, inter-connectedly conceptualised thrust.

Taking on board the conceptualisation of SC History 13-16 Project evaluator, D. J. Shemilt, this study brings to bear at differing stages and phases across this interpretive analytical discourse a series of concepts ‘crucial to the historical enterprise … in place of formal definitions’. Most important among these are the concepts of ‘evidence’, ‘empathetic reconstruction’, ‘motivation’, ‘causation’, ‘change’, ‘continuity’, ‘the connectedness of past and present’ and the idea of History as an ‘explanation-seeking’ as well as a ‘descriptive discipline’.\(^{26}\) I emphasise this last bringing significance to the place of description in historical narrative, insofar as some measure of description serves to explain, outline and / or indicate the main features and bounds of a
course of action or, a schematic plan relevant to the task in hand. Thus, this inquiry looks toward identifying and mapping ‘racialisation’ as a construct in the SC text, *Place, Time and Society, 8-13 (PTS)* the Humanities Project, representing what may be seen as the project’s model exemplar for teachers in classrooms and involved in the particular project’s development.


Similarly underlying some apparent reserve, an acknowledgement of what is otherwise generally seen as our common humanity may be found, despite acknowledged differences. Structured on the principle of (disciplinary) “interrelatedness”, narrative events unfold on a partly-linear, partly-interactive, course, across the themed examples of curriculum-oriented, history-humanities texts. In this formal / form of review, the historical focus occasionally yields to aspects of geography, giving a sense of its place across the lower-middle, and early-secondary, age-ranges. Even so, there is scope
for whatever project as it stands to be extended to older secondary learners after teacher-adjustments. Overall, this chapter may be seen to represent stages in the SC conceptual development of ‘multicultural’ history curriculum, through texts for history-humanities institutionally albeit without (on most occasions) particular use of the term, ‘multicultural’, in the (then) still emergent genre.

Conceptually, *Place, Time and Society* [PTS] represents ‘a process of Curriculum Planning’, just short of the ‘final’ product, but ‘ready’ for classroom teachers optionally to build upon. Underlying this particular SC authorship-thinking, here, is the belief that teachers are not merely *recipients* of material ready for implementation, but have an active (*professional*) role to play as they plan and critically weigh-up the delivery of history-humanities curriculum. Indeed the authors of the Humanities 8-13 Project alert their prospective users of these texts to the need for professionalism, for its fullest appreciation. Interestingly, the University School of Education’s co-producing academics’ report, on their project, shows it as having made unexpected demands upon them, while participant state school teachers, correspondingly, found it strange to take a leading role alongside the academics. These oppositional positions explain, in part, Alan Blyth’s need to include, in the Preface of the Project Guide, a proviso to the effect that: ‘this basic publication is written for [school] teachers, for it is on teachers that curriculum planning depends’. In line with the institutional remit in enhancing teacher efficiency, it was similarly essential that the PTS Working Group comprised teachers, for practice-oriented and pilot components. Clearly, the SC as the former CSG
responsible to the Ministry of Education - later re-designated Department of Education and Science [DES] needed, by remit, to be actively involved.

In this light the institutional approaches to the PTS Project, and others, reflect organisational structures underlying both the given projects, and the particular role(s) required of all participants, academics and classroom teachers and, to advantage, in the light of wider SC institutional approaches evident in Evaluator Denis Shemilt's question raised in the early pages / paragraphs of his evaluation of Secondary learners’ (sub-teams’) broad approach generated in the 1980 evaluation of the older learners’ projects, raising the question: ‘What History Should Teach?’

Providing an answer to his self-posed consideration, Shemilt offered his own un-wavering response as to: ‘The nature of the subject’, or indeed ‘Why should History, rather than’ some other empirical discipline like Anthropology or Sociology or Economics, be included in a ‘co-ordinated curriculum?’

Making his own response to this altogether rhetorical question Shemilt suggested clearly that: ‘One answer would point to the special status of History among empirical disciplines’ and that ‘of all empirical subjects History and Physics are conceptually and methodologically the two most dissimilar’.

Additionally and therefore taken together, these two define the 1981 ‘empirical spectrum’ of the SC History 13-16 Evaluation Project. Shemilt continued his justification: Thus a priori there are good reasons for including these two subjects as basic elements in any ‘core’ curriculum’. Shemilt pushes his case further forward: ‘A second, and perhaps more pertinent, justification would point to the dominant part played by historical (and unfortunately, by
historicist) thinking in the way we view ourselves, our culture and our society’. And readers are further reminded that this was / is ‘the line taken by the History 13-16 Project’ – insofar as ‘History answers the social and personal needs of adolescents’, indeed of us all.

For the PTS team, their response stood to be delivered to greater or lesser degree, bearing in mind not only their target audience of middle-school / primary learners but also the “integrated” / interrelated scope of their established curriculum and its philosophy. Shemilt indicated its importance positioned early on page four of his 1980 History 13-16 modified in this chapter / study with Blyth’s young 8-13 learners in mind. Here, the nature of history-humanities is made evident as relevant successively and progressively, in line with given themes, for example ‘immigration’ and particular units like ‘People on the Move’, addressed in this study), focused primarily / historically on curriculum policy. Structured accordingly and first, upon (historical) methodological concepts Key concepts include, in progression, Sequence ‘A’: similarity / difference (, Sequence ‘B’: continuity / change, Sequence ‘C’: cause / consequence).

In terms of classroom organisation, time was reserved for (structured) discussion aimed, in present contexts of diversity, to prepare learners for considering the more ‘delicate’ issues (like ‘race’) arising. Although social skills / personal qualities were specified for inclusion in the learners’ programme, more planning time appears to have been directed to the structures within which these were placed than how learners were to be guided toward aspects which this study sees as necessary transformational.
behaviours. Yet, in line with SC and general project principles for managing curriculum, it would appear to have been left for teachers and schools ultimately to decide whether ‘race’, for example, formed an active element across key curriculum components. However, the broader scope of the Project, reflecting the given interests of the 8-13 age range, translates into syllabus themes being structured around a broadly interpreted (seemingly-human-developmental, and potentially majority-cultural,) range of ‘First’ and ‘Middle’ School levels of learners’ interests. It may be that input from non-Western cultures evident in the body of themes exemplified in pilot Projects would thereafter be individually incorporated or not, by ‘local’ teachers determination. Nevertheless, development of learners’ capacities to deal with issues surrounding social skills and values received particular attention, insofar as these would require a classroom climate appropriate for rehearsing relevant processes / qualities - for younger learners as much as their older siblings. Again similarly, among the corresponding Key (social and historical) concepts, the Values and Beliefs together with Critical thinking, Empathy and Autonomy featured as definitive working components. Casting the mind back to the multicultural curriculum exemplified for learners from Age 8+ to 12+, such content may be broken down into particular aspects in the learning experience in history / humanities curriculum.

The more personal attributes for dealing with ‘values and beliefs’ (representing ‘key (elemental) processes’ in history teaching and learning) are placed early in the course, on the basis of dealing with a potentially ‘delicate’ matter at an early age when attitudes of acceptance would more likely be
accommodating to potentially ‘sensitive’ aspects of ‘race’ or cultural difference. In Table 5, Sequence ‘A’ PTS Page 134, the early-years introduction to *The Kalahari Bushmen* suggests this being a potentially more sensitive issue than the Aborigines of Australia, Table 6, Sequence ‘B’ page 136. It may otherwise have been a move to reduce a foreseen explosion of Westernised learners’ giggles at The Kalahari Bushmen clad in their traditional scant apparel. Whether the subsequent Culture clash: The Aborigines of Australia \(^{29}\) proved fully successful in the school in which it was developed and piloted, was not discussed. Nor was it specified whether it was presented to learners in the category of ‘People and progress: cultures at risk’. This would have been for ‘local’ teachers to decide. Conceptually, from a Western standpoint, the latter concept may seem open to question, if not real controversy. Useful starting-points for discussion might have surrounded the terms ‘aborigine’ and ‘indigene’, for the 12+ learners, serving to strengthen the wider understanding of teachers and in turn their learners, as to the breadth or, narrowness of scope, in relegating the Australian indigenes, seemingly, to a stereotypical position of the ‘underdog’, despite their longstanding origins, potential primogeniture, being the first-placed, in some spatial proximity to Australia. Whether such thinking was considered for classroom discussion is unstated. So too appears to have been the current position of one or other of the two groups involved in ‘culture clash the Aborigines’, standing on the opposing side to their later British settlers. Without some indication of the course followed in discussing these designated groups of occupants, it can only be surmised whether this ready opportunity
to consider the issue of who really “owns” Australia was likely to have been missed. The PTS appended Table 7, Page 138, may provide a useful digest of Sequencing Principles apt for respective age groups. Whatever the stage of maturity of the learners, this topic will have offered scope both for the exercise of empathy and learners developing the capacity to think beyond an otherwise overplayed reliance on the more stereotypical ‘exotic’. Beyond mere rehearsals of ‘difference’, scope is provided for consideration of ‘conflict’ and ‘clashes’ in terms of more positive and enduring values and beliefs beyond being at odds as a mark of tradition.

Regarding westernised thinking, care may need to be taken to re-fashion the scope of westernised actors and their interpretations of historical events, so that opportunities may be grasped arguably to demonstrate, just who the more likely indigenous Australians might be. Similarly, further capitalising on the given theme ‘Families in different cultures’, natural links may be made by taking learners beyond what they will have studied, at age 9+ (as suggested in the project’s sequence of topics), while using aboriginal family structures as an engaging way-in to appreciating cultural ‘difference’. Otherwise structured, for example, upon the beliefs of a different kind of nation-group, with a history of storytelling that is, more unusually, under an appointed skilful storyteller as custodian of that (‘tribal’) group’s stories – differing practices in the history of storytelling might be explored, in the knowledge that no individual member holds ownership over another group’s narratives. Such exchange of knowledge stands to uncover new sites of interest for learners, in the history-humanities subjects, usefully enhancing their understanding and appreciation
of other kinds of past, and how the value of another past ‘connects those owners with their times that have already gone’. Such approaches demonstrate earlier expressions of the kind identified by Norman Fairclough in his linguistic explorations of practices that gave rise to the term *passivated*. In this stance, Aboriginal actors are more likely to be portrayed as being passive, and effectively relegated consistently to too negative representation, in some contrast to those designated by the express term, *activated*. Those activated are the ‘select’, the ones who ‘do’ things, ‘make’ things happen, as in the case of the favoured White Dominion settlers, more lately arrived in Australia, in their proactive characterisation. The assumption is that the Dominion ‘expats’ naturally have the capacity to achieve, by virtue of their whiteness, and thereby classify as activators.

*History as case-study-in-action, a themed schema*

Using Table 7 for learners aged 11+ through 12+ onto 13+ of the PTS [138] project and Sequence C provided an opportunity for intensive learning of key concepts like continuity and change / similarity and difference advocated for older learners over six terms, its conceptual underpinning being geared toward the development of social skills without compromising the intellectual. However, whereas ‘Liverpool and the Slave Trade’ represents a space for introducing a potentially sensitive issue, the matter of distancing this topic in real curriculum time seems somewhat artificial, despite the chronology. Insofar as social topics abound variously across time and open to the consumption of all at any place and time access to many Blacks, and
potentially other empathetic observers, slave, the general accessory is still part of Black history today, regardless of the chronology. In fact its meaning may be stronger than that connected with the Boer War in South Africa and the Boer War, closer to our own time, but about which study at age 12+ is meant to take place) being set on a par with South Africa Today. This thinking evidently explains and reflects Liverpool’s considered decision to mark the event of trans-Atlantic slavery in the exhibition space it occupies in today’s City of Liverpool. Slavery remains, in the minds of generations of Blacks, what the Holocaust is to Jewish populations today, albeit sometimes overplayed. Indeed ILEA offers to its learners the sometimes-challenged and debatable position of Trinidadian Prime Minister and academic, Eric Williams: ‘Slavery was not born of racism, racism is a result of the Slave Trade’. This thinking may be seen as relative both to the time of the author’s writing and his country’s ‘moment’-in-time.

Indeed, the three historical events earmarked for learners’ successive attention may be seen as all-of-a-kind -- one and the same kind of race-violation. The experience of apartheid, for example, active in the lifetime of many of the learners in classrooms of the 1970s and beyond, will not necessarily have been a ‘new’ experience as the sequencing suggests. Clearly, the experience of News bulletins, including news-casting for younger viewers in Britain – like The BBC’s ‘Tea-Time’ John Craven’s Newsround - will have meant that some familiarity with South Africa policies and practices of racialization will already have been established, without awaiting its gradual inclusion in British classroom study somewhat later in the day. In effect, ‘race’
in Britain of the 1970s was already developing a momentum of its own, and
gaining its own headlines in the printed and broadcast world media. I revisit
the Project’s rationale as rehearsed in the text’s explained process, without
further considering the question posed, and discussed arguably over-
cautiously, in terms of ‘Liverpool: A multicultural Society?’ and declaiming:

The theme Liverpool and The Slave Trade is an attempt to introduce a potentially sensitive issue by
distancing it in time. ‘South Africa and the Boer War’ introduces conflict at a distance and South Africa
Today brings this into a contemporary setting. It is only after these experiences that the final highly sensitive
theme [asking] the question: ‘Liverpool - a multicultural Society?’ is tackled.\(^{35}\)

Clearly while this topic raised more questions than classroom teachers may
have been able to accommodate empathetically; it should equally not be
dismissed due to misperceived sensitivities, as apparently suggested above.
For many people whose history touches upon, for example, the Trans-Atlantic
Slave Trade the harshness of slavery is not eased / dismissed by the distance
of history. The Project team’s position may seem unrealistic, even untenable.
In such kind of events a direct approach better de-fuses / disperses any
potential embarrassment of blameworthiness relative to an inherently
affective, uneasy, caution. An updated level of empathy might readily be
enlisted to better effect, insofar as much of the Black present untapped is
more likely to foster unhappy consequences of a factual past.

In a similar light some supporting teachers, among the PTS Team, ready to
engage the thinking of their young learners appear to have missed a cue
through inadequately reflecting learning theorist Jerome Bruner’s principle (of ‘process’ over ‘product’). This is manifest to the effect that ‘the educational process is not a book to be read from cover to cover’, but [constitutes] a way of life to be experienced [Bruner-like] spirally in progression at every stage’.36 The issue is evidently, that Bruner’s intentions of making accessible to learners almost anything ‘of value’ by making it conducive to learners’ interest, and cognitive grasp, may have been undersold, in the collective emphasis primarily, upon content-based curriculum planning. In effect, the unintended outcome was the turning of Bruner’s heightened advocacy (of ‘process’) into a somewhat less stable element (largely redolent of ‘product’), by virtue of their Project’s rehearsals of variously fashioned / selected product-driven principles. Equally, the prevailing discourse of sequencing being seen as of ‘vital importance to under-13-year old learners in Social Science’, and their needing to be ‘caught’ at a critical moment [in their youthful] learning, meant that the much discussed ‘body of content’ highlighted in the Key Concepts, as structured, gained all precedence, among teachers. This structuring is evident in teachers’ responses to a post-Project dissemination questionnaire -- the Project Guide needing to explain the ground covered in history-humanities (not as historical experiences, including skills and indeed attitudes). Rather, it was thought apt to answer to queries of ‘What [topic] might children reasonably be expected to have ‘done’ (as opposed to more broadly, or even more pragmatically), issue / ideas encountered, thinking understood or even experienced in the social subjects before they reach the age of 13 years?
In response to the final query cited above, the Project’s somewhat post-hoc explication is seemingly extemporised / preparation-free: ‘This question is really about the skills, knowledge and attitudes’ - as opposed, apparently, to the erstwhile much rehearsed content, ‘that children could be relied on to carry forward’ to the next stage of learning. Evidently less implicating in their appointed role, was the Team’s checklist of questions that learners / readers might ask of themselves, in advancing the learning task, as advocated in the Project’s objectives: ‘What do I [as learner and historian-in-the-making] want to know? Why? What am I prepared to count as evidence? How am I going to use it? Is it really worth the effort?’ These questions, equally open to conceptual / “ideological” responses as to ‘how?’ and beyond the mere content-driven, necessarily remain undeveloped here.

Bio-pic 1: People on the Move: The Irish to Liverpool

Bio-pic 2: People on the Move: A West Indian Family Moves to Birmingham

The examination of the bio-pic projects, which follow, arguably constitute abstractions of ‘race’ and immigration – understood, by their particular constituency, as indirect representations, of ‘race thinking’ or, indeed, ‘race’ deracialized, insubstantial. Similarly, the express purpose of fostering learning in history curriculum, evident in the SC approach, the Humanities Project 8-13 years, above, targets cultural practices of their protagonists as prime concern. These take representations further by juxtaposing contrasting elements of the same theme in a subtle ‘play’ of ‘similarity’ and ‘contrast’.
Thus, whereas specific references to ‘race’ are technically absent, in addressing People on the move: a study in migration, differences are implied as to other likely kinds - social class, religion, economic standing, in the White Irish having similar experiences to the Black colonial / post-colonial Caribbean peoples. The two themed concepts feature across the historical narratives: Cause and consequence and Similarity and difference, presented in the form of case-study reconstructions. These relate to Dublin of 1825, staidly portrayed in some contrast to the colourful uniqueness of post-colonial Jamaica of the modern era, 1950s / late 1960s, with some references back, graphically, to earlier times. Yet compared with the realities of racism as portrayed, even the stark monochrome of the starkest poverty seems somewhat sanitised, potentially acceptable – against the prevailing discourses of ‘race’ / racism and hints of racialization. Yet, this potentially clinical, detached, portrayal transmits volumes both in terms of its unspoken Institutional undertones and as a collective-group decision to proceed, with caution, toward the more delicate of controversies.

The theme, Movement is taken forward in People on the Move: The Irish to Liverpool, demonstrated: first, within one society, the Irish to Liverpool, moving from an established community and society, in the UK, initially from Dublin, to another UK environment, Liverpool; and then, in A West Indian Family Moves to Birmingham, migrating from an independent Jamaica post-colonial society, circa 1947. The interest for The Project Team, here, was that learners should (a) note how respective societies have been, and are being shaped by the movement of people, both within their own society and between
it and other societies’; \(^3^8\) (b) that this feature was deemed to continue into the future, and thus it was ‘important that pupils gained some understanding’ of population movement; \(^3^9\) (c) the discernible ‘shifts in migration patterns associated with the changing levels of technology’ in the society as inferred, in that new farming and agricultural practices could be needed to prevent the levels of potato famine experienced by the Irish. A final caveat was similarly inferred insofar as discernible shifts might instead, or additionally, be determined by environmental variables – for example, through the given location of the school and type of occupations in which pupils’ parents would be engaged. \(^4^0\)

Accessing sources and extracting data are skills to be learned even as the story is being told. In Bio-Pic 1, ‘The Irish’, there are snippets of information in the records of migrating peoples of varying backgrounds. Some are well-heeled, unlike the evident poor. Their paths are smoothed by parish officials, from Ireland, for example the Board of Guardians, ministers of religion and magistrates. Descriptions of the diet and normal clothing of the labouring classes of 1820s Dublin substantiate their circumstances of want. The historical description is meant both to inform and impact upon the relatively less needy of 1970s Britain, so much better-off they now appear to be in contrast. Emigration, the alternative was necessarily recorded, the increasing numbers of men, women and children leaving Ireland month by month, \(^4^1\) those who could travelling to the United States, others stopping short in Liverpool. These scenes provide starting-points of discussion and analysis at Liverpool docks, \(^4^2\) this showing the better–off leaving port, eager in contrast to the
deprived left behind, in more abject circumstances. And the ever-present scope of conveying and acquiring information of the Irish experience from the failed potato crop to an opportunity grasped to escape its grasp is encouraged to develop their data collecting skills accordingly. Alongside the disembarkation statistics from Liverpool docks, the factual detail in the 1851 census records, of England and Wales, offer learners a rich source of data. The whole is a lesson, thrice over, in historical skills, the use of sources and ‘learning lessons’ from lived experience.

Using the experience of assembling data whether from public, or private sources, through the practice of their historical skills – from the ‘mainspring of history in human action’ through ‘empathetic reconstruction’ by putting themselves in the place of other people alongside their understanding that ‘causal factors work in concert not singly’, learners in history today may well become the ICT specialists of tomorrow in explaining the immigration experience visually graphically and virtually so that the factors of the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivations may be better understood and the ‘reduction of uncertainty’ or ignorance reduced toward achieving an explanation of the core issues through the pupils’ practice. Such is the scope in history learning toward better interrelationships.

In Bio-Pic 2: A West Indian Family to Birmingham, oral evidence in the main, among the Caribbean family, reflects the ready options for recording and formatting texts, accessible in late twentieth century Britain. Every opportunity is taken to increase learners’ skills / experience, as well as knowledge, in data gathering and of new technologies as these become available. These two
projects are rich with scope for explaining and appreciating difference without being sensational or adversely critical. Whereas ‘The Irish’ is structured on an interview format, for gathering and reporting data, the latter project is reported in a continuous narrative with transcriptions from a variety of reprographic civic records, onto an uninterrupted graphic text.\(^{43}\) The verbatim report in idiomatic ‘Caribbean English’ reflects something of the region’s \(^{44}\) history, the ‘cultural hybridity’ between forms of West Indian English (Creole patois), and standard Queen’s English – both familiar among a versatile population.\(^ {45}\) The narratives, of both themes featured, are further consolidated by photographic evidence from their respective home-Countries and historical period: some developed, modern / urban areas, alongside the rural / agricultural and natural environment. These are representative of both communities which, for many of the immigrant peoples, constitute home, their everyday lives and livelihoods. The richness of historical sources is demonstrated through census records, migration statistics, maps, directories and other historical documentation. These historical narratives are sites of learning, for teaching.

I turn next to ‘What is History?’ Schools Council History Project 13-16, based at the University of Leeds in 1972, under the leadership of former schoolteacher and academic, David Sylvester, until 1975. The Project Team was subsequently headed by Sylvester’s fellow-educationist Tony Boddington, alongside Aileen Plummer and some four others. This text was published by Holmes McDougall Ltd., Edinburgh, in 1976. Giving some focus to the discipline itself, I use the pilot unit, People in the Past ['People'], to
demonstrate the broad structural-conceptual constituency, sequential and or, period-wise, in its delivery. This manifests a concise structural journey in the factoring of ‘history’, foremost through its nature disciplinarily with a prime focus on the past next, as introducing learners to its very nature, the “natural” aspect, of its constituency. This is advanced upon by elucidation on its status in general temporality as of time;\(^\text{46}\) this following upon understandings of the term ‘period’ the ‘division of time’ aspect, of history, thenceforward providing a fuller sense of chronology, the “ordering”, sequence, of historical time;\(^\text{47}\) all evident in the constancy of method and approach in essence. This is manifest all told, through the (pupil) material, text. It emphasises learning by understanding, and the material comes in the distinctive format of a fold-out leaflet.\(^\text{48}\) This whole aims to introduce to learners the nature of history, as rehearsed and to enhance their understanding of the chronological frame, within which the historian pursues his / her studies. Project objectives aim, by studying and discussing the material, to develop pupils’ ability to appreciate:

the wide range of human activities which we can study in history; understand the conventions which historians use in referring to periods in the past; the scale of historic time; and gain experience in recording events on a time chart and realise the value of this.\(^\text{49}\)

Suggestions to teachers for using this unit cover aspects surrounding whether approaches to history might be made from ‘above’ or ‘below’ (of famous people or, the apparently less high profile), be written about and discussed, whether actors are alive or dead; be subject to a hierarchy of gender, or not; derive from particular historical periods; our ‘own’ history or, that of other
countries / peoples; whether constituting the hierarchy of certain types of human activity over others, or not. Overall, a general range of textual means of production / representation, intended to give a balanced view of their subject matter are discussed in terms of their handling of people’s sayings and doings throughout history. How best may time be treated for understanding? And extending this, by leading to some discussion of comparisons between historic time and the whole history of the earth; suggestions about learning aids include a simple cardboard clock on which each second represents ‘n’-million or so years, in the earth’s history.\textsuperscript{50} The considered place of the imagination is hardly unimportant to the historian text-creator, whose underlying interest, here, is clearly in attracting the natural interest and informed enthusiasm for the subject, among young learners.

As with the younger learners, the focus on provision for older pupils, aged 13-16, is directed toward history as curriculum discipline, apt for instilling the nature of historical enquiry to learners, and in its teaching. The Project \textit{SC History 13-16 Project: A Handbook} is one such text. Three prime areas of concern are evident in the Project’s Handbook: first, the reconstruction of the nature of history as a discipline and its relevance to schools; second, the associated problem of syllabus making, for ages 13-16; and third the assessment of historical concepts and skills, particularly for examinable pupils aged 14-16. History is portrayed first, as a useful contributor to general education. Second, through the study of history and historical evidence, pupils are enabled to develop certain abilities, attitudes, and analytical skills.\textsuperscript{51} Of focal interest in this study is third, Key idea 5, of the list of five, history is the
study of people in the past, involving asking questions about their actions, motives and the consequences of their deeds. It was similarly important that syllabus units helped pupils understand their present world; the values, attitudes, problems and beliefs of people of a different time and place in the world (the historical concept of empathy); and to understand change and development in human affairs.\textsuperscript{52}

While the Project gives close attention to Assessment in history, this aspect receives limited attention here, beyond highlighting some of the categories selected, identified for evaluative consideration. Among these are some four category variables: a) Examinable and Un-examinable; b) Seen and Unseen; c) Social and Political; d) Our World and Others’ World. The Project considers whether certain aspects may be thought more, or less, examinable than others, for example the concept of empathy and its correlate attitudes / positions taken up; however, no such consideration is carried out here. Significance is attached to the given themes having derived both from the world of history as discipline and the domain of ‘culture’ in the categories of variables. This approach is rewarding, as the joint function is well served. What is significant about all this is that history serves as a vehicle / conduit for a range of roles and that any theme / topic, for example, ‘race’, stands to be properly considered if pursued. Other questions refer to matters surrounding course-work and assessment as against timed unseen examination papers. Clearly, the contention surrounding loss of academic rigour in the CSE course in some contrast to the traditional ‘O’ Level Examination would not be resolved easily. Questions put forward for possible inclusion related to whether school
history should have a social, or a political, slant or interest; or whether it should refer to our local environment, or more broadly, that of other peoples. These issues would make an interesting classroom discussion although firm decisions would finally depend on teachers’ readiness to be involved. Taken as a whole, the Project Handbook constitutes a useful, and fully considered disciplinary text that has scope for embracing the wealth of topical / thematic material relevant to learners of the particular time, for which such literatures were created. They also manifest scope for the incorporation of elements appropriate to the time of their delivery in schools.

Located within the Modern History / Modern World Studies Series, The Irish Question and The Arab-Israeli Conflict Units bear reference only. These demonstrate their position in the real-life discourse of contemporary historical writing. The currency of their topics is inherent in the titles. Indeed, there was so much consultation between text producers and publishers that such interaction became a feature of this Project overall. Consultation was particularly intensive for The Irish Question and The Arab-Israeli Conflict, aimed to ensure not only the absence of bias in the writing / reporting, but accuracy in matters of factual detail, and being up-to-the-moment in its narrative, with thorough representation of ‘cultural’ material in all its meanings. However, this reference serves only to confirm the topics’ importance in the contemporary world. Neither of these two is examined in detail, here. A particular feature of the Project was the inclusion of a purpose-built external examinations syllabus for ‘O’ Level, and CSE Boards (this latter being expected to require internal teacher-assessment, and moderation), tied
into the overall process, and materially heightening its credibility in learners’
experience - by offering a positive alternative to conventional external
syllabuses. Modern History Series 13-16, like SCHP: ‘New Look’ History,
1976, and ‘What is History?’ was highly lauded, severally, as being:

... Wide in range diverse in methodology and varied in
their geographical scope [and comprising] a modern
‘crisis’ such as (The Arab-Israeli Conflict), a social and
cultural history (such as The American West) a theme
traced over a long period (such as Medicine through
Time), and also local and regional history (with
fieldwork devised by the teacher).

The teacher-devised fieldwork on a selected topic was discussed by Denis
Shemilt in his evaluation of ‘History Around Us’. This is a segment aimed:

To stimulate history-related activities by fostering
interest in and knowledge about the visible remains of
the past. Fieldwork is also intended to afford pupils
practice in handling and correlating evidence of various
kinds, in reconstructing daily life and physical settings
and in explaining change and particular departures
from general archetypes and trends.

While the aim, overall within the given structural bounds, was to introduce
pupils to a collective of ideas about history as a curriculum subject, through a
study of people in particular circumstances, the principles contained in the
Teachers’ Guide show the parameters within which it operated to be as
follows, broadly paraphrased:

First, that history is a subject about people and
whatever they have said and done in the past; second,
that the study of history involves detective work and a
search for evidence and clues about people in the past;
third, that there are many different types of historical
These expressions represent the kind of ‘intertextuality’ and ‘interdiscursivity’ - interaction with others' writings discussions voices and understanding, advocated by Norman Fairclough, in his Language and Discourse (2000) and to the extent that such evidence has grown and changed through the ages.

Returning to What is History?, the point is made finally, as discussed above, that there are many problems connected with historical evidence – it can be biased, open to differing interpretations or insufficient. Overarching this whole is the reminder that a study of people in the past involves asking questions about their actions, their motives and the consequence of their deeds. Tied into these matters in teaching and learning, the Project Team made provision for examining and assessing in History. Here, teaching and examining were seen as constituting different ends of the spectrum, an extended process, in which teachers’ attention was given to the matter of examining. Arguing the case for external examinations and aware of some general reservations – the Team hoped that children would come to appreciate the importance that examining should not be ignored. Yet, a ‘more social' rationale impelled upon related concerns of the society, whereby the Project expected that ‘schools and their teachers should examine pupils in what they have learned and consider some certification (of pupils) as a result’. Indeed, the Team-view remained that ‘public examinations are an essential feature of the context in which their teaching takes place’, and this was particularly the case in teaching 14-16 year olds. Such justification was made on pedagogical, historical, and social grounds. In this, considerations beyond ‘knowledge’ and
‘recall’ were extended into ‘skills’, with questions arising as to whether skills can be separated from knowledge and understanding, among other elements, and whether essay-type answers presented the right format. Matters of the examinations proposed, will be returned to after first consideration of content more broadly, in terms of topics treated. Reference only is made to two related texts listed next, first, (SC Working Paper 50 - Multiracial education: Need and Innovation, 1973, a data-gathering survey, prefacing the main text, Education for a Multiracial Society 5-13: An Evaluation, following the key work [EMS 5-13] which remained unfinished and unpublished, by Elaine M. Brittan, in 1976. This will be examined singly in Chapter Four. Initially due for publication in 1976 by Evans / Methuen, for the Schools Council, the latter, and main, work remained potentially dormant until 1981. This occurrence reflected the generally unfavourable response to certain approaches of the SC to matters of ‘race’. More expressively than any preceding SC Projects, in this analysis, the Preface to the EMS Report highlighted the institutional aim of ‘preparing young people to live in post-War Britain’ (bearing in mind the changed demographic of post-1948 to the mid- into the late 1970s). Despite the Team’s apparent high-profile preparation undertaken and research carried out, there was no evident clarity as to how ‘curriculum content [might or should] reflect contemporary changes in society’,62 beyond the matter potentially of discourse on ‘race’.

Whether the author’s expectation was of learners revisiting a unified understanding of nationhood (as an example of what might be desirable with the latest post-1948 arrivals) was not made clear. Nevertheless, early
contributors to ‘that island race’ were briefly referred to in the established historical sequence: of Picts, Celts, Romans, Angles, Saxons, Vikings, thence to the Normans,63 and taken forward ultimately, to the contemporary field of New Commonwealth immigrants. The real intention was made clear thereafter. ‘Race’, as a contested area and as defined at the historical present, would be central to the conceptual frame and thrust of ongoing work, as would the fact of there being an unspoken absence of consensus in regard to related issues. The move to include the post-1948 in-comers is refreshing insofar as references to the nation have not, more generally, extended to the new demography. Similar texts, bearing narratives of the broad mid-twentieth century, have often remained silent in this detail. Not being short in detail here, the survey carried out in the early six-month period, preceding the Project Team’s piloting – albeit with some addition to the textual narrative ongoing - covered six prime types of schools, selected on the basis of age range and black-white, ‘racial’, composition across several levels of intake and intensity of immigrant settlement, in given defined areas.

Leaving concluding observations to be addressed at the end of this institution’s final textual analysis in Chapter Four, SC II and the Conclusions chapter, I briefly draw together the above elements. This chapter sought to uncover in texts published by the SC during 1976-1988, just where the institutional interest lay in history curriculum, in contexts of England’s post-1948 visually diverse society. The chapter set the ground-plan for illustrating how informed institutional members, educationists at various levels, largely re-designated the practice increasing elsewhere, of relating problems of
diversity, ‘race’, directly to ‘culture’ in school curriculum. It set the scene for considering the conjuncture of the mix of institutional approaches in texts produced - from the conservative non-transformational to the purely utilitarian content-driven, among early SC projects, within the distinctive EMS Project, in the upcoming companion Chapter Four SC II.
Chapter Four

Case Study I: The Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations II

This chapter is structured upon the historical background reviewed in Chapter Three SC I, and the broad contextual underpinnings discussed in Chapter Two, Policy Context. This second of the twinned chapters completes the SC institutional and textual analysis in history / history-humanities curriculum. Emerging broadly from the stable of writers introduced in SC I, this chapter constitutes an exception in its direct approach to ‘race’ unlike the wider body of institutional disciplinary texts of the post-1948 period. Taking the Education for a Multiracial Society project [EMS], as reflective of post-1948 discourse among the wider population and a symbol of its time I provide a brief review of a selected cache of pages from 1981. Significantly this project was jointly proposed by the National Foundation for Educational Research, [NFER] the National Union of Teachers [NUT], and the newly reconfigured National Association for Multiracial Education [NAME]. Building upon the broad historical detail the aim is essentially, to assess the EMS purpose closely, beyond the more practised institutional tradition / convention of its earlier textual counterparts. Further to this, while the approach to this chapter substantively reflects something of the conceptual and institutional founding aims, functions and purpose underlying the EMS project, parallel attention is given to the historical period, both nationally and internationally. The narrative highlights the potential wider influence of ‘race’. Such influence derived
foremost as perceived, from its three proposing organizations. These three were publicly acknowledged in their particular promotional roles.

At the time when the questioning of EMS was drawing to its close the SC similarly was under formal assessment. Its inquiry was established to determine whether the institution should continue in its given role or not. The assessment was carried out in 1981 on the broad understanding of definitions of Professor Nancy Trenaman, Principal of St Anne’s College Oxford. Her report, ‘Review of the Schools Council’ was addressed jointly to the Secretaries of State for Education and Science and for Wales and to the Association of Metropolitan Authorities and the Association of County Councils. In particular the inquiry gave attention to the claim voiced about the SC (in the seventeenth year of its existence) and cited in Trenaman Review Conclusions as ‘always [having been] the subject of controversy’. ‘Controversy’, as Trenaman understood it, as a human practice ‘was inevitable even healthy’. As stated in the introduction, the purpose of the inquiry was ‘to look at the nature, need for and conduct of the Council’s work from first principles’. I provide a brief background of SC responsibilities for the school curriculum – a function newly foregrounded alongside the longstanding responsibility for examinations, held historically by the SSEC since 1917. Indeed the latter-day interest in curriculum in England and Wales was designated by Minister of Education, David Eccles and his in-house Curriculum Study Group in 1962. This aspect of SC history occupies an acknowledged place in the narrative covering the period of Eccles’ Ministry.
The EMS pages selected for investigation reflect the project interest in ‘race’, the sole text directly covering the phenomenon in SC History / history humanities during 1976-1988. Conceptually significant for its interest in ‘race’ the EMS project, promoting equality among learners similarly reflects the institution scope for professional teacher individuality / autonomy. This race-specific text, initially of 1973-1976, manifests a departure, for the SC author-historian approaches in history / history-humanities curriculum. The proposed departure was determined necessary against perceived long-standing inequities met by some among Britain’s rapidly-expanding diverse population.

The EMS: Brief Historical Profile / Background

Importantly, the team’s presumed need for this Project was confirmed in its six-month fact-finding survey of 1973, Multiracial Education: Need and Innovation, SC Working Paper 50 [Need and Innovation]. Notwithstanding the significance attached to the findings of the aforesaid survey, but apparently questioning a perceived challenge of the measured wider-institutional position on ‘race’ a substantive section of the project -- some five chapter-sections, on ‘racial awareness, the development of racial attitudes in children, teachers’ expectations, ethnic identity, and the role of schools in a multiracial society became a focus of disagreement between the executive SC and the Project team. As the executive SC conclusively withdrew those sections from publication against the authoring-team wishes, it is surmised there was substantive disagreement over the interpretation broadly, of those issues.
An SC ‘alter ego’ (alternative self):

Proposing ‘cultural competencies’ in human interaction

In presenting a parallel institutional alter ego I signal the potential of a missed opportunity by the SC in overlooking a realistic option in EMS. That option, arguably apparent from the project’s initiation might have come about under different circumstances. In advancing this approach conceptually this study attempts retrospectively to better understand how ‘race’ was being addressed. I grasp the opportunity, over time, to take this narrative beyond Education Secretary, Shirley Williams’ Consultative rationale, of 1977, for a changed curriculum ‘reflective of the diverse society’. Thus this chapter resets the focus from its earlier twin concentration upon critical discourse analysis and historical-interpretive methodology, with a greater focus on historical-interpretive engagement and the understanding of ‘multi-cultural competencies’, through history- humanities curriculum.

Inclined toward a fully educative, qualitatively informed outcome, I revisit / re-construct a re-configured intellectual interface posited by Gibson, in her transformational curriculum register. This was and has remained apt during the period when SC ‘race’-challenger author, E. M. Brittan, formulated her multi-mode, subsequently compromised, EMS project. In view of all such concerns this study seeks, duty-bound to uncover whether there might have been a workable alternative. It seems likely that the executive institutional SC may have considered an alternative approach and thus rejected what they saw as an unacceptable outcome. Arguably the executive SC rejection of a core section of the final EMS Project, lately presented, made it imperative that
this highly flagged work -- supported both at its launch and in production, by high profile figures within professional education associations -- bears vigorous cross-questioning. Other aspects of the material / intellectual, academic world may be found to be more compatible for its given purpose in a reconsidered transformative curriculum in general teaching.

I leave this brief historical profile, thoughts of alternative perspectives, toward considering Brittan’s uncompromising stand against long-standing inequities, returning to the conceptual EMS strategy for multiracial history / history-humanities curriculum. I now discuss the nature of introductory pages defining the project. I provide an overview of selected pages with key sources, for example some two early texts of Daniel, W. D. and Smith, A., respectively cited by Brittan herself. These texts constitute optional / supplementary reading for participant teachers - encompassing part of the research evidence Brittan sought. Added to this were theoretical aspects of curriculum - its aims determinable objectives in content selection, import in philosophical, psychological, sociological and indeed social underpinnings. Brittan projected this whole toward ‘changing the (history) curriculum [into] multiracial education in the diverse society in England’. Interestingly, Brittan herself admitted being ‘slightly at odds with “child-centred” educational theory’, specifically with ‘other recent [unspecified] curriculum projects for [broadly] the same 5-13 age-range’, which otherwise ‘emphasized process rather than content, and skills and concepts rather than facts’. Expressly:

It [was] not the team’s wish to detract from the importance attached at present to skills, concepts and processes (quite the reverse, for a concern with
autonomy is germane to the project’s own concern with self-esteem and self-identity) [projects researched 1971/2 to 1973/6, published 1976/81] … demonstrate the interdependence of content and method. [My emphasis] ²

Whether these remarks of Brittan were prompted by / directed toward the SC PTS Project 5-13 (with its interest in skills and such like) was not directly stated. Viewed against the broad institutional output, this study sees Brittan’s observation as significant. Whatever the impulse to her thinking, informed knowledge and the study of others’ cultures need not translate into learning-by-rote, parrot-fashion, as potentially implied by Brittan toward the institutionally-shared PTS Project among others. More, my ongoing historical disciplinary inquiry maintains the high importance earlier attached to wider SC deployment of historical skills concepts and processes, in the teaching and learning of history. In passing, I append alongside for continuity a point of structural detail: project pages cited in discussing early stages of EMS reflect a Brittan self-referential pattern broadly maintained in early stages of this chapter of my enquiry. (My own footnoting following Univ. London IOE practice, is used here for the greater part, particularly for the rest of this study).

This approach continues from page 9 down.

Taking Brittan’s line of investigation forward, I surmise the project purpose set out (EMS, page 1) as an oblique base / source of her research premise(s):

- ‘assessments of the state of race relations in Britain;
- ‘historical studies of British reactions to immigrants in general and attitudes to black people in particular;
- ‘analyses of the presentation of race and immigration in the mass media;
- ‘the socio-psychological literature on the development of children’s racial attitudes; and
- ‘evidence of educational research on the achievement of minority-race pupils, and the extent to which schools have taken it, and the four [preceding] categories into account, in developing policies for curriculum and [its] organisation’.

*Outlining the Project Scope*

Altogether, Brittan’s assembling of these factors was directed toward some interpretation of the content and nature of the wider integral curriculum to be adopted. This understanding was made evident in the selection of prime chapter-headings, from her wide-ranging 1981 Project Report. Thus, I begin a limited though meaningful examination (potential cross-questioning) of the structural frame bearing the *EMS* text its aura bearings orientations. I do this by setting out and examining the more significant, conceptually-framed, elements / categorising aspect(s) among the *EMS* text-titles provided in its Contents page - selected from featured topics: Preface onto pp.1-7, including Introduction: ‘Defining the situation’, bearing such source references as: discussions on ‘White over Black’ by W. D. Jordan (1969), referenced by Brittan appendix-serving text, viz. [C52] and A. Davey’s 1978 Paper on ‘Racial Awareness in Young Children’, [C 62].

Similarly indicative of the geographical scope of concerns, with an everyday interest in ‘race’, Editor P. J. Bernard’s ‘Les Travailleurs Etrangers en Europe Occidentale’ ['Stranger Workers in Western Europe'] engaged by Brittan, discusses the ‘Experience of Adolescents from Ethnic Minorities in the British State Education System’, 1976: Page 8. *Chapter 1*: ‘Changing the Curriculum’ – Content in multiracial education, (pp. 9-12). *Chapter 2*: ‘With Objectives in Mind’ (p.13). Factors governing the selection of (educational) objectives (pp.14-16) and ‘Objectives and learning experiences’ (pp.20-21). *Chapter 6*: ‘Studying other cultures in the Junior School’ (1): General overview (pp.64-72); (2): ‘The Indian Subcontinent’ – Case Studies 1-3 (pp.74-83). *Chapter 8*:
‘Studying other cultures in the Junior School’ (3): ‘Africa and the Caribbean’ pp.84-102 – [Selected Units]: ‘Images of Africa’: What are the Objectives?
The Importance of Classroom Strategies, Principles for selecting Content. Chapter 9: Work in a White Area: Towards a Cross-Curriculum Policy. In terms of EMS overall, these constitute (my selected) representative pages which will be given varying focus.

This detail is selected on account of its characterising theoretical interest as distinct from the variously themed subject-disciplinary, institutional-component (counterpart texts) otherwise highlighted for my fullest consideration. This approach signals my broad, holistic, approach to EMS less-explicit principles, express qualities particular interest in history / history-humanities curriculum. Such interest extends across Brittan’s topical range. This approach implicitly aimed to counteract the negativity that ‘race’ was believed to foster within the society. To the extent that Brittan’s approach to curriculum content was largely product driven, I look to indicate an apt widening of that approach through reference to USA ‘multi-cultural’ researcher, Margaret Gibson’s ‘competencies in multiple cultures’ (1976). Significantly Gibson’s thinking based on principles was non-utilitarian decidedly discerning toward content and qualitatively rooted:

Given that individuals can and normally do develop competencies in multiple cultures, the question for educators is how best to create learning environments which promote rather than inhibit the acquisition of multi-cultural competencies.3

The scope for qualitative engagement and underpinning, acknowledged by Margaret Gibson above, is strongly relevant in the wider post-Brittan British /
English context of multicultural education. This concept broadly translates into those thus informed, educated into an awareness of, openness toward, others’ cultures, thereby being pragmatically alert to inherent practices. This latter sense differs somewhat from the seemingly more instrumental thinking / conceptualisation of Brittan’s utilitarian product-driven stance.

While Brittan sought to achieve equality and fairness for all learners, aspects inherent in the thinking of participant teachers, the author-historian was more opaque in framing her report to the advantage of readers’ expectations. I provide an example. Whereas a clear statement explains: ‘A multiracial curriculum is most readily distinguishable and definable by its content’ … and this is followed by: ‘The content of the curriculum is a selection from the culture or cultures which the school serves.’ The reader is further advised slightly confusingly: ‘In many instances the changes involved in making the curriculum multiracial will be of an unobtrusive or un-spectacular nature’, being at once both ‘distinguishable’ and ‘unobtrusive’.

Arising from the above, Brittan speaks discursively about the value of having multiracial imagery on classroom walls but the suggestion comes over in what some may consider a simplistic patronising way. Indeed the concept of inclusion, more generally, was not always infused with dignity. Yet Brittan pursued the idea:

It would be easy to dismiss individual multiracial visuals on classroom walls as superficial contributions to what children learn at school, but when black people figure prominently in the multiplicity of visuals servicing their regular curriculum in this way … they are experiencing something significantly .

4
She ends however with a further assertion: ‘More obviously substantial would be the scale of content changes brought about by “multiracialising” subjects such as Geography, History and Religious Education’. This last is singled out as a ‘good example to take’. Clearly, it appears that even in establishing the principles upon which the practice of inclusion extended to all peoples served in whatever system, Brittan had had some difficulty in achieving the objective required. Expressly conceptualised, humane / humanising objectives need clear principles. This need is intensified inasmuch as any projected practice in content-driven methodologies, not least their assessment, may itself prove reproductive. Routine use of such practice may require caution. It demonstrates a need for sustaining clarity in content-driven methodologies as engaged by Brittan. That outcome, content-driven appeared somewhat narrow devoid of a spirit of humanity allowing little progression for learners’ showing some development toward ‘higher’ capacities in qualitative attitudes / behaviours. Without these last, learners would less readily progress in the event of visible difference, to securing the wherewithal of a qualitative educational experience.

While the flow in any reading of texts is often best gauged sequentially this is less likely so where the exponent expression is tenuous and tentatively presented. Yet, I attempt to illustrate this somewhat unhelpful feature which potentially represented a non sequitur without full regard to the full scope of the Brittan narrative beyond page 12. Thus indeed:

The intentions of this [text] are to elaborate principles for developing a multiracial curriculum and to illustrate and illuminate these principles with varieties of practice.5 (My emphasis)
The concept, ‘principles’, seems somewhat loosely used here. Brittan’s elaborations above appear limited in addressing the underlying issues and the elements central to her case, through a variety of ‘object’-driven narrative practice. However, a wider study of the total EMS project would be required to fully understand these issues. Thus I proceed by engaging critically with the ‘objectives’ aspect of the project relevant to the ongoing (EMS) inquiry, before returning to consider more fully the qualitative and conceptual elements of this inquiry.

Without spelling out her idea of ‘principles’, Brittan immediately entered into examples of practice without stating what the actual underpinning rules / theories of practice might be. Her text moved rapidly to discuss ‘factors governing the selection of objectives’ by placing these, OBJECTIVES – the objects of her endeavours centre-page of what became Figure 1 (EMS page 14) with the image developing, as-it-were on a blank A4 size sheet of paper. This space expressly would develop into a series of directional arrows pointing toward central ‘OBJECTIVES’: ‘Philosophical (1) – ‘The kind of multiracial society envisaged’ together with: ‘The school’s role’. Next: ‘Philosophical (2)’ -- ‘Children’s needs and rights’. The pseudo-principles of page 12 in their turn transmuted into ‘philosophical’ 1 and 2 above, without otherwise denoting substantive “rules” / ideas underlying the proposed action.

The explication of ‘Factors governing the selection of objectives’, [Brittan page 14] was explained in the following terms: ‘A school’s stated objectives are an expression of its philosophy…’

Two aspects of that philosophy will have some bearing on the selection of multiracial objectives. The first is the school’s characterisation of the ideal multiracial society and of its own role in bringing such a society into being.
The two philosophical elements (supposed principles) were finally made evident in ‘Sociological (1)’ and ‘Sociological (2)’, highlighting firstly, ‘The state of race relations in Britain and in the local community’, and secondly, ‘The socialisation of children into prevailing norms’. The final Objective directional-arrow, ‘Social-Psychological’ leads to ‘The development of racial attitudes’, evidently comprised of children. This whole approach appears to have been passed on as tried and tested practice even though Brittan still had much scope to develop her thinking and practice in this area. Whether such presentation was meant to suggest some endorsement of the given practice remained unstated. I demonstrate below the Brittan model through her theoretical and visual manifestation. This concept is set out in a diagram: Factors Governing the Selection of Objectives. Conceptualised across a range of philosophical thought, the final segment of the circle representing the ‘Social-Psychological’ is linked to ‘The development of racial attitudes’ in children. Again, this is assumed to being meant as good practice without Brittan making some specific reference to learners’ transformational needs. This model is reproduced, courtesy of E. M. Brittan
Factors governing the selection of objectives

Figure 1. Factors governing the selection of objectives

- Philosophical (1): The kind of multiracial society envisaged/The school's role
- Philosophical (2): Children's needs and rights
- Sociological (1): The state of race relations in Britain and in the local community
- Social-Psychological: The development of racial attitudes
- Sociological (2): The socialisation of children into prevailing norms

(E. M. Brittan)
A prime feature and arising interest is the conflation of ‘race’ with culture, into
the single ‘multiracial’ frame -- another focus, seen broadly from a conceptual
theoretical frame was to uncover reasons, explication for the focus on ‘race’.
Notwithstanding the holistic conceptual overview in sections above, I restrict
my investigation to an examination of the project opening section and theme.
I discuss the broad flavour significance of the overall concept ultimately
floated. The pages on ‘content’ selected are limited but informing, to the
extent that I refer largely to Brittan’s stated intentions in getting her Project off
the ground. The scope is relatively measured, restricted, in some contrast to
the thematic breadth of other SC texts differently conceptualised in their
examination. The EMS scope, however, is of significance. Whereas Brittan
provided some indication of approaching her Project theoretically – supported
by proven aspects from long-standing copy of experienced writer-commentators, like Daniel (1968) and Smith (1977), her early commentary
upon given elements has not come across altogether convincingly. Indeed
Brittan appears to have fallen between two stools: 1: An underlying sense
potentially of deferred realisation, a function of what may somehow be an as
yet personally unrealised outcome, [of both author and attending actors’]
purpose or role. 2: The pervading invasive involvement in a research project,
without a clearly registered hypothesis, premise.

Consequentially, this whole (text and context) bears the weight of some yet-
to-unfold focus emerging from these research outcomes. That sense may
derive from team expectations raised to the effect that:
The team identified five categories of research evidence, each of which could throw some light on children’s perceptions of a multiracial society and the role of the curriculum in it.6 [My emphasis]

If not meant to be taken verbatim in terms of its grammatical mood the cited piece above may be considered misleading – producing potential uncertainty that rebounds, from a seemingly tentative expression of what an otherwise resolute / resoluble premise may well disclose. Yet, any disparity detected could be the author’s unwitting oversight in a potentially unwanted (though required) restructuring of the executive-SC challenged, ‘race’-driven, EMS text.

Again, although presenting five cited resource categories likely to bear hard evidence, Brittan seemed reticent toward “releasing” the (express) outcomes. Such reticence may have been an indication that the unfolding narrative ‘report’ was indeed a commentary-in-progress – as the pilot study proceeded, rather than being a coherently ordered post hoc narrative-account. Exponentially the authors’ fact-finding survey, Multiracial Education: Need and Innovation, SC Working Paper 50 may have required closer reading against the event of there being some chance of foreshadowing / presupposing if not pre-empting, participant teachers’ “reading” of the literature -- potentially intended to affirm what her premises, numbered 1 to 5 operatively supposed. Nor could it be taken for granted that teachers involved, at any given stage, were necessarily or readily identifiable across the given pilot-participants or, had even read the relevant / optional literature recommended, including: first, Daniel, W. W. (1968) [C52], and second: Smith, D. J. (1977) [C 62.] Indeed, the seeming uncertainty / potential
discrepancy (between the narrative concept and ‘under-stated’ reportage mode / method) underscores the need for Brittan’s further explication (p. 12) of her “methodology” in terms of: ‘the project’s relationship with examples of curricular practice’ being / having been (at different points of the project) ‘diverse’, effectively as:

Sometimes, the innovation in the curriculum has been entirely, or very largely, at the project’s instigation…described in EMS Chapter 9. At other times [when such innovation] was designed and initiated by the teachers, the project’s role was to develop [ideas] or extend [their significance] by making available extra resources and materials.⁷

This apologia came with concessions concerning the teachers’ capacities to go beyond identifying seemingly intractable problems, with pointers toward further [potential] research. Considering the course of the project as a whole, there may be further questions that could have been asked but that is not an active proposition here, beyond surmising there may have been more at issue in the EMS Project, even an absence of foresightedness beyond the (problematic) matter of ‘race’. Or again it may be, that having directed disproportionate time / effort to resolving the overarching issue of ‘race’, all higher operational values whether organisational technical or academic received less attention than these may otherwise have gained. Consequently, there may have been aspects of the Project’s management which were more consistently overlooked. Thus, I further consider here that insofar as this project’s place, on my envisaged SC list, had a post hoc inquiry in mind, such an expectation (as much as any thought of a potential structural shortcoming), may have been earned by virtue of respective actor-participants having their
own related expectations / research interests, in ‘race’, beyond that described here. There is a sense of some at least of this project’s readers somehow being left with an underlying sense of having been undersold. This sense may have resulted dually, whether from SC executive interventions or, indeed (my) reader-expectations as to what the educational project entailed consequentially. Even so, in seeking to broaden the (virtual) discussion of this project-text on ‘race’, I introduce the aforementioned approach of Gibson, grounded within the predominantly content-driven work of Brittan and also following John Slater at the Institute of Education. I use this model to demonstrate what constitutes the ‘multi-cultural competencies’ contextualised in Chapter Two. I revisit Gibson’s approach, uncovering its relevance in what amounts to a Project Multicultural England / Britain of the historical and the present-day. Gibson’s manifest purpose was, as with Brittan’s unspoken aim, to determine ‘how best to create learning environments which promote rather than inhibit the acquisition of multi-cultural competencies’.8

Looking back to Chapter Two, pp. 64 65 68 and Gibson’s concept, her aim was: to increase conceptual clarity of just what was meant by “multi-cultural” (in USA thinking). From this I seek to gain some understanding of what was meant by ‘cultural competencies’ and whether any aspects of this concept might enhance approaches today. More particularly here by inference in British ‘multicultural’ contexts, this study makes explicit the cultural competencies for Britain today with or without Gibson’s assumptions ‘[underlying] each of [her] five conceptualisations advanced’9 over time. And thus without further discussion I signal the wider connectedness of the given
project actors and their respective contributions, to the progress of this inquiry. Indeed it is apt that some measure of this time be directed to further reviewing the remaining projects of particular interest in the SC repertoire. I bear in mind the history SCHP 13-16 Project to the extent that their developmental properties could be qualitatively informed. I ponder over principles of Project Director, David Sylvester, whereby as Denis Shemilt (in assessing the significance of the SCHP 13-16 Project success) reported it: 'Experimental pupils [following the ‘experimental’ pilot-project approach] … tended to see [History] as a problem-solving, explanatory discipline', and as such, 'it [was] quite likely that this revised image of the discipline had a radical impact upon pupils’ level of conceptualization'.

It is of some interest that the longstanding problem-solving skills-based concept of learning appears to have had little if any influence upon the EMS project planning, evident around the time when Brittan conceptualised her text. It is equally likely that Shemilt, in assessing other SC experimental pilot-projects acknowledged the contributions of many similarly driven curriculum discourses of that time. Yet, a potentially disconcerting issue underlying the EMS approach is the preparedness to leave significant aspects open-ended, for example the early defining of a ‘multiracial curriculum’. As it stands, EMS does not reflect the then newly–defined disciplinary theories or fully engage with the historical period. This position may have arisen from the EMS wanting to portray the value of its originality even if the ‘race’ theme was considered divisive.
‘Multiracial’ became a hybrid form, melding ‘culture’ into a narrow definition of ‘race’\textsuperscript{11}. Accordingly:

A multiracial curriculum [became] most readily distinguishable and definable by its content. Essentially it comprises two elements. The first is a simple and constant recognition, visually and verbally, of the multiracial \textit{complexion} of British society. The second is an extension of the first, but refers to culture rather than ‘race’\textsuperscript{12}.

It cannot be affirmed that this understanding was either widely recognised or as yet employed. But for all this, project-creator Brittan remained increasingly prepared and willing to work towards change by being conceptually ‘different’, independent and innovative in marking out her discursive territory. Of general importance in gaining a comprehensive picture of case study SC II is one’s having some understanding of the evidence-seeking introductory project ‘Multiracial education: Need and Innovation’ in 1973. This would provide material background detail relative to the exceptionally brief \textit{EMS} Preface. The forerunner establishes and emphasises the original aim of seeking to ‘prepare children for life in the [racially-mixed] society in which they live’. Yet, in looking to what this might involve in a post-Second World War British society, of the mid- to late-1970s, it was also noted that no general consensus was reached on ‘the extent to which curriculum content should reflect contemporary changes in the society’\textsuperscript{13}.

Nevertheless, taking forward the narrative of the authors’ survey, Townsend-Brittan led readers through the varied landscape of mixed backgrounds comprising (as they saw it) ‘this island race’. That description suggested a
unity of a sort, which would have concentrated upon the disparate settler-invaders’. Whether the expectation was of revisiting a desirable sense of nationhood was not made clear. Nevertheless, early contributors to that island race are inclusively ordered in the established historical sequence: of ‘Picts, Celts, Romans, Angles, Saxons, Vikings, through to Normans, onto the contemporary field of New Commonwealth immigrants’.

The broad intention was thereby clarified: ‘Race’ would be central to the concept of this text, as would some reality of there being an absence of agreement about certain related issues. The decided approach selected at the review stage of the ‘Need and Innovation’ prior survey, covering six prime types of schools, was taken on the basis of age range, black-white ‘racial’ composition, across several levels of intake and intensity of immigrant settlement in given areas.

Some indication of the emotive nature of issues arising in Brittan’s EMS project found a place in evidence to the Rampton Report of the House of Commons Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration, 1973, by the National Association of Schoolmasters:

We do not think it to be any part of a teacher’s professional role to determine the nature of the society but we do see it as his professional role to get on with the job of devising and giving an effective education to all pupils within the framework which society has established. We declare, however, that the nature of the society which we wish, or intend, to have in Britain is not defined with any clarity in relation to the multiracial problem.

Here, the author’s supporting remarks reflect the kind of issues inherent in the above response: ‘No attempt was made by the researchers [Brittan /
Townsend] to define the concept “multiracial”, largely because it was considered preferable to leave the question open-ended rather than exclude some of the respondents’ options’. Yet, beyond confirming the authors’ premise, it is questionable why it should be thought necessary to confirm rather than potentially preclude the contributors’ expected reservations. However, the response is significant in providing a clear expression of what some teachers at least, would appear to have been considering their educational role might be.

Again using Shemilt’s SCHP 13-16 review as an index to its wider success particularly, in the development of subject-disciplinary skills, leading from the lower onto the higher, I cite some two “new” users of that pilot-project so far known to have taken up the option of committing their views to paper’. And those teachers, from two Humberside schools, Andrew Marvell and Kelvin Hall discuss the advantages of the Project as they perceived them. Thus, ‘on the [planned], cumulative approach’: ‘History Science Languages Maths., now build brick by brick, from lower to higher skills’. Indeed, ‘the material itself, content-wise, had many opportunities for cross-fertilisation’, for example in ‘Britain 1815-51: Depth Study with Nineteenth Century-Public Health (Medicine) and Conditions in China / Ireland (Modern World Studies) and History Around Us (as local-historical evidence)’.16

Other commentary surrounded the wide variety of historical material which ‘provides pupils with a much more genuine insight into History’s relevance and capacities than a single specialism’ of, for example, ‘British Social and Economic History from 1700’.17 In strong contrast, provision for the EMS 5-13
age-range seems to have proved insufficiently inspiring, even unduly problematic, in important regards. I explain this aspect through my counter-proposition arguing that notwithstanding successes of a majority of wider institutional SC History Projects, “Experiment” by its nature could sometimes prove inconclusive and not generally accountable. Its outcomes may be unexplained, even non-productive without a justifiable purpose. In the latter regard, of interest in the EMS text, this project arguably bears a ‘no case to answer’ prospect to the extent of not showing a more explicitly functional human-developmental role for learners, prompting from this study a broad rhetorical question: Does the EMS project like, for example, the USA journey in the ‘Competencies of multi-cultures’ offer scope for developing a sense of humanity, evident caring, socially responsible strategies inherent in the process of everyday living and learning open to learners?

This thinking is relevant inasmuch as a qualitative process may open paths into other kinds of learning involvement, in due course, by contemplating ‘readiness for learning’ opportunities, to paraphrase Jerome Bruner. By such means, ‘massive general transfer can be achieved by appropriate learning, even to the degree that learning properly under optimum conditions (formal or informal) leads on to “learning how to learn”’. Bruner expands on this further exploring the learner’s ‘shock of recognition of what the [learned] material means when fully understood’.18 This comes about, as it were, in “good” time. As demonstrated by Australian “wordsmith” Robert Hughes and an extended core of broadcaster-producer educationists working on his behalf, learning is best achieved through the Bruner advance in fullest understanding. The
outing of this exchange was the historical production of polymath journalist and art-enthusiast, Robert Hughes’ ‘Shock of the New’ Television series exploring the changing faces of “modern” art, over time into the Twentieth Century.

Toward ‘multicultural competencies’ in England (Schools)

In providing a passing reminder of Gibson’s approach sub-titled Approaches to Multi-cultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumptions I signal four of her five conceptualisations attesting to being ‘programmatic’. I review these toward the potential UK adoption / “accretion”, of some basic assumptions in terms wholly or selectively of:

(i) ‘underlying values, (ii) changed strategies, (iii) intended outcomes and (iv) the given target populations - all understood as being in particular regard to multi-cultural education’.20

Gibson’s aim was (as contingently this study’s is): (a) to increase conceptual clarity of just what was meant by “multi-cultural” (in USA thinking) and by inference in the British contexts of this study alike (after Gibson); (b) to make explicit a number of assumptions (which “[underlay] each of the five conceptualisations advanced”). The fifth conceptualisation (v) a social anthropological perspective, attached significance to both ‘education and culture, and without equating education with schooling or, viewing multi-cultural education as a type of formal educational program’.21 This approach offers scope for extending interaction. While Gibson’s Conclusions indicate
her work as relating to the USA, this study sees her thinking educationally as being appropriate to the UK also. However, this study does not seek to activate USA advocacies wholesale, but merely to lay a ground plan of potential for ultimate “academic” consideration as the light of any undertaking. Whereas the impulse / impetus of the Gibson approach derived from ‘minority-group pressure for equity in educational opportunities’ (greatly accelerated by US federal legislation for bilingual and ethnic studies programs), multicultural education here in Britain generally had not become - - as overwhelmingly as in the USA, one of that decade’s fastest growing mantras. Indeed, unlike literature on USA multi-cultural education -- which showed that ‘the program’s [existing] proponents offered no systematic delineation’ of related thinking, but that ‘program statements [were] consistently marked by vague and emotional rhetoric’.\(^{22}\) Yet, UK enthusiast-contenders taking to print often divested into the topic greater stature, immeasurably, beyond the populist ‘saris samosas and steel-band’ approach,\(^{23}\) albeit without yet historically aiming, toward the qualitatively informed engagements pursued by Gibson, discussed in Chapter Two, the Historical-Contextual (page 64) of this study.

In this dual, skills-driven and historical study, I unpack a conceptual and qualitative conceptualisation. This is understood personally, from an already established strongly anthropological perspective, while reflecting Gibson’s perspective. This attaches significance to both ‘education and culture, without necessarily equating [either] education’ [solely] with schooling or, viewing multicultural education ‘as a type of formal educational program’\(^{24}\) only.
This whole constitutes rather a meaningfully considered intellectually-driven stance, worldview and way of life, purposefully being in contexts within or, outside of, everyday schooling. Unlike Gibson, I withdraw from using this opportunity to index Cultural Understanding, Cultural Pluralism and Bicultural Education both as a potential comparative / alternative conceptual base and for discussing school curriculum reform. ‘In [considering] key concepts [institutions / individuals may better] explicate their assumed relationships’. Such a definition would come about [by manifesting specific meaning across] ‘the multiplicity of (multi-) cultural competencies, at hand and in doing which [educators may thereby] promote conceptual clarity and bring some order [logical thinking / constituency] to the field’s broad scope’ in whatever adoptive educational contexts.

In the contexts of a British formal / informal schooling qualitative educational courses could feasibly begin in the early years. The proposed approach accordingly could then be extended beyond the sole emphasis upon the ‘knowing’ of ‘content’ and mere facts. The process would progress toward enhancing human-developmental qualities values and goals cumulatively through educational programmes. There would necessarily be scope for planning in terms of the inclusion of ideas and principles in British and wider global learning programmes as well as schooling and related contexts of ‘being’. Endorsement of this approach presupposes some preparedness and readiness in the developmental process. This entails learners being grounded in the matter of well-being. Operationally it presupposes professional theoretical underpinnings and a
clear understanding, of whatever processes theories targets structures are called into educative service, by its purveyors, toward a common general well-being.

By looking toward a more inclusive human-developmental outreach, this approach and study stand beyond:

the [Brittan] “nexus of relationships binding white society (its teachers, its parents, its children) to the children of families it defines as racially different – children of African, Asian and Caribbean descent”. 26

The proposed alternative counters / supplements the narrow visually-informed EMS ‘race’ concept based upon the mere visual, observational. Rather this study offers prospects across the spectrum of learners and wider diverse population alike, extending to a constituent global whole. Further, insofar as structures for implementation and its related guidelines would more successfully apply beyond any particular tradition, I turn forthwith to other lines of thinking. Some such practice would ordinarily require inspirational and or aspirational involvement, projected toward a sense of wider humanity. Thinking beyond this skeleton would be for future thinkers, planners and personnel in future programme design and execution. Such actors may follow what John Slater describes as ‘humane behaviour’ at his IOE special professorial lecture of 1988. Along with Gibson’s ‘cultural competencies’, a Slater form of ‘humane behaviour’ offer considerable opportunities which are foreshadowed in the progress of this study.
**History-humanities dehumanized?**

John Slater addressed some ‘traditional hobby horses’. He questioned some practices in History and Humanities education of the post-Second World War, 1970s / 80s period which remain relevant today. Informed by the ‘humane’ in History-humanities education, Slater makes a pertinent observation in relation to curriculum content. He suggests that ‘humane behaviour is threatened by some of the views on history currently being aired’ and remains ‘suspicious of a history curriculum defined primarily in terms of content, whose criteria for selection have not been defined, and which are seen ‘principally as a prop to attitudes that have to be accepted rather than understood or interpreted’.  

Indeed, Slater remains equally ‘suspicious of content seen mainly in terms of national achievement and great people’. Unquestionably the same view holds of the individual learner as well as the wider institutional context. As to matters of race, Slater examines the compromising discourses, the ‘Uses and Abuses of History’ (1981) and how history is taught, citing reports of Paul Kennedy and Werner Berghahn on racial and cultural superiority which often descended into ‘uncritical and too often strident nationalism’. Indeed the Kennedy-Berghahn discourse describe how since 1945, throughout Western Europe and the USA:

such history has been scrutinized and found to have been not only historically, but often morally, suspect associated too often with ideas of racial and cultural superiority and an uncritical and often strident nationalism’.
The more extremist responses to human frailties and the proneness to ill-judged choices remain one of humanity’s most persistent manifestations of the human condition. More, Slater substantiates such concerns about the abuse of history by further citing French historian Marc Ferro’s account of South Africa’s demonstration of cultural superiority, selective transmission of persistent ‘racial and cultural values rather than [insightfully] examining them’. Among other historical genres Ferro has worked on early European interests.

Further concerned by a perceptibly subtle / widespread custom, Slater similarly further critiques his audience, contending: ‘The propaganda about “heritage” is deafening’ (citing The Observer, 26 July 1987 article by Neil Ascherson, historian and Honorary Professor at UCL Institute of Archaeology and author of *Stone Voices: The Search for Scotland* [2003]). Within this discourse on history teaching, Ascherson points up our long-standing, otherwise often ‘smugly un-reproached relationship with heritage’. Ascherson’s observations, as rehearsed by Professor Slater (considering how the potential for light-hearted distortion of the factual reality - ‘the deafening propaganda about heritage make it rather harder - not easier to understand the present through the (distorted) past’; all this, to the extent potentially that young learners stand to be misled. But Slater’s ‘moral’ here is not toward finger-pointing self-righteousness on any part, just mindful caution.

Returning to my broad analysis of the EMS Project content, different positions were voiced at the planning stage which arose from the tenor of that Project. I see these against the Gibson ‘cultural competencies’ discourse and the
Professional Schoolmaster uncompromising textual response. Reflecting on such and other distinctions I query that it might have been more productive for the Project originators to have spent greater time on planning in relation to the key issues. Would it have been more productive to encourage shared knowledge / conversation at an early point rather than resort to post hoc incrimination? These seem fair questions in the given contexts -- I bear in mind the potential for troubled outcomes of an ambitious Project. I recognise potentially unexpected consequences and raise both a particular query and the retort prompted from the evidence-seeking EMS Project Questionnaire expressly counter-claiming:

We do not think it to be any part of a teacher’s professional role to determine the nature of the society, although we do see it as his [her] professional role to get on with the job of devising and giving an effective education to all pupils, within the framework which society has established. We declare, however, that the nature of the society which we [would] wish, or intend, to have in Britain is not defined with any clarity in relation to the multiracial problem. 31

Whether the lone NAS educational conceptualisation, inherent in the use of the term ‘determine’, was meant to translate into his teaching union ‘reading’ of the (multiculturalist) outlook of present-day society, is unclear. It might just be that the respondent’s understanding of that reading suggested a potential engagement in social engineering - artificially structuring the ‘order’ / mix, of individual / wider collective attitudes and behaviours across society. That would be a potentially contentious matter. Yet the observation is significant, for providing a clear expression of what some teachers, at least, appear to
have been considering their educational role might be. Whereas the focus of attention in planning the EMS text appeared to have been directed toward the deployment of substantive knowledge, insufficient attention seems to have been allowed for the professionals’ part in the sensitive task. Related criteria, for the selection of learner requisites, proclaim: ‘The curriculum needs to be both international in its choice of content and global in its perspective’: 32

[And], its variety should be made evident in the visuals stories and information offered to children; pupils should have access to accurate information about racial and cultural differences and similarities. 33

What exactly was meant by ‘accurate information about racial and cultural differences and similarities’ or how this might be dealt with by teachers, was not explained. It might have been more appropriate productively to highlight our common humanity. Nevertheless, continuing in the same vein the Team provided something in the order of what may be seen as an open-ended proposition that stood to be equally problematic without a clear sense of how, achieving some clarity might be assured. Moreover:

People from British minority groups and other cultures overseas should be presented as individuals with every variety of human attribute and quality; stereotypes are unacceptable and likely to be damaging; other cultures and nations have their own validity and should be described in their own terms. 34

These may have been good intentions but such observations appear somewhat short of the meaningful treatment that the EMS Project and theme required. And the insistent question as to the necessary preparation of
teachers for their sensitive tasks continues to be pressed home. Indeed, the aim to enhance ‘children’s perceptions of a multiracial society and the role of curriculum in [achieving] it’ appears to have gained little assistance, informed thought, as to how best learners’ needs might be served in these circumstances. Nor was attitude change actively addressed toward a willing accommodation to difference. Evidently having achieved the required justification for manifesting the nation’s culpability with respect to ‘race’, the expected evidence was confirmed and the long shadow of poor ‘race’ relations endorsed / emphasised.

I take forward the continuing inquiry in an overview of the EMS Team’s direct approach to its task. Unlike the majority approach, by the institution, in reforming history-humanities curriculum – this being guarded, conservative in imagination and its sense of purpose, the EMS Team manifested diligence in censuring those whom others may wish to have won over to their cause. In this sense I revisit a section of a course of teaching arising from a pilot programme devised, thus exemplifying approaching work with a diversity of young learners in an English classroom of the day.

Building on the narrative of ‘Identity’ in the contexts of a primary school teacher and her class working on the given topic, I revisit a spontaneous exchange which developed between the unsuspecting teacher of a Primary class and her naturally outspoken pupils. In the following account, derived from the EMS Project, the class of pupils were the prime actors, the teacher surrounded by a group of lively and quick-witted young people, clearly uncertain how to deal with the unexpected. The EMS narrator sets the scene:
While the work on their bodies was going on, a group was asked to describe themselves without use of their names. It was in this activity that ‘a mixed-race child needed the teacher’s skill and tact to help him through the interjections of his peers’. The first boy started off deliberately and slowly with a thoughtful pause between each sentence; this set an approach the others followed:


And so it continued … and whether this ‘painful inquisition of Stephen’ was, in fact, necessary makes a moot question. The case report concluded, curiously if not altogether acceptably:

The inquisition of Stephen by the other children was undoubtedly painful, and it is hard for a teacher to predict when such a difficulty may arise and how best to handle it. In this case, helping Stephen to articulate what he knows to be true with a confirming: ‘He said
his Daddy came from Jamaica’ probably gave him much support as possible at that moment, and for him to accept reality rather than to be allowed to get away with a fictional identity is vital for the development of a healthy self-concept.39 [My italicised query]

The concern here is that the thought (of the adult in charge of the class) was unlikely to have entered the mind of the infant on the receiving end of the adult comment. What is possibly needed here is some appreciation of what may lie behind the Black child’s purported reluctance to ‘colour-in’ his / her face with black or brown colouring. To those “active” in the art or having knowledge, of portraiture and informed about child development, it may be readily understood that the infant “reluctance” in managing the technicalities of his own attempts at the genre of portraiture stemmed from his still developing capacities / competencies.

A similarly difficult occurred in a classroom piloting the EMS Project, and where the classroom teachers in the pilot study were professionally working on the principle of starting from the point at which their learners are located and, accordingly know best. The given theme was ‘Myself, my home, and my family’.39 Equally important here, as apparently were the well-rehearsed expressions on the ‘validity’ of others’ cultures, some general advance guidance to teachers on approaching the ‘family’ topic might have been helpful, particularly on the personal discussion of family members and “home” matters. There was much to be gained from pointing teachers, in anticipation of such spontaneous moments, toward a reference source compatible with related potentialities. Having some experience of children
confusing the meaning / everyday vocabulary of ‘lazy’ and ‘liking to relax’ could prove useful in unexpected situations. I have in mind a teacher’s awareness to a related pitfall befalling her, just when she could have been preferably more tactfully responsive. Some interception by perhaps enhancing the pupil’s understanding of the terms being ‘lazy’ and liking to ‘relax’ could have served his / her family well where a tricky claim was made as to someone’s family practices. This approach seems feasible in the given contexts of minimal certainty / or the absence of “voice” on all sides including that of a non-participant member mentioned in the pupil’s narrative writing.

In such varying contexts of today’s learning and teaching environment, rather more realistically grounded observations may be drawn upon and corresponding benefits accrued, from the theoretical conceptualisations of for example, Etienne Wenger (1998) and / or Wenger and Jean Lave (1995 / 2002) - among other differently minded proponents of learning. These such are identifiable as being situated in ‘communities of practice’ where ‘social learning practice’ [SLP] takes place. In these communities learners are enabled to interact in social sites of learning whereby interactive processes stand to serve the needs of learners, through experience gained, in meaningful ways, by practice in overcoming given obstacles. As proponent of ‘social learning’ in ‘communities of practice’, Etienne Wenger put it, the crossing of ‘boundaries’ to learning can take place:

[Only] when participants are able to recognise an experience of meaning, in each other, and to develop enough of a shared sense of competence to do some mutual learning.40
The learning curve is high. And the essence of developing competences, through crossing the greatest of boundaries is the prerequisite of ‘shared’ opportunities in (history) teaching. Sharing implies, requires, and translates, here, into coming to some accommodation with the politics of ‘race’ in education, a prime interest, object, and means of working to engage learners in shared acts of discourse -- toward achieving transformational behaviours through history-humanities curriculum.

Conclusions

Bringing together prime elements of the discussion across the two allied interrelated chapters, I draw final conclusions. First, the general position of history as a curriculum subject may be seen as having been variously restructured according to the particular inclinations / concerns of participant author-historians. These were re-worked into a freshly re-considered, ‘new wave’ contemporary-period (early- to mid-1970s into 1988) discipline. All the while, respective historians kept the traditional disciplinary image largely intact, notwithstanding some few pragmatic assertions remaining, to a degree. Second, the prevailing interest in and importance given to teaching historical skills -- prime aim in the curriculum subject was heightened, arguably proportionately relative to its given traditional status.

Third, given the importance of historical skills their general application and added value to curriculum history, regularly rehearsed politically -- the general privileging of skills in structuring curriculum content, to the general benefit indicates the likely continuation of history in post-National Curriculum
contexts. This substantive whole suggests the discipline stands to continue being taught, in state schools, almost certainly. Fourth, through demonstrating possible developments manifest in matters of attitude in everyday life and well-being, likely future differences over the discipline would be such as would bring new prospects and wider purpose inevitably. Any exceptional disciplinary developments stand to retain loyalty to the subject - satisfying the need for rigour in practice, more circumstantially. Fifth and finally, the analysis of historical material for a 'scientific' objective culturally-competent history-humanities curriculum beyond boundaries, underscores the heights to be reached educationally. I bear in mind the development status already achieved by the discipline, in its proven stature across respective teaching texts with indications toward yet further promise over time.
Chapter Five
ILEA: A Historical Site of Educational Endeavour:

Is Identity a Function of History?

In the early pages, this chapter highlights aspects of the historic educational site of London’s metropolitan city, in which the needs of generations of learners have been provided. The aim, ultimately, is to determine whether like the SC, and the HA as will be seen, the Authority’s historic institutional environment that developed - even before the establishment of ILEA itself - has influenced the character of, and outlook upon, texts produced for reformed history / history-humanities curriculum, of 1976-1988. I examine the role and unique, solely educational purpose, of ILEA, briefly in its given urban metropolitan location its strategies in serving the interests of a school population, reflecting post-war diverse society. In doing this I seek to uncover whether and the extent to which, strategies engaged are informed by ‘multicultural’ thinking, understood broadly in terms of ‘race’, as institutionally perceived. In attaching some significance to the Authority’s spatial location and broader place within the metropolis, historically, I connect its heightened thrust of thought and political self-awareness more lately within the Administration to London’s historical metropolitan role, its prowess in Empire and the influential cosmopolitan ethos of the Capital. All told, this sense has translated increasingly into executive policymaking, its leading role in educational delivery answering social need in disadvantage over time and
working ultimately to enhance the place of women through its ambitions for a changed and still changing school population demographic.

Retrospect and Prospect

Bearing in mind the overarching sense of well-being fostered in providing for learners’ development, a more nuanced aim is to uncover any continuity of policy / approach, in serving the affective aspects of learners, in delivering an education service over time. In doing this, I acknowledge the mixed social circumstances and the relative advantage in the Authority’s location within the global city, designated among the historically re-defined, re-constituted, Borough Councils of 1965. In these circumstances, likely to underpin the nature of the textual material produced with the post-1948 schools intake in mind, I recognise the view of Gerald Grace, exponent of urban education, that, in terms of the education delivered in the metropolis, ‘the schools of the inner-city areas today are both arenas of change and repositories of continuity and as such reflect the social configurations of the localities in which they stand’.¹

Educational London before ILEA²

In portraying contextual elements of continuity and change over time, I trace ILEA’s development following a historical path effectively from the London Education Act of 1903, when all education was transferred (from the Boards of Education) to the London County Council [LCC], active during 1904-1965,
in an extended scheme for secondary education in the metropolis. Through the re-configuration of the LCC into the metropolitan-based Greater London Council [GLC], active from 1965-1986 the progeny, ILEA, emerged. By this convergence of events, circa 1963-1965, ILEA uniquely won sole responsibility for local education,\(^3\) taking on the challenges of the longstanding urban facility. Its historical profile in the Capital of a once dominant global power of great standing, highlighted in imperial terms between 1905 (the year before the HA’s foundation) and 1939 (the start of the Second World War), was rehearsed, for example, in each volume of the municipal Authority’s official manual of the time, *The London Education Service*. The sentiments were clear: ‘London is the home of the world’s markets; the centre of international finance; the Capital city of a world-wide Empire; the meeting place of nearly every race of people’. Conflating these historic observations with others similar about the Metropolitan Authority - the LCC - ‘always conscious of national and imperial obligations’ and ‘keenly aware of the lead to be given to others by London’, stressed, as historian polymath Stuart Maclure concluded:

> It is not only, therefore, the needs of the locality which are insistent in their claim on the London Education Authority. [Indeed] *policy* of London, including the organization of its education service, must be largely influenced by Imperial circumstances and the general advance of humanity. For it is on these that [London’s] own existence largely depends.\(^4\) (My emphasis)

While policy guiding LCC London’s educational employees, administrative and teaching constituted a useful rallying cry in the proper exercise of their duties, there seems equal scope for it raising a level of misapprehension, at
the less auspicious advance of post-1948 colonial arrivals. As Maclure’s expansionist account of the above suggests, there was a sense of hubris, excess, about that pride, built on Imperialist achievement, insofar as, beyond a doubt, the darker underside of the Imperial agenda would return, unsuspectingly, with the entry of Black colonials seeking their place in Britain as legitimate British citizens. This understanding held, more particularly, as for the most part, did the fact - far stronger than a possibility - that much of England’s wealth and prowess, in Imperial terms, was gained, no built upon the fruits of the Black Empire. This came from centuries of slavery and such revenue as accrued from the trans-Atlantic Slave Trade, more specifically between the shores of Britain, the USA and the Caribbean. Whether such revenue derived directly from slaving arenas of Bristol, or Liverpool, or elsewhere, may be inconsequential. It is noteworthy that by 1915, what was ‘the beginning of the Education Library housed in County Hall -- containing volumes at the disposal of teachers and educational administrators -- a library for the circulation of books among those engaged in London’s education’\(^5\) was set up. The LCC executorship was explicit in its high purpose, effectively that:

\[
\text{to achieve the best results in the training of its future citizens, it [was] important that the Council should do all it [could] to keep its teachers in touch with the latest developments of educational theory and should also give them facilities for pursuing their knowledge of other subjects [areas of knowledge].}^6
\]

Interestingly, the transforming of the historic Education Library into the Inner London Resources / Materials Service coincided with the questioned advance
of humanity in the form of post-war ‘mass’ Black Commonwealth immigration to the UK. This latter event, as this study suggests, combined with the Authority’s background and history impacted upon the nature of textual material produced for the new diverse society both directly and indirectly.

The immigration event, aptly dubbed an act of ‘reverse colonisation’ by the burgeoning, rapidly developing, young Jamaican poet Linton Kwesi Johnson, gained historical authenticity in post-1948 Britain. Here the poet used his gifts in the performance of rhythmic poetry-writing. This was based on his interpretation of social and political issues / events, in the ‘dub’, reggae, musical rhythms verbally expressed. This particular every-day and pertinent ‘play’ of words, typical among sectors of the Caribbean peoples was to gain in stature through its common appeal. A point of undiminished interest, even jollity, to Caribbean peoples at the earlier phases of immigration was the operative phrase, ‘reverse colonisation’, particularly when cited later, in relation to the Open University course *Ethnic Minorities and Community Relations* (1982). (The young Linton, among the original immigrants, made the journey, aged 9, from Jamaica to settle in England. Now a newly defined British citizen, he later studied sociology at University of London Goldsmiths.)

I take the narrative forward, by briefly revisiting the history of Black post-Second World War colonial immigration to Britain. This may serve to regularise some of the conflicting accounts surrounding the newcomers’ historical and present-day relationship with Britain. According to assertions of David A. Coleman, immigration statistician on establishing the course and impact of post-Second World War Black Commonwealth immigration, ‘there
was no British government arrangement to import “guest workers”. This may be true, in terms of ‘guest workers’ as then understood of the Black incomers, up to the Colonial Immigration Control Act of 1962. Indeed, viewed from first-hand knowledge of well-placed civil servants, officially involved in hosting their English counterparts supporting their manpower-seeking mission, in Barbados - and representing the (British) Ministries of Health and Transport, Caribbean workers were invited to provide their services. This role operated as a system of projected placements. This was the case, at the height of the recruitment drives to supplement the depleted work-force in England. As a point of detail, many of the early immigrant peoples returned latterly, to their former pursuits, to take up enhanced positions in their local hospitals, schools, or whatever. Although Coleman concedes that ‘some British firms recruited [workers] privately’, this is not the whole story. Indeed, films in Britain’s broadcasters’ archives transmitted the recruitment process-in-action, between the Caribbean, particularly Barbados, and the UK. Again, Coleman describes the organisation of incomers as piecemeal. This may also be true of some of the substantive few independent travellers, albeit in private friendship groups, who made their own way into Britain hoping, or more optimistically expecting, to secure employment on arrival. Inevitably, some of these pioneering groups will have come to the notice, or ultimately crossed the pathways, of London’s professionals, not least its education authorities. Whereas central policymaking on education of the sixties like immigration post-1948 has been seen as ‘ad hoc, laissez-faire and even non-existent’, it may more accurately be described as post-hoc. Thereby the detail followed
the practised art of teachers involuntarily seeking out and finding solutions, to
the unexpected challenges accompanying the instant announcements of
pupils’ arrival in the average classroom of the 1960s to 1970s and even at
times, the 1980s. Take, for example, the DES policy objectives of 1971,
aimed:

(i) To help create a climate in schools in which colour and race were not
divisive and which would give all immigrant children opportunities for
their personal development;
(ii) To ensure that building programmes and teacher quotas reflected the
needs of areas with large numbers of immigrant pupils;
(iii) To offer advice and practical help to teachers faced with the challenge
of teaching immigrant children;
(iv) To safeguard against any lowering of standards, due to the pressures
of large numbers of non-English speaking children, which might
adversely affect the progress of other children; and
(v) To encourage and promote relevant research.11

As Chris Husband affirms, through the above responses in an exploratory
survey, ‘this was a retrospective survey of 1971’.12 As such it relates to the
decade of the 1960s. Indeed, the Black presence was strongly manifest in
classrooms across ILEA from the early 1970s, the Authority responding
purposefully both in terms of learners in school and in extending parents’
knowledge of their children’s experience of school. This period was closely
rehearsed by Peter Newsam, reviewing his ‘Last Ten Years’ in the Authority,
of c. 1981. Newsam, Education Officer for ILEA (1977-1982) and Deputy to
Briault, architect of the ‘Whole Community’ approach, for some of that time,
usefully put on record Briault’s connection with the LCC for some 30 years,
before he took up the position of Chief Education Officer [CEO] for ILEA, from
the academic year 1971/72.
Briault’s purpose toward the newcomers was demonstrated in the arrangements for regular newsletters to parents presented in their home languages, with translation facilities available for pupils in school. This period constituted the dawn of the Authority’s first post-immigration policymaking phase in addressing the Black presence, used generically at this point inclusive of Asian pupils, a policy informally initiated and adopted. I interpret this phase as foremost reflecting the Authority-wide pioneering spirit in delivering curriculum. This initiative will be expanded upon shortly. Some emphasis is placed here, on the institutional, insofar as whichever of its later achievements would be deemed wide of the mark, at the earliest point the Authority, by its action, manifested an unshaken intention that its management of change in response to the demographically changed school intake would be a community matter, approached and resolved collectively, as an institution. And no opportunity would be lost in serving the interests of its British subjects newly settled in the ‘Mother Country’. Clearly, learning would be better served where learners were content in the learning environment.

Reflecting the organisational structure, this chapter follows the partly biographical partly operational aspects of its particular case-location and is explored in two parts. The first represents the definitive periods of its administration and rehearses the concept of the education community holistically, inclusively in their diversity - the ‘Whole Community’ phase. The second phase covers the analysis of relevant curriculum texts, discussed through the lens of ‘race’. This material is defined both by the structures within
which institutional policy has been created toward implementation and through the Authority's second-phase resolve to counter disadvantage of various kinds, including racialised practice. Policymaking relating to the arrival of children of the Black Commonwealth is charted partly through Minutes of the Authority's Education Committee (Schools) in the earlier years of immigration. The second phase, running effectively from 1981 / '83 into 1988, previews the analysis of curriculum texts produced by ILEA from the early to mid-1980s. These two strands stand in strong contrast, with each other. The first period bears the mark of Chief Education Officer [CEO] Eric Briault, bringing to an end his time with the London County Council and marking the beginning of his tenure with the new ILEA, first as Deputy Education Officer and then CEO through its new beginning in the precisely structured London Government Act of 1963. In this new constituency ILEA was a stem of the Greater London Council [GLC].

Celebrating the life of Eric Briault in a TES Obituary of 9 March 1986, Peter Newsam revisits the period in ILEA's early history when rapid movement of the population, out of London, was apace. Insofar as such movement in population, just then, comprised families, there was a toll on school rolls across the Authority. The effect upon London's education prospects is a significant part of the Authority's history. The exodus from London was such that of every 100 children born in 1965 only 66 reached ILEA schools five years later. In a few years half-a-million of the more stable sectors of inner-city London had been rehoused their number being only partially offset by immigration.\textsuperscript{13} It is probably not surprising that the exodus of naturalised
‘indigenous’ families had not been offset by immigration, since the number of families involved in the ‘White flight’, to the suburbs, appears to have exceeded, by far, the incoming Black colonials. The scope of movement out of London’s schools would not be unnoticeable:

Falling numbers were of an extent that in 1972, a forecast to 1980 showed that by 1980, the 11-plus age-group would be down to 32,363 NOT 21,000 and still falling. That would mean the top “grammar” 25 per cent of otherwise prospective entrants would be down from 8,000 in 1976 to 5,250 in 1980.14

If this trend were to continue, prospects for the new Authority were grave, but it was likely there would be other possibilities if a broader reorganisation of secondary schools were to go ahead, as Briault’s vision suggested:

If the grammar schools continued to take their entry of 3,000 in that year, there would be some 2,250 pupils of similar ability to be shared between the 150 other secondary [schools] the ILEA would then be maintaining - an average of 15 such pupils a school.15

The difficulties could not be overstated and the topics of debate over that period continued to gather pace. Although a few schools might have been able to preserve ‘a balanced intake and remain comprehensive, most would revert to or simply retain secondary modern status, whatever names might appear on their [headed] notepaper’.16 Yet, there was a ‘second way forward’. As Newsam put it, ‘this was that the Authority should deal with the matter of selection v. comprehensive schooling. With the Authority being “on the right side of political backing, in 1973 and 1974, and with a small team in support”, Briault produced a blueprint in the form of four Green Papers, ‘which set out alternative futures for every ILEA secondary school’. Newsam’s narrative
completes the story, outlining the place of the raised school-leaving age. Bearing in mind the improved ‘staying-on’ rates, Briault proposed that by 1980, grammar and secondary modern schools alike would be combined to create comprehensives with between six and eight forms of entry (180 to 240 pupils a year).  

Although there would be other views beyond these in the Comprehensive story, as specified in the London Plan, ‘anything much smaller would be seen to contravene the principle established. In the Plan for restructuring schools into comprehensive intakes it was vigorously upheld by Briault, that nothing should be done to harm the prospects of able children’. The changes required of London’s selective schools and in particular, the suggestion that they should form part of much larger entities, proved too hard for most ILEA schools to accept. As Newsam recounts it, other ways had to be found to ‘create or preserve at least some schools in inner London with comprehensive intakes’. To Newsam, ‘such schools have been and remain successful academically and highly popular’, notwithstanding there being too few of them. It could only be surmised how the immigrants arriving, at seemingly regular intervals, from other traditions of a British education would respond to changes being discussed.

1975-1977

During the period, 1975 to 1977, meetings of the Education Committee (Schools) invariably carried questions surrounding the impact of colonial
immigration on the ability of Authority schools to deliver educational services effectively. At a meeting of 30 January 1975\textsuperscript{19} questions were raised as to the appropriateness of teacher ratios in delivering curriculum bearing in mind the new entrants and the pressures that immigration to the UK was thought to be having on teachers, more particularly the increasing demands on teachers in the classroom. A positive response was made in the improved teacher-pupil ratios of 1:29 in the primary sector and 1:17 in the secondary, with standard timetable contributions from headteachers. It was further suggested that an increased number of ‘multi-ethnic’ teachers and inspectors matching pupils’ backgrounds be recruited to the benefit of pupils.\textsuperscript{20} At a further Committee meeting of 4 March 1975, there were observations as to the detrimental impact of different cultural practices, among immigrant pupils, arising from the traditional contexts of learning in ILEA schools, to the extent that ‘change [was] needed in teaching materials and methods, from nursery school upward, to replace books in which boys [were] invariably shown in dominant roles with girls playing supporting parts’.\textsuperscript{21} While this expression may have been seen to have connotations merely in terms of convention among Britons and colonial British of the very recent past, for certain incoming groups their everyday behaviours were sometimes related to religious practice. In the light of all this and looking toward the analysis, the featured curriculum texts examined are informing, constituting as they do, landmarks in the historical-geographical and cultural location of bona fide and prospective learners in London schools. I turn, in due course, to focus upon the texts, areas of historical importance and longstanding places of settlement for erstwhile
newcomers, or locations from which the indigenous took the ‘White Flight’ into the more select (relatively ‘immigrant’-free) suburbs. A brief introduction now indicates the texts to be analysed, in their order of appearance in the next chapter, ILEA II.

*Post-1980-81*

As a whole, ILEA’s texts for history and history-humanities curriculum are based on themes relevant to the newcomers’ experience of migration and to an extent, the particular geographical locations that may have held their interest as their given destinations. These also involved some of the issues they would encounter. The topicality of the themes is heightened by the evident commonality in the experience of the area and even the social and/or economic hardships revisited in the study of the 1930s, in continental Europe as also in Britain. First in the range of ILEA texts is Brick Lane: a historical study of settlement, (1980), a knowledge-based approach serving usefully as a General Introduction to the geographical area as to the theme of immigration, for Teachers, published by ILEA’s Learning Materials Service [LMS], London. Conceived and written by Emma Thornton, this pack contains a primarily visual representation of the historic East London neighbourhood. This comprised 75 slides together with an audio-tape cassette profiling the area with a self-explanatory Teachers’ Resource booklet. The Teachers’ Booklet receives initial focus in the coming analysis. While the slides are complementary to the discussion, the strength of the commentary provides a
further useful vocabulary building dimension to the imagery, verbally and pictorially, as the narrative analysis proceeds.

Second to be investigated is Marches - The Handbook, written by Crispin Jones and Jan Mathew and published in 1981. This omnibus package, despite its relatively concise presentation, comprises some five informative sections to the volume, of which three are strongly featured in the analysis. Whereas the largely graphic units like Brick Lane, and Images From this Century serve a key supporting role structurally, for the verbal and visual content, the verbal elements of the Marches texts, Sections 2 and 3, selected from the whole below receive closest consideration analytically. The three relevant units of the Handbook comprise:

Section 1 Marches: Multi-racial Britain: Images from this Century [Images]
Section 2 Marches: Unemployment and Racism
Section 3 Marches: Post-war multiracial Britain.

Following the brief introductory sequence above, I expand on the structure of this chapter particularly the Authority’s policy in the two phases of its administration identified first, in particular regard to concepts of ‘community’ and marked by an emphasis on inclusiveness, and second, ‘diversity’ characterized by its accent on ‘difference’, as perceived.

Looking particularly at policy relating to the new school population, at the highpoint of their arrival, I trace official action toward such implementation, looking back to the early first-phase of the 1970s into 1976 and ultimately onward into 1981. I draw upon discussions at the Education Committee (Schools) Meetings and members’ thinking toward the implementation of new
ideas posed. These represent, broadly, the earliest phase of the Authority’s thinking. They constitute a supporting collection of literature reflecting the philosophical underpinnings of an emergent policy, aimed to serve the needs of a substantial majority of London’s children, over the second administrative phase broadly 1981 to 1983, into 1988, correspondingly. The first phase is characterised by its policy, defined as ‘the Whole Community’ approach. This bears upon what may be described, affirmatively, as an ‘old school’ approach, having been tried and successfully tested. The second veers toward something in the nature of questioned affirmation. These two phases stand in strong contrast, one against the other. Earlier texts comprise and constitute primarily, a selection of the more standard Minutes of Meetings of the Education Committee while, emerging at potentially the tail-end, of this first information-gathering and disseminating documentary phase, are educational data produced by the Authority’s Research and Statistics Branch, under the leadership of a young Peter Mortimore, later a Director of the University of London Institute of Education.

A nucleus of the body of documentation produced in this period and which is, for the most part directed toward uncovering gaps in prior learning, pertinently served the needs of ILEA learners, by looking at the learning capacities of the local pupil population and immigrant children, and being available in a compendium of titles including: Achievement in schools 1: Social class (1981). Achievement in schools 2: Sex differences (1981). Achievement in schools 3: Ethnic minorities (1981). Thus supported by this body of research and more, through the Learning Materials Service [LMS], ILEA was ready to
serve the needs of both its teaching staff and learners, across all levels of educational delivery and in whatever area of knowledge was required. And this material was expected to be both factually valid and accessible to the diversity of learners linguistically, culturally, and in terms of wider school curriculum. Indeed, by 1970, the now established administration, of 1965, had already responded to considering the needs of the changed school population, forward-looking in the production of curriculum materials for its diverse pupil-population. One example is the Authority’s pioneering series World History Outlines. Bearing a degree of geographical insight, World History Outlines covered the histories of representative groups of migrating peoples / long term visitors to London from among The Caribbean, 1970, through to India, Africa, and Papua New Guinea, over time.

The narrative of progress and expansion in serving the learners’ needs continued productively in 1975, as the Minutes of Meetings demonstrate. Working to the agenda Immigrants in the Authority’s Schools, at a further meeting of the Education (Schools) Sub-Committee of 15 July 1975, the prime question of curriculum, as a whole, was raised on the probability that ‘since about one-sixth of children in the Authority’s schools [were] first or second generation immigrants … [did] the Leader consider that in general the curriculum in schools (apart from aspects designed to remedy language difficulties) [took] sufficient account of these children’s needs’? Yet, the response would not be a simple matter of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. Indeed, for some teachers particularly in geographical areas like Lewisham and other educational divisions south of County Hall, decision-making processes and
procedures were already being thought too slow to benefit the existing pupils on roll.\textsuperscript{23} For the Sub-Committee Chairman, due speed was not an option for as far ahead as he could see. It was sufficient for him to observe that although ‘considerable progress [had been] made in adapting the curriculum to the needs of learners currently on roll, although there [was] still room for improvement’.\textsuperscript{24} By the time of the Committee Meeting of 10 February, 1976, the agenda discourse of cohesiveness and equality, disadvantage and difference was finally extended to the consideration of quality of provision\textsuperscript{25} in curriculum development. This exchange arose in the wider context of ‘mixed-ability teaching’ (related in part to comprehensive schooling). The call was expressly made in the ILEA Inspectorate’s Report on Curriculum development, at the Committee Meeting of 18 May, 1976. Indeed, it was important to the Inspectorate to place on record, then, concerns attached to this aspect of their work, particularly the vision of helping schools to ‘assess the effectiveness of their curricula and plan and implement change to ensure that they [met] the full needs of their pupils in a changing world’.\textsuperscript{26} Indeed, the importance of curriculum development was continually being reinforced, presented as ‘a complex process in which the Inspectorate [remained] involved in a variety of ways and at different levels’.\textsuperscript{27}

\textit{Retrospect and Prospect}

Reflecting the scope of Authority operations and, to an extent, its particular curriculum interests of the given moment, examples of external collaboration
included national procedures like the evaluation of Schools Council projects, for example ‘Geography for the Young School Leaver’, (c.1980), among other aspects of ILEA’s educational outreach. Equally significant was the Authority’s funding of much of the in-service costs for teachers involved in the many Schools Council projects. Indeed, speaking of this ten-year period, some of which coincide with his tenure as Deputy Education Officer [circa 1970-1980], Peter Newsam recounts the necessary, and successful, changes implemented across the Authority. Newsam’s account points up, at first hand, influences of the recent past upon London’s contemporary educational operations. Interestingly, bearing in mind his prospects for the next phase in terms of having potential, Newsam could not have foreseen the levels of change that lay ahead. In effect, attempts at the Authority’s abolition, during 1980 would be overcome, but that was not the end of the story. Change would come about in ways hardly foreseen post-1981 into 1988, and carrying over into the institution’s abolition, finally in 1990.

Having considered the earlier tradition of consensus in education and marked the first operation of the policy championed by Eric Briault, the ‘whole community’ approach, I again take up the trail. Under Briault’s leadership, the Authority proceeded with its then accustomed absence of extremes somewhat in the realm of ‘integration’ without apparent concerns for fullest ‘assimilation’. This approach was evident, for example, in the undifferentiated, cohesive, sense of “community”. In this approach, the administration widened the educational outreach in its efforts toward enhancing parental knowledge, of British educational practice in schools and ‘working for the whole
community’. This entailed providing virtual mind-maps into everyday life in Britain in the form of information booklets for all parents, translated into ‘home’ languages catering for those non-, or beginning, second-language English [ESL] speakers. Extending the Authority’s democratic principles further into practice on other fronts, ‘in 1971, well before this had become the practice elsewhere other than in Sheffield’, the administration had included a representative range of local residents in consultative roles: ‘Parents and teachers [were] placed on the governing bodies of schools and colleges. Places were later made available for non-teaching staff also’. Of great significance here, such meetings allowed for a free exchange of views between members and governors about the way the Authority was working. And, early in that decade the matter was taken further. Elected members of the Authority held regular meetings with representatives of governing bodies. Almost certainly ILEA was fully committed to the task of satisfying all its pupils’ needs, having first set about securing details of the numbers, origins and educational status, for example, of the range of pupils present in inner London schools.

Thus, by the early to mid-1970s, the Authority was recorded as having 25% of the total West Indian population of immigrant groups across the whole country, with Spitalfields holding 40% of the population who were Bengali, and of which group 28 children entering primary school in the area in that September, some 23 knew no English at all. The task at hand was not to be guessed at or underestimated. The Authority’s status was similarly recognised by the same source as one of the areas of highest concentration
of migrants, ‘especially “coloured” migrants’, confirming the Authority’s ‘racially mixed’ constituency, both as schools delivering the educational service on the Authority’s behalf and as the wider community with ‘pupils from the “indigenous” population as well as children of migrants’. The earlier generalised acknowledgment of the ‘new’ society appears to have needed firm statistical confirmation of what was believed to be the position, for almost the previous decade. Insofar as information was becoming available on the composition of the school pupils it seemed apt for ILEA to be more specific with data about the Authority’s newcomers’ cultural, and / or ethnic, ‘difference’. There were to be benefits from such knowledge.

According to Alan Little, an early leader of ILEA’s growing practice of Authority-driven research, his report opened up working definitions of the numbers of schools with an ethnically-mixed pupil body. And thus, educational policies strove to reflect an underlying belief that ‘multi-racial education should enable black and white pupils to have equality of educational opportunity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance’. The reading of the social climate to date, in ILEA, suggests that underlying approaches to such educational delivery, overall, were informed somewhat on the lines of the central government’s policy of “assimilation” (of the newly arrived into a “standard” British format, whatever that may be), while working towards that of “integration” (a broad acknowledgement of an all-cultures-in) society. Thus, the dangers of disparities arising from unequal educational experiences, documented by ILEA’s Research and Statistics Branch would necessarily inform subsequent institutional policymaking.
Among outcomes of the researches aimed ‘toward satisfying children’s [educational] needs’, published in 1983, was the series of six pamphlets bearing the generic title ‘Race, Sex and Class’ produced in the name of the leader by ILEA’s former Director of the Research and Statistics Branch, Peter Mortimore. The Authority’s stated purpose, in this, was ‘to examine the question of achievement in education from the vantage point of working class children, black children and girls’. Such productions attested to the Authority’s self-sufficiency. Among the wider body of research was the Junior School Project, 1980-1985, Part B, Differences between junior schools in terms of ethnic composition, taken in relation to Part A, addressing Pupils’ Progress and Development and Part C, Understanding School Effectiveness.

While the question of institutional racism, for example, was not claimed to exist in practice within Authority institutions, research findings suggested that some sectors among minority ethnic groups were at a disadvantage, at least in terms of their ethnicity, as a broad group. Certain unhelpful differentiation was identified between particular minority groups, for example, of subcontinental Asian origin and those from the Caribbean in the interpreting of cultural practice, particularly in the area of family structures. Yet, such generalisations taken from their original contexts, are not always reliably put to use, as was seen in Chapter Two Policy Context (pages 5-7) of this study, on the DES document of 1965, The Education of Immigrants, re-printed in 1971.

Significantly, and bearing in mind ILEA’s interest in culture as determined in the DES publication, the consultative Green Paper of 1977, ILEA’s policy
statements endorsing a ‘cultural pluralist perspective’ meant it becoming, together with Manchester, a similar Borough Council, ‘two of the most vigorous authorities in developing multicultural programmes in their schools’\textsuperscript{39}. As indicated above, progress towards achieving this position had already been made during the Authority’s Education Sub-committee (Schools), and full Education Committee, meetings of 15 July 1975, 6 October 1977 and November 1977, respectively. Much of this was achieved in the contexts of improving Secondary education as part of the Comprehensive expansion. During this extended period of time, ILEA’s attention, to what other LEAs have defined and promoted as extra-curricular activities, was directed to what constituted the heart of its educational provision – in terms of its status, time allocation and funding. I speak from first-hand knowledge, having been among the ILEA teaching staff at an early stage and party to what was generally considered a thriving and effective Authority. Such features, attributes included ‘Educational television, pioneering computer services, well-stocked libraries, splendid playing fields and outdoor centres including climbing bases in Scotland and Wales, tickets to the ballet, opera and theatre, and free instrument teaching in schools and at Saturday Centres’. The London Schools Symphony Orchestra, under the young Simon Rattle, demonstrated the extraordinary levels that could be achieved by inner-city pupils. I recognise the Mortimore commentary that: ‘Facilities for pupils with special educational needs were outstanding’ in its provision for a range of conditions whether physical, mental or carrying whatever form of social-behavioural deficiency in learning capacities alongside whichever of the
range of institutional support was proved appropriate in the learners’ respective needs. Mortimore’s review represents but one of his last recollections, during the final days of his tenure with the ILEA, rehearsed in The Guardian, Tuesday 3 June 2008, under the caption: ‘20 years ago they killed ILEA. Why?’ Aptly summing up this whole, Mortimore concluded that ‘Much of ILEA’s strength stemmed from its interest in innovation’. Continuing his reminiscences, Mortimore further rehearsed the Authority’s achievements in leading other institutions: ‘With its economy of scale, the Authority was able to develop a range of ideas, many of which were later adopted by authorities all over the UK’. Some of these initiatives included its Adult Education Service, Specialist Teachers’ Centres, joint Inspection and Advisory teams, and the Research and Statistics Branch, all the while influencing developments nationally and internationally.40

As recounted by Mortimore, in his very personal record: These were the prevailing pioneering contexts ‘in which I worked so happily for six years’. Overarching all else, the earlier administrative commitment to overcome disadvantage discussed, was expected to operate on an all-inclusive level ‘with respect to the curriculum, [and] involving the commitment of the complete Authority workforce from cleaning personnel [and] ancillaries, through to management’.41 Wishing to build on its achievements from 1975, and expecting teachers to respond to the newly defined school population and society, the Authority’s lately elected Labour administration, of 1981, committed itself to four major objectives for priority action. Among these objectives, one was directed to the needs of the minority ethnic communities,
of particular interest in this study. Although ILEA may be seen as not needing
particular persuasion in their concerns surrounding anti-racist approaches, it
is noted that the Rampton Report, interim forerunner of ‘Swann’, published in
1981 had also written about ‘links between racism and Black
underachievement’. This report, while not finding racism to be general
practice amongst teachers, had confirmed tendencies towards the
stereotyping of minority ethnic pupils. Also highlighted by the new
administration was the intention to serve the needs of all social classes,
primarily the disadvantaged, and to ensure that girls and women were given
equal opportunities in accessing such educational opportunities as were,
hitherto, available largely or only to boys and men.\textsuperscript{42}

\textit{Confronting ‘all the possible manifestations of racism’}
Committed to redressing concerns about Black underachievement as a
function of racism, the administration embarked upon a process of self-
examination, determined to confront ‘all the possibilities and manifestations
of racism [as a disadvantage] in ourselves, our actions and our institutions’
across ‘all parts of the service’. A determination was reached insofar as ‘If we
are to offer a good education to all the young people irrespective of ethnic
origin, in our schools and colleges, it is of fundamental importance that racism
should be eliminated from the education environment’.\textsuperscript{43} It is unclear,
however, whether the more ‘everyday’, taken-for-granted, form of racism, as
appeared to be present in the comparisons made between representative
groups, above, were considered to be derived from prejudicial assumptions,
evident in the assumed generalisation of intra-cultural events such as family discord. A point being made was that the random formulation of theories about peripherally known minority groups may, in turn, lead to the perpetuation of stereotyped views of such groups. Negatively founded, such views tended to surface and take root in the form of racism. This aspect of ‘race’, in broadest terms of (teachers’) expectation and achievement (i.e. outcome), otherwise translated into ‘prejudice’. Thus, in ILEA’s terms, the eradication of this form of racism would serve as an objective, in forming an integral part of the discussion of history as a vehicle for teaching about ‘race’ and ‘culture’, alongside other misperceptions needing redress, relevant in later pages of these twinned chapters.

Yet, for history to serve as a vehicle in teaching about ‘race’ and culture, further understanding about related issues, social class and disadvantage, would need to be secured. The Authority’s reading of findings of its Research and Statistics data as prime source, alongside external findings, were replicated across the Authority, but at a less striking level of difference. Hierarchical levels of attainment occurred, insofar as in 1972 literacy rates among ILEA’s 11-year olds were highest among pupils whose fathers were of the professional and managerial classes, and were seen to decline progressively across four other levels of fathers employment from ‘other non-manual’ through ‘skilled’, ‘semi-skilled’, to ‘unskilled’ levels of employment. This finding reflects upon migrant families, whose difficulties in finding employment meant parents being forced to take the more menial jobs rejected by the accepted indigenous majority; the new settlers thereby
suffering a dual disadvantage of ‘race’-consequence and social mobility. For many Black settlers, this factor stands as a function of their inner-city location and experience. The effects of these multiple deprivations were further demonstrated in a National Child development Study of Barnes and others in Reading and Mathematics at age 16, where the differences had increased still further between the differentiated groups. ILEA’s paper extended the analysis to university acceptance rates at 1977-1980, although reservations were voiced at the unreliability in comparisons for the two-year period cited, insofar as a change of calculation method had been applied and trends were shown to persist through acceptance rates to universities, and had been consistently lower in the unskilled fathers’ groups.46

Although the Authority had embraced issues of gender alongside social class and ‘race’ in the formulation of policy, between 1981 and 1983, there is a sense that gender equality was believed to have been mixed and to have received relatively less attention than the other two so-called disadvantages. Possibly resulting from this, gender was further documented by ILEA’s Chief inspector, David Hargreaves, in 1985. His approach took the line that sexist attitudes, in schools, might be aptly addressed through strategies and systems designed to help explore, and identify, incidences of sexist practice in schools. This in turn should bring about change, through placing anti-sexism on a similar agenda to current priorities in anti-racism. More explicitly, schools were expected to plan a programme of action, which included a school-devised (school) policy. This was seen as being ‘not quite a separate initiative which operates in isolation from other developments’, but an integral
feature of school improvement [which] must permeate the work of all teachers and inspectors.\textsuperscript{47}

ILEA’s history, prior to the research period, as discussed by a commentator of that period, otherwise foreshadows and chronicles its lines of response to the diverse school population. Indeed, this change may be seen to have come about in two, somewhat distinct, phases. In a more general sense, therefore, the broader political constituency of ILEA, as an organization, could be seen like that of others in the society, to have arisen in the ‘processes of discourse’, through which its members sought to ‘assert and ultimately reconcile their wishes’.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, the significance to education of the internal politics of an inner-city operation such as ILEA during the period of this research, is understood to be both, by virtue of its functionalist position (as part of the interdependent social system) ‘pathological’ and as observed by Kogan in more general terms, as characterized by ‘the issues discussed in educational contexts [bearing] on the major problems of our times’.\textsuperscript{49}

In this way, ‘Education’, mixed with politics of an inner-city operation, as then delivered by ILEA, may be seen as ‘social policy writ large and related to many current issues of politics and governance’.\textsuperscript{50} More challenging, but perceptible in an Authority such as ILEA, whose second-phase administration was informed by the political, ‘Education is an important and exciting area of politics, and the issues that emerge from [institutions,] schools and colleges have far wider significance [to their proponents] than education itself’.\textsuperscript{51} It is unlikely, at the time that these observations were being made in 1978, that Kogan could have foreseen the possible outcome of ILEA’s final if forceful
administration. It may rather be that in Prime Minister Thatcher’s role as Education Minister in Heath’s government that Thatcher, before achieving her own premiership, could have sensed something of Kogan’s sentiments then, and bided her time to achieve her mission of abolition. Equally, similar thoughts may be expressed on the part of Authority leader, Frances Morrell.

**ILEA: racism / ‘race’ as a function of Black underachievement**

Thus, in considering ILEA’s conceptualisation of its texts for history curriculum, from 1981/83, I bear in mind both statements by the Authority executive and meetings of the Education Committee, over a period of great demographic change and note the efforts expended in attempting to provide a (history) curriculum relevant to learners’ needs. I consider the Authority’s reading of ‘difference’, ‘race’, in terms of differential levels of disadvantage. Taking the Leader’s policy statement documentary series, Race Sex and Class (1983) as an index to its overarching concerns, of the research period, I seek to establish how, and how far, the colour of central politics then stood to have a bearing on the events arising and whether the inner-city location may have impacted upon relevant texts in pupils’ learning experience. Inasmuch as the institution’s prevailing interest in the ‘pathological’ (deficit / disadvantage) frame relating to a perceived “difference” may, or may not, have been a function of its history and experience, I explore whether these stand, in some accord, with the issues engaged as represented in relevant documentation. In sum, I seek to explore the accuracy, in these contexts, of the theoretical assertion, that ‘education is social policy writ large and related
to many of the current issues of politics and governance’. I relate this, similarly, to the newly elected local (Labour) administration which on assuming office, in 198 committed itself to three major targets for priority action. The first was directed to the needs of minority ethnic communities, focal in this study. The second was to serve the needs of all disadvantaged social categories and the third, to ensure that girls and women would be afforded equal chances in accessing such educational opportunities as were, hitherto available largely, or only, to boys and men. In effect, this was a political intervention. A series of policy pamphlets generically entitled ‘Race Sex and Class’, of 1983 and arguably politically driven, heralded the Authority’s priorities launched by new Leader, Frances Morrell. This was steered through a policy-informing conference paper by Research and Statistics Branch leader Peter Mortimore. Its implementation was intended ‘to examine the question of achievement in education from the vantage point of working class children, black children and girls’. While consideration of ‘disadvantage’ in regard to ‘race’ and social class was not a new phenomenon in the Authority’s experience, taking gender into account directly in terms of equity in the education of girls and women was still relatively uncharted territory. This was the case, particularly with regard to the provision of a fuller educational experience to females. Nevertheless the focus and commitment to the cause, generated and represented by the new administration, appear to have acquired an urgency of purpose probably not shown by London’s education administration before, or since. I count as part of this broad period of action

In considering the Authority’s interventions against disadvantage, particularly as compensatory to educational underachievement related to social class, the discourse moves beyond the static approach in social class attribution and the potential misguidedness of malpractice (in which, achievement declined progressively across four other categories of a father’s employment namely ‘other non-manual’ through ‘skilled’, ‘semi-skilled’, to ‘unskilled’ levels of employment, but about which some institutional reservations were voiced. The referenced data represents, first, external studies of attainment in primary and secondary schools. Using its own Research and Statistics data, as source, external findings were found to be replicated within the Authority, though at a less dramatic level of difference. The point of social advantage, and or disadvantage, was further demonstrated by use of the National Child development Study of Barnes and others, in Reading and Mathematics at age 16, and showed the differences having increased still further between the differentiated groups. While the ILEA paper extended the analysis to university acceptance rates at 1977-1980, as shown, reservations were voiced at the unreliability in comparisons for the latter two-year period. This question arose from the change of calculation method applied and trends being shown to have persisted in acceptance rates to universities, with consistently lower scores in the ‘unskilled fathers’ grouping.
Committed to address racism and other related issues as a function of underachievement, the newly elected administration, working on principles of ‘satisfying [all] children’s needs’ began with a process of self-examination, determined to confront ‘all the possibilities and manifestations of racism in ourselves, in our actions and in our institutions’ across ‘all parts of the service’. This determination was reached on the grounds that ‘If we are to offer a good education to all the young people irrespective of ethnic origin, in our schools and colleges, it is of fundamental importance that racism should be eliminated from the education environment’.57 A more “benign” form of racism, derived from prejudicial assumptions, became evident in the assumed generalisation of cultural practices such as ‘family discord’. Views about peripherally known minority groups were formed and pseudo-theories developed, which in turn led to the perpetuation of stereotyped views of particular groups. Negatively founded, such views tended to surface and take root in the form of racism.58 This aspect of ‘race’, in broadest terms of teacher expectation and learner outcomes otherwise translated into prejudice. Thus, the eradication of this form of ‘racism’ was taken as prime object dealt with through curriculum resources. And it informs an integral part of the discussion / interpretation of history as a vehicle for teaching about ‘race’ and culture, in later paragraphs.

Although the Authority emphasised issues of gender, in relation to achievement, alongside those of social class and ‘race’, in the formulation of policy, there is a sense that this aspect of equality received relatively less attention than the other two. How far this is true in the case of history, as a
curriculum subject, will be considered in the context of the curriculum subject as a resource. Nevertheless, the guidelines for teachers appear to have a proactive edge, whereby there is a need for teachers to be aware of the contexts within which they operate so that appropriate action may be fostered as a natural course, in their pedagogical repertoire. As documented by the then ILEA Chief Inspector Hargreaves, 1985, sexist attitudes in schools should be addressed; suggested strategies and systems designed to help would come about by placing anti-sexism on a similar agenda to current priorities in anti-racism. This would be brought about by a preparedness to explore and identify incidences of sexist practice in schools. Schools in turn were expected to plan a programme of action, which might include a school policy. This was understood to be ‘not quite a separate initiative which operates in isolation from other developments’, but an integral feature of school improvement [which] must permeate the work of all teachers and inspectors.59

In its undertaking to serve the interests of the less advantaged of all groups, ILEA demonstrated a faithfulness to the early tradition, responding to the new challenges in the governance of education of post-War London, empowered by the example of past practice. This operation was set in motion to the continuing effect of a region ready for the challenge and prepared to approach the task with commitment. Indeed, the Authority’s cultural crisis was marked by its informed approach to formulating policy. There was little question, but that ILEA had set about the task of ‘satisfying [all] children’s needs with commitment’. The fact was that, for example, at the early-mid 1970s the
Authority had 25% of the total West Indian population of immigrant groups across the whole country, with Spitalfields holding 40% of the population who were Bengali, and of whose 28 children entering primary school in the area in that September some 23 knew no English at all; the task at hand was not to be underestimated. Citing the ILEA Research and Statistics Branch, Ian Little, now in an independent capacity, recognised ILEA as one of the areas of highest concentration of migrants, ‘especially “coloured” migrants’. This observation confirmed the Authority’s status of having ‘racially mixed’ schools and a community of ‘pupils from the indigenous population as well as children of migrants’.\textsuperscript{60} The tentative, seemingly uncertain approach toward a designation of the ‘new’ society, existing as it had for some time, is a little surprising. It seems almost as if the process of accommodating to the change from the ‘assimilation’ of the new migrants, within the society, to a position of ‘integration’ proved problematic, conceptually. Was it perhaps an issue to attempt to integrate the newcomers whilst also needing to be prepared to recognise ‘difference’ in cultural and ethnic forms, if not norms? Nevertheless Little concluded:

\begin{quote}
What did exist was a large number of schools with a diverse pupil body and educational policies must reflect this: multi-racial education must enable black and white pupils to have equality of educational opportunity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

The transferring from ‘coloured’ to ‘black’ is complete, reflecting something of the terminology’s social / technical history. The Authority’s corresponding call for an equal opportunity in education and an effective learning environment for all pupils, taken from a standpoint of equality and involving a ‘whole school’
‘whole institution’ approach melded with that advocated by Briault. It also demonstrated an awareness of the DES Green Paper of 1977; of Rampton 1981, and foreshadowed prime tenets of the Swann Report, of 1985, then pending. Again, ILEA’s public demonstrations of endorsing a ‘cultural pluralist’ policy perspective would be likened, together with Manchester’s, to ‘two of the most vigorous examples in developing multicultural programmes in their schools’, at that time. As shown above, this step had been discussed in Authority Education Sub-committee (Schools) and full Education Committee meeting of 15 July 1975. It would be consolidated upon at similar meetings of 6 October 1977 and November 1977, respectively. This approach was required to operate among the complete Authority workforce, ‘from cleaning personnel, to ancillaries and upward, through to management’. The Authority’s pamphlet Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools affirms the institutional intention ‘to confront and dismantle all forms of racism’ in its institutions. This undertaking, prefaced by a historical reconstruction of the development of racism in Britain, outlined strategies for the delivery of the Authority’s multi-ethnic initiative in schools and articulates the Authority’s express commitment to pursue ‘as a top priority the development of its initiative … within an overall perspective of equality and anti-racism’. This working document sets out the ‘main lines of activity for schools, the people who will mainly be undertaking these and the time-scale’ within which these may be carried out. Other documents recommended for concurrent consultation included ‘A Policy for Equality: Race’, ‘The Authority’s Anti-
Racist Statement and Guidelines’, ‘Multi-ethnic Education in Schools’, and ‘Achievement in Schools’. No opportunity was given for ignorance of policy. This administrative period had witnessed the published consolidation of and re-commitment to many principles affecting curriculum initiatives and policy that had been a part of the administration’s earlier vision. In terms of pupil achievement the Leader had made explicit, in 1983, that:

While not all children [could] achieve the same educational level – some are obviously more gifted than others, and motivation and interest vary enormously – whole groups should not fall short in their achievement. If they do we need to examine our educational system very carefully to make sure that the system is not, in some way responsible.  

It bears rehearsing, under a fresh mantle, the undertaking of ILEA bearing the commitment to Authority schools and Further Education [FE] colleges:

If we are to offer a good education to all the young people, irrespective of ethnic origin, in our schools and colleges, it is of fundamental importance that racism should be eliminated from the education environment. 

The Authority’s undertaking was clear. And such realisation is sought in respective policymaking across pages in the institutional texts produced and at the extent to which the outcomes match the nature of commitments made. In sum, this chapter sought to reconstruct a narrative of ILEA’s origins and development within the historical high-powered global city, as designated among the more recently re-defined and re-constituted Borough Councils offering compulsory education, broadly from 1965. It addressed the role and unique founding purpose of the Authority in its particular urban metropolitan location, its strategies in serving the interests of a school population reflecting
post-war diverse society. The chapter charted the extent to which the Authority’s history, in particular regard to its thrust of thought, in policymaking, underlies textual material for the new school intake and purposefully reflects the ‘social permutations of the localities in which its schools stand, as sites of change and or emblems of continuity, in the re-configured society’. Indeed, ILEA’s development was seen to follow a historical path running effectively, from the London Education Act of 1903, when all education was transferred from the Boards of Education to the LCC, during 1904-1965, in an extended scheme for secondary education in the metropolis. Through the re-configuration of the LCC into the metropolitan-based Greater London Council, active from 1965-1986, ILEA, sole of its kind emerged. By this convergence of events, ILEA won sole responsibility of being the ‘local’ Education Authority of the metropolis. Unique in its origins ILEA delivered its educational service uniquely.
Chapter Six

Case Study Two: The Inner London Educational Authority II

This chapter builds upon key factors in the biographical profile and contextual events identified/explored, in Chapter Five, ILEA I. It seeks to substantiate the extent to which the Authority’s approach to policymaking in developing its education service and curriculum materials, during periods in 1976-1988 may have been influenced by historical and environmental elements of London’s metropolitan City. Effectively, these reflect ‘the social [and lingering (psychological) Imperial] configurations of the localities, in which [the City] stands’.¹ This factor is particularly apparent post-1981 into 1983 and beyond. Converging with historical local and educational developments, post 1965, and influenced by historical Imperial circumstances of the metropolis, such elements come together in these twinned chapters. These aspects figure as potential influences upon the manner of thinking brought to bear by the Authority leadership and its politically-informed discourses post-1981 into 1983 and beyond, in the research period. The study sees this as a heightened reaction, on the Authority’s part, to the Imperial past that still engaged the mind of some. This sense became evident in an arguably over-compensatory subconscious (Authority) manifestation of a form of Imperial hubris. The politically-engendered high-powered executive approach was brought to bear in post-imperial policy-making, in confronting ‘race-thinking’ gender and social class. Analysing this strand of the Imperial project assuredly, historian Denis Judd expounded:
There can be no doubt that the long-lasting experience of Empire affected the way in which people in Britain viewed both themselves and those over whom [colonial masters] ruled. [Yet, reflecting some compromise, the historian deployed a counter-thrust]: Perhaps though, the Empire was more of a mirror in which British identity and British needs and aspirations were reflected, than an historical phenomenon.  

Whether a mirror view makes the less pleasing aspects of Empire less serious was not resolved. This notwithstanding, keeping to the fore the express line, that ‘lessons should be learned from [texts on] the historical past’, such lessons, according to the Authority leadership post-1981/83, would be enacted on the proviso and to the extent that:

If we are to offer a good education to all the young people, irrespective of ethnic origin, in our schools and colleges, it is of fundamental importance that racism should be eliminated from the educational environment.

Accordingly, in its determination to confront and counter all manifestations of ‘race thinking’ / racism, in Authority schools and by extension, wider society, ILEA deployed its anti-racism strategies vigorously toward redress. How far the emergent outcomes match the leadership rhetoric against ‘race’ is considered, in this review of the enquiry into respective texts by the two research questions, underpinned by the historical interpretive analysis ongoing, bearing in mind the capacity of language in the exercise of power, as mooted by Norman Fairclough, proponent of linguistic analysis.

Unsurprisingly in an Authority of ILEA’s stature, with the scope of its on-site resource-production, Authority facilities were unequalled by any prior or, similar contemporary educational administration. Advisedly seeking to
explain the nature of texts produced, by the Learning Resources / Learning Materials, Service [LRS / LMS], in the institutional remit, some revisited prefacing remarks are provided. These rehearse the role, purpose and scope of this central resource. In this light, history serves as a vehicle in cultural literacy. This sense is reflected in the LMS aim, of the teacher-in-charge of the Authority’s material resources, Lorna Cocking, namely ‘the provision for children in Inner London of an education that reflects and builds on the strengths of our multiracial society’. More:

[It] not only serves the needs, but also draws on the experiences and knowledge of children and teachers in inner London. [Moreover] the policy statement on multi-ethnic education underpins all our materials. It affects the information we offer to children and teachers, it influences our perceptions of the experiences the children bring to the classroom; and so determines what we see as the starting points for appropriately building on these experiences.5

Thus, a brief account of the LMS background opens with the commitment of this resource in serving (history) curriculum, across the Authority. Significantly in the above, importance was attached to the visual appearance, the graphic aspect, of all LMS materials, their levels of written content and information, even to the extent that staff ‘had to “stage manage” what and who appeared in a picture’, so that materials ‘reflected a view of the more positive aspects of a large multiracial city such as London’ and despite the fact that some of this may ‘seem self-conscious’. This meant that as Resources Leader Lorna Cocking saw it, all of ‘our materials have a wider educative function’.6 More significantly and evidently bearing in mind the popular stereotypical cartoons of an earlier age the LMS leader explained what she believed
to be a shortcoming in the graphic skills of available illustrators: ‘Sadly, it is still very difficult to find illustrators who can draw black people satisfactorily – to show black people as individuals, not as the all-too-common stereotypes we see in so many books’. Yet, equally disturbing, here, is the fact that such images may have come about through a conscious or, sub-conscious, preparedness of the given draughtsmen to discard their learned capabilities in objective interpretation and representation, in exchange for otherwise dubiously directed racialized codes of representation, distinct from the live individuals readily at hand for objective study. With other likely differentiation in mind I turn, at this point, to draw the general awareness to, or indeed explain, how the narrative across the two ILEA case chapters is likely to be self-differentiating, within the Authority, distinct from the perspectives of the other institutions examined. This distinction arises insofar as ILEA’s educational grammars and organisational structures / experience, unlike those of the SC and the HA, are a function of their everyday operations. This difference is more a factor of organisational structure present in LEA and classrooms contexts, beyond any deeper causal / consequential issue significant to the ultimate textual outcomes. And such differences may be shown to be minimal as the study proceeds. Such differences arise in contexts involving, for example, the role of the Inspectorate and even the different ages within the learning phases of participants in the education delivered. Thus, beyond providing a literary critique of author-historian, Crispin Jones’ well-scripted / equally well-structured historical narrative, I attempt to convey what comes over to me as the texts’ likely appeal to
engaged learners – the spirit of Jones’ writing, his story-telling, his engagement with the day-to-day expressiveness, formulations, essential in charting the likely experiences of the various incoming settlers seeking better economic returns and ultimately a new life.

In a brief stock-take, here, it may be remembered that my earlier concerns, of there being potentially an unequal ‘playing-field’, across the case-institutional structural domains were ruled out. This decision obtained insofar as it was clear that what mattered operationally was the calibre of executive personnel in-post. Thus, in respect of ILEA, its wide-ranging personnel -- policy-making executives local political gatekeepers, whatever, each group pursuing institutional interests, structures in educational delivery, discourse related institutional procedures / processes all manifested roles to engage and stakeholders to satisfy.

These requirements unfold implicitly, as the narrative proceeds. I advance the narrative from the periphery toward the centre, as it were, aimed to unpack the role of the subject discipline and related policymakers, in this Authority. I begin at the History and Social Science Teachers’ Centre [HSSTC] initiative, and its pamphlet, ‘Clio’: Ethnicity & Culture Issue, agency / aide-memoire as much for the LMS leader and sometime conduit for history as subject discipline, reflected expressly in its title, after the muse of History.

Duly I look first at ‘The role of a (secondary) school’s history department in a generalised view’, Part Two (1981). The published series, including the primary phase issue, was directed specifically to schoolteachers. Compiled
by Secondary Staff Inspector, Howell Davies, the given publication introduced and provided examples of curriculum schemata – from a rationale and course outline to general practical considerations, in somewhat abbreviated detail. These build upon the “foundation” base explored at the primary level, the kinds of learning experience preceding the secondary-level, the skills to be developed, concepts to be mastered and experiences to be savoured. In progression, these herald the consolidation inherent in the secondary years. An advisory note suggested the need for learners understanding the nature of history, prime characteristics of its study, the relevant concepts, attitudes and skills and qualities developed through its study. These aspects are realised in skills / curriculum texts produced by author-historians, for and relevant to, the diverse school pupil intake, as will be seen. In setting history, first, as a curriculum subject, in the context of our multi-ethnic society, the Staff (History) Inspector revisits what may be considered as, but is not thus entitled, the ethnicity of early Britons. Structurally, the narrative unfolds through the well-worn tracts of Britain’s lived history, from the much rehearsed Angles, onward through to immigrants of later dates, including Huguenots Poles and the displaced Jewish peoples specifically and extending to latest twentieth-century incomers of the day. The customary reference to newcomers’ needing to adjust in a new country is made, alongside a complex of examples to assist the settling-in process: attitudes to (post-1948) ethnicities / ‘race’, culture and language, with the potential for tensions being offset by mutual understanding. The underlying thinking offers precautionary advice to the newcomers: about ‘having to make
adjustments in language and lifestyle’, that ‘Britain has long been inhabited by newcomers’, there always having been ‘people of many ethnic origins’, and that ‘tensions would be reduced through respect for difference’. Such respect would be ensured by sharing ‘common ground for discussion’. The whole would be achieved through ‘varieties of interpretations’ reached through the broad traditions of historical thinking in the cause of equality of opportunity, and without interested parties holding ‘absolute / concrete positions’. As this was the teachers’ guide, it would be for the then autonomous teacher to engage with such suggestions at his / her discretion. In terms of the scope / historical range of the subject discipline, it must be mentioned that as set out, significant details of the narrative were openly omitted inasmuch as certain topics, for example, historical ‘methods’ were being ‘comprehensively treated elsewhere’ apparently by sometime HE collaborators of ILEA, for timely introduction. In brief explanation of the above pending submission, ILEA personnel had access to a range of HE establishments with whom the Authority was able to confer, for example the School of Oriental and African Studies [SOAS] and the University of Sussex. Valuable topics of discussion for learners’ benefit included: developing historical thinking; the role of history in developing pupils’ experience – the different ‘areas of experience’ being discussed in terms of the draft DES Curriculum 11-16 and along the lines of Paul Hirst, exponent in educational philosophy and the understanding that ‘the pursuit of different forms of knowledge is central to education’. This latter has been critically discussed, subsequently by Professor of Philosophy John White,
Institute of Education University of London. The areas of experience discussed range from the Aesthetic / Creative, Ethical / Moral, Spiritual, Linguistic (Language), Mathematical / Scientific, to the Political / Social.

Attempting to explore policy for history teaching in an Authority such as ILEA, the reality of the truism that ‘familiarity promotes contempt’ -- a “taken-for-granted sense” or a somewhat modified version of this, comes into the picture not merely to mind. And notwithstanding the outlay of ILEA’s resources, in personnel and financially, there seems to have been a restraint, potential reserve, absence of preparedness to discuss how the current historical narrative was being updated, at that point, despite the Authority’s welcome to latest incomers, including families from Bangladesh, the Caribbean, the Indian sub-Continent and yet others. The contribution of the study of history in helping to promote understanding is dutifully treated, with specific reference to the ‘different societies, systems, and cultures’, different historical times and locations. The rehearsed importance of recognising that each society has its own values, traditions and ways of everyday living seems, from its recording, to have been more routinely considered, than a practice engaged with conviction. It can only be surmised whether the reality may have been more in keeping with ILEA tradition / reputation than this narrative apparently would have today’s readers (of this text) believe. Indeed the actual experience of incoming learners of the time could have been a little troubling to the real incoming learners, set against the rehearsal of ‘assimilation’ together with insufficiently defined thoughts of ‘integration’ abroad, while the
general discourse moved to references toward imagining (empathetically) ‘what it is like to be someone else’.

Nor had it been suggested whether ‘being someone else’ might explore ‘being an outsider’ today, or refer merely to a historical figure from the past. Yet, discourses of ‘being someone else’, considered at the earliest point in the light of longstanding Britons, may have been lost on the dampened sensibilities of older secondary learners. Indeed, the young primary pupils may have been more readily empathetic. Whatever the thinking the condensed “short-hand” device for understanding ‘empathy’, in its fullness, appears to have received insufficient attention. It stands to benefit from drawing upon dramatic applications, where studied emotions might be played out. Similarly suggested by the Inspectorate, matters for classroom discussion are presented in respect of integrated (humanities) studies, its subject groupings, student groupings and related organisational strategies / settings.

Other aspects of present-day importance are suggested, one such being ‘life in a technology-based society’, which is given a historical approach. Thus, technology is seen beyond the customary contemporary sense relating largely to the developed world, and starting with the inclusion of the more traditionally-handed-down historical practice, as in the specialist areas of Ancient civilisations, mediaeval times and aspects of local history that figure successfully within and ultimately leading to contemporary contexts. All-embracing, the texts are both mindful of their past and present while looking similarly to their future though not yet reflecting, in 1982, the new Authority
Leader’s more pressing, forceful pronouncements of confronting and countering ‘race-thinking’ / racism.

Significantly the Appendix, of ‘Further information and useful contacts’, to the Teachers’ Handbook, above, includes both the Schools Council and the Historical Association, indicative of an Authority purposefully looking outward. Yet, it seems strangely short-sighted for consideration of the content of courses to be somewhat narrowly circumscribed: ‘In a school attended by pupils of West Indian origin, greater emphasis might be placed on the history of the Caribbean’.\(^\text{10}\) This observation is surprising in the given contexts. Although much depends on the time available to accommodate a wide range of material in curriculum, general access to knowledge need not be determined by learners’ country of origin. Nevertheless the curriculum resources, as presented, broadly demonstrate the Authority’s purpose, at this point, to counter issues such as ‘race’ and its by-product, racism, in a constructive treatment of others’ histories, material culture and related practices. In this light, representative resource units serve as sites for historical and cultural understanding, these forming the basis of my textual analysis.

Running in parallel with ILEA’s understanding of secondary phase history teaching is its close, more ‘equal’ and ‘relevant’ history-geography cooperation in primary schools – seemingly beyond the history-humanities cooperation of the SC (in its ‘integrated’ social sciences project). ILEA’s integrated project was realised in a themed Primary School project (1980/81). Structurally, ILEA saw its prime role, in Early Years teaching, as an
opportunity to create in, and among, pupils, an understanding of the potentially ever-present nature of history. This would serve to develop a sense of curiosity, the ability to seek out and expect clues in the exploring of evidence, to develop an understanding of mutually related concepts like time, cause and effect, the appreciation of change, and continuity. To all this would be added the ability to empathise, to understand and imaginatively enter into another’s feelings in whatever historical period or site, distanced or close-at-hand. While an awareness of different sources of information and materials was valued, it was also important that coherence be maintained, and links made with other curriculum subjects, for learning through the study of history. Such openness of mind, here, would seemingly facilitate openness in other aspects of ‘difference’ / diversity. Also expected for developing young historians were problem-solving abilities and formulating lines of argument, with scope to practise and develop keenness of observation.

Among the humanities subjects for ILEA, as promoted by the SC, its primary Geography course involved a cross-curricular link with history, in ‘The study of places in primary geography: Pupils learning about distant places’, by Jill Brand and Diana Craig, 1981. References to ‘distant places’ conjure up enthusiasm through ideas of ‘difference’- with this proving a natural area in a multicultural-educational study. Here, the Project’s title represents both the relevance of the content and its pedagogical scope within wide-ranging primary curriculum. Stimulated by the pull of distant places, the whole was developed into a BBC video-programme in 1987, the younger learners being responsive to the strong multicultural-geographical elements and their
underlying educational developmental aspects. Highlighting the place first, of the ‘local’, in the form of the historic London’s East End - ‘Brick Lane’ as the immediate object of the analysis, the attention turns next toward the analysis of nationally sited resource units.

*Brick Lane: a historical study of settlement (1983), by Emma Thornton: 75 Slides, with Teacher’s Resource booklet*

This text contains two sections: Part 1 covers the tape-slide collection of the Brick Lane area, representing both its historical and geographical aspects, together with examples of its architecture, cultural change and its particular character as ‘a magnet for immigrant groups’, over time. Recommended for use as a support unit, or starting point, the booklet complements study in local history, migration and settlement, prejudice and racism, and themes in British 19th and 20th century social history. This first section addressed to the individual teacher in his/her resource booklet provides discussion points, supplementary documents and pictures, and a booklist for further reference. Independent of the first, Part 1, Part 2 covers ideas and resources for working on the history of a local area, in any part of London, through the key themes, indicated in the title above, ‘migration and settlement’ and ‘prejudice and racism’. There is scope to engage a range of curriculum areas – English, geography, history, integrated studies, and social sciences - adaptable for secondary pupils of all ages.

Increasingly becoming part of the Primary curriculum, local history is seen as a subject that pupils can enjoy, are prepared to cover with interest and to
engage in its capacity to involve participants keen on exploring their own locality. The range of skills to which this area lends itself, historically, is also transferable across the curriculum. These include enquiry: finding out, sorting, interpreting, analyzing, synthesizing (gathering together meaningfully) and information presentation. The topical contexts possible for such study run from transport to settlement.\textsuperscript{11} The themes ‘migration and settlement’ and ‘prejudice and racism’ form the basis of a body of ideas and knowledge-concepts informing the visual content of the seventy-five slides, in colour. Some consider delicate issues ‘central to an understanding of contemporary society’, and are deemed suitable for school discussion ‘despite their controversial nature’.\textsuperscript{12} These may be explored in a national or global context or, as in the case of Part 1, through local history. Somewhat more straight-forwardly perhaps than the SC, the need for sensitivity is cautioned:

\begin{quote}
With some groups it may be helpful to first introduce such themes at an historical or geographical distance - in time and place - so that the pupils can explore their reactions without feeling that personal experiences and or perceptions are the focus for study.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

Much care is given to advising teachers of the best ways of approaching the task. Harming youthful sensibilities is taboo. On the other hand, the pupils’ own experience, with other groups, and their attitudes, may be used as the starting point for exploring these themes. A prime proviso is that whatever the approach, ‘it is important that work on these issues represents an integral part of the curriculum, rather than a tangential, problematic addition’.\textsuperscript{14} Clearly ‘difference’, in terms of ‘race’ and ‘race-thinking’, is perceived as
disadvantage of a kind, although it has not been made clear that what may be foremost in mind, here, is the outcomes of others’ response to ‘race’ that is essentially at odds, and thereby create disadvantage. This is a recurrent theme in other ILEA texts and one which is apparently paralleled, to an extent, with the stringent economic circumstances endured in the 1930s narrative of the early Marches text, as will be seen. Whatever the circumstances in the contexts of history teaching, the overarching purpose essentially is to use the Project as a tool for teaching historical method and developing pupils’ practice through its use, alongside the underlying aim of promoting understanding and awareness of meanings of concepts of everyday experience, such as immigration and unemployment. Whether the understanding of such concepts enhances intended meanings, associated with ‘learning lessons from the past’, a concept stressed in the ensuing pages of the Marches trilogy under investigation, will be considered further.

Overall, pupils are led to understand that learning history involves methods, systems and structures; and are encouraged to develop their practice, of historical method, by carrying out their own research and acquainting themselves with historical sources. Learners are enabled to understand that, over time, Britain had invaders and other earlier immigrants, including a substantive Black population. Learners are encouraged to be alert to the need for factual accuracy, objectivity and evidence to support beliefs. Groups among the range of cultures occupying the historical frame are brought to pupils’ awareness at any one time. This means that from the earliest opportunity, the Inspectorate’s requirement, that pupils are made aware that
they are living and learning in a multi-ethnic society alongside the ways in which these came about, is duly met. Viewed over time, the Brick Lane environs constitute a microcosm of London’s contemporary population. Necessarily the aspects and or, objects selected or highlighted for discussion in the Project are informing as to which aspects of the immigration history and experience are believed to bear interest for ‘indigenous’ pupils and newcomers alike: the different types of religious buildings important to the various communities, whether Jewish synagogue, Muslim mosque or protestant Huguenot church. Particular ways of life similarly, are transported from the newcomers’ places of origin to their areas of settlement. By these means, learners are kept alert to the different types of employment and industries in which each of these communities earns their livelihood. Such evidence comes whether from across a range of foods, languages, written-about-places or spoken as the newcomers’ first language, alongside practices like the Huguenot traditions in lace making, and fine silks and printed cottons, either on sale or made into clothing from India. An understanding of the close relationship between industry and culture is a point of interest among all groups, from Irish weavers to Jewish tailors and specialist bakers. Even so, Truman the Brewer’s represents the centrality of the public-house in British national life, alongside the music-hall among other forms of entertainment. Landmark sites of Britain’s maritime supremacy and interests overseas and nearer home are featured, in some contrast to records of inadequate housing in London. Overall, pupils are assisted to understand the hardships endured in varying historical and locational contexts.
Thematically, these events foreshadow those selected for in-depth treatment in the Marches omnibus, in heightened intensity - the author-historians’ disciplinary interest in their creation is palpable.

As to the personal affective aspects pertinent in teaching and learning, pupils are given to understand that new arrivals are not often welcome, and that new settlers may generate dissent. They are helped to understand that being ‘different’ may prompt attacks, or prejudice. And correspondingly, that it is neither rational nor necessary to show or be shown hatred, because of being different. Yet, interestingly, little attention appears to be directed proactively to modifying adverse behaviours either as perpetrator, by learning how to desist from carrying out untoward actions, or in discussing ways to respond, as a victim of someone else’s misguided action.

Making a closing reference to Brick Lane’s physical environs, the area landmarks are purposefully revisited in the slides - the visual introduction to its history being enhanced by maps of the given period. Necessarily the representations show the physical change brought about by successive patterns of settlement, over earlier, and subsequent, historical periods. This non-verbal, primarily graphic, historical representation is alive with telling accounts, no less expressive than the verbally portrayed. Further documented transformations feature in due course, in events rehearsed and exemplified in two extended units from the MARCHES trilogy, Marches: ‘Unemployment and racism’ and Marches: ‘Multiracial Britain’, in which life-experiences of new generations of twentieth-century settlers ultimately unfold. Certain elective themes are similarly discussed.
For ILEA, the selections from the omnibus trilogy, Marches, of 1986, by Crispin Jones and Jan Mathew, constitutes the Authority’s prime text in the reform of ILEA’s history curriculum. Marches may be seen as the Authority’s overarching policy statement in the context of ‘race’, representing its political underpinning and indeed, ‘the lessons to be learned’ by the Authority’s pupils, and potentially wider society. It speaks both literally and metaphorically, at a stroke. Its aims will be discussed in terms of their potential for achievement as the narrative proceeds. Crispin Jones, the lead author-historian of the Marches Project, later became a Senior Lecturer in Education at what is now UCL IOE and has published widely in the areas of urban education and multicultural education. He has also worked in the Department of International and Comparative Education and the Centre for Multicultural Education. Prior to this he was a teacher and an adviser in London.

The analysis begins with an overview of the representative sections receiving close attention.

**Overview:** (a) *Multi-racial Britain: Images from this Century (Images)* (b) *Marches: Unemployment and racism. ‘IMAGES’*

The first six photographs of Images, showing the Jewish community, bear discussion alongside the sections of its narrative counterparts the Jewish community in East London and the Jewish East End in the 1930s. These six introductory photographs depict the range of experiences of the earlier immigrants and cover the early European refugees over a period from circa 1890 to 1936. The migration experience represented in the first two
scenes from 1890 and 1902 show a woman dictating a letter to a professional letter-writer in Whitechapel, and a group escaping persecution in Eastern Europe. Interestingly, the demobilised Jamaican servicemen seeking employment arrived at the same south-east London destination, Tilbury docks, Essex, in June 1948. The point is made of the difficulties encountered due to language and other cultural differences. Reasons for immigration are made clear. There was much scope for classroom group discussion. The whole topic provides good background material of homes and countries left behind and of hopes and or expectations of a new present.

In time, from about 1903 to 1914 and into the ‘thirties, with life becoming more settled industries reflecting the newcomers’ particular needs sprang up. These were in the form of utilities, industries satisfying everyday needs of food and clothing. There was Levy brothers Bakers of Passover cakes; along the street from this was a tailor’s workshop – catering for the specialist area of clothing. The sense of migrant needs driving the development of industry accordingly is striking. Image five, almost domestic in prospect, and perceptibly almost having a sense of security, shows home extending onto the street, as typical of the period; children at play and parents resting against the doorways, taking in the view. This image offers a sense of belonging, through the claim to this particular space of home, but without any sense of full acceptance by the long-term settled population. Image six portrays something of the ‘darker’ side of the migrant experience - the predominant presence of ‘the law’ in the course of their duty. Here, police officers disperse what is left of the assembled protestors, demonstrating against a proposed
march, of October 1936 scheduled by the British Union of Fascists to pass through the neighbouring streets of East London. A single figure is in the frame, a Jewish immigrant in the process of counter-demonstration, who appears to have fallen. Crouched in front of one of the many premises bearing graffiti messages to the anti-Jewish demonstrators, she appears to bid the fascists to keep away. The images portray their message with clarity - the size and presentation adequate for the task, all inviting pupil discussion.

These photographs, like the accompanying handbook, offer teachers scope to discuss, with their pupils, ‘the historical and social context in which racist attitudes are bred’. The idea was to allow pupils the opportunity to arrive at their own personal resolution of these issues, either to establish or defend claims of the Jewish community’s harassment in the ’thirties, the ’fifties, and through into the ’seventies. Image seven portrays West Indian Immigrants arrival at Victoria Station, London in 1956. Image eight sadly depicts a common event – a West Indian being refused accommodation in London ‘No coloureds’. Image nine shows a demonstration against the proposed Immigration Bill, London 1971. Ten covers protests in Brick Lane, East London against racialist attacks on the Bangladeshi community, 1978. Photo Eleven presents a happier note for the newcomers, celebrating the Notting Hill Carnival, London 1978. ‘Twelve’ shows Sikh families preparing the ground for the building of a new temple, Southall (1978). Thirteen: Women shopping in East London 1978. Clearly all is not strife the White resident walks comfortably arm in arm with the Black newcomer, helping her become acclimatized. Fourteen: A street-market trader in Whitechapel, 1978. Fifteen,

‘The handbook’
There are five main sections to the volume: First is ‘The nineteen thirties, fascism in Europe’. This leads into second: ‘Britain in the 1930s and the British fascist movement’; this in turn leads, third, to address the overarching theme ‘Unemployment’, by providing insights (through their sub-titles) into Meaning of unemployment; this is followed by The Jewish East End in the 1930s, and The Battle of Cable Street. The third section on Post-war multiracial Britain opens with Racist attitudes, the changing nature of the British population, this in turn leading into: The past gives rise to the present: Newcomers to Britain since World War II, moving on to Changing attitudes and actions (the 1950s, to events of 1976), which ends with Black people in Britain today: the facts. This investigation ends at the section on Slavery – in a sense the recognized beginning of the narrative on an early group of migrants, the “West Indians” – among the first of the ‘Newcomers to Britain since World War II’. A brief half-page introduction to the project sets out paths acknowledging the development of racist attitudes in Britain, and exploring the effect this has on its victims. Importantly (for the lessons to be learned - the aim of this Project) this section cautions young people against being
influenced by ‘the strength of racist arguments’. The broad objective is made explicit:

Namely that the potential danger of racist attitudes will thus become clearer, and will give students a perspective for a positive and informed approach to the multicultural society of which they are a part.\textsuperscript{22}

As a whole, Marches, the Teacher’s Handbook, addressing the individual teacher specifically, is a comprehensive and substantive soft-covered volume containing some eighty A4 pages of text with illustrations, ‘planned and written primarily for teachers to use in conjunction with the videotape’.\textsuperscript{23} A summary of the video-text is provided in the text’s Appendix 1. A freestanding wallet of the sixteen photographs and prints of original images is a further source of information.

In analyzing curriculum texts produced by ILEA, I seek to determine how their commitment to ensure racism is eliminated from the environment might be achieved. All dated 1981 the three key Marches elements have the common theme of disadvantage, among ethnic minorities in Britain, each migrant group suffering the specific disadvantage of unemployment. The initial focus of this enquiry is directed to ‘Images’, the set of photographs, and the Handbook, of which, the disadvantage of Unemployment and racism forms a major part, some 50\% of the text, with illustrations. The texts are set in symmetrical columns as in a broadsheet newspaper. An intellectual and academically informed publication, the Handbook reflects the professional expertise of the career teacher; it is directed, not to supplant professional skills, but to enable teachers to raise relevant issues in curriculum, and at the same time set these in their particular contexts.
Marches themes in focus

Britain in the 1930s: The (wider) 1930s The British fascist movement

Initial focus of the project, The 1930s and the re-emergence of fascism together serve a cautionary note. It suggests that attitudes and behaviours or similar tendencies of the present day could develop into violence and disruption. Taking examples by way of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and the unpleasant effects of both regimes, attention then turns to Britain and the rise of Oswald Mosley and his fascist movement. The prevailing ‘harsh, social and economic conditions’ of the ‘thirties are made explicit. Mosley and his ideas are rejected at Cable Street, and the project moves on to cover post-war Britain, not before further elements of discussion are prompted from pupils.

Clearly the object is getting learners acquainted with factual knowledge, events, and developing the skills with which to address these as historians in the making.

The second half of the book, pages 32 to 42, allocated to this post-war period is necessarily nearest to pupils’ own experience. This is a period of some thirty years (since the onset of Black immigration) during which racism had been fostered, and ‘constructively opposed, at many levels’. Black perspectives, both historical and social are brought into the foreground. Directed more specifically to older secondary pupils, in the main, each section is treated in some detail. Events are addressed in terms of their political objectives, the wider local and global effect, social conditions and general chronological significance. Each section carries primary evidence. The primary records cover the experiences of respective population groups.
represented - personal reminiscences serving as topics for discussion, through which pupils may empathize with historical figures. Empathy here, relates directly to placing oneself in the historical counterpart’s shoes. There is also scope for comparisons of the historical with present day events. As in Marches: Unemployment, the understanding of ‘culture’ in its various manifestations is the central aim, alongside parallel discussion, of the Jewish community in East London and ‘the critical importance to the refugees of the survival of their culture’. Nineteenth century London, as documented, prefigures some racist tendencies of its twentieth century counterpart. By the time of the Jewish settlement in 1880s Stepney, London is pictured as an already overcrowded area; with Stepney being no exception. The new settlers faced problems from the start. Without the facility of English, newcomers needed to be among their earlier arrived counterparts, to share their language. The already neglected and run-down area would find itself further stretched, by its limited capacity to absorb the increased numbers, in its now established “Jewish settlement area”. This area is marked by its ‘shabby houses, small factories and warehouses’; the proximity of ‘familiar shops [with potential for local employment] and social and cultural amenities’, offering not only the best chance of employment, but also a great sense of shared experience. Paragraph 5 refers to the migrant settlers' locating ‘their aspirations for a brighter future’ in their children - a feature common to all ethnic groups. Jewish parents (like many from other ethnic groups) are aware of having been ‘too frequently denied educational opportunities’. They are therefore determined that their children ‘should have a better education’. With
dual systems of education available to this group, parents are made aware of the choice to be made between 'state education provided by the Board schools, and Jewish education provided by the established Jewish community'. The practice, 'increasingly common for Jewish parents to send their children to the Board schools', arises from the increased open-mindedness of these schools to Jewish religious practice. Thus, by 1902, the supervisor of schools for East London would note that 'sixteen Board schools in the East End were practically run as Jewish schools'.

Early twentieth century documentation of the Jewish community continues in The Jewish East End in the 1930s; this comes in primary evidence collected and published between 1940, through the early 1970s, to 1979. The community is shown as extending northwards from the nucleus of the East End, into 'more comfortable suburbs of Stamford Hill and Golders Green'. Reminders that the programs 'had not died with the Russian Tsar' are found in the aura of the streets: 'The Gentiles lived clustered together up on one half. We (the Goldman family and "more of our kind" occupied the other [half]). The Gentiles would 'career noisily up the street, hurl abuse at the Jewish houses, and occasionally send one of their "empties" through a Jewish window'. The catalogue of experiences is followed through in contemporary classrooms, pupils finally becoming involved in a discussion point - expected to include questions surrounding 'the conditions for immigrant communities today, such as the Bangladeshi community in the East End of London'.

The final three pages, of what is approximately one-third to a half of the pack, culminate with the battle of Cable Street - a blow-by-blow account being
recorded. No other issue is covered, apart from detailed information about the battle, together with full details of measures adopted to prevent the demonstration taking place, and an outline of effects upon the area following the fist-to-fist engagement. This aspect of life in London’s East End ends with a statement by Mosley’s son. He describes, with derogatory undertones, the effect he believes his father’s political activities may have had: ‘While the right hand dealt with grandiose ideas and glory, the left hand let the rat out of the sewer’; thereby he places himself in a less positive light. Two pages are given over to the economic crisis in 1930s Britain, thus triggering unemployment and first-hand meaning of unemployment, some one-third of this space transmitting background information on Oswald Mosley. It charts his rise on the political scene, leading into conditions arising from unemployment, the measures initiated to combat the effects on the unemployed, and the general response to the experience of these measures. The government of Ramsay MacDonald, first Labour Prime Minister, is discussed briefly, tracing its progress from 1929 to 1931 and the Great Depression, through to coalition with a majority of Conservatives in an eventual wartime administration. The distinction shown toward unemployed women is considered, and the welfare benefit system explained. Moseley’s New Party is examined. The matter of benefits to counter the ravages of unemployment is again taken up, ending on a note of discontent, at the ending of winter benefit in 1938. The effect of unemployment upon its victims is relayed in some detail: primary evidence showing the difficulty of trying to feed, clothe, and keep a large family on a minimum budget. The message
proves the same, whether in 1930, 1939, 1940, or 1974: ‘We were [all] really at this time casual workers’. Feeling against Means Testing (and seemingly ‘intelligence seeking’) is clear: ‘They took off 2s.6d because a pot of jam was on the table’ (on their surprise visit). The Handbook’s appointed "Discussion point" offers contemporary pupils scope for comparisons over time: ‘Compare the budget of a family living now on unemployment benefit with that of a similar family in the 1930s. What differences are there, in standards of living, technical equipment, and in general amenity’?

A larger proportion of the attention is given to Post-war multiracial Britain, which occupies the relatively more substantial part of the verbal narrative content. This section traces the development of events that led to the Second World War and then its aftermath; the major concern - racism, demonstrated, by-and-large, by the effects upon Britain of non-white immigration in the present era. Particular attention is given to the ‘changing nature of the British population’. The reader is led into the theme by reference back to ‘what happened at the end of the 1930s’ retracing the events leading ‘from the growth of fascism in Europe to the outbreak of savage and tragic world war’.

This next section, the texts’ approach to Teaching against racism, provides active insights into how the author-historians perceive teachers might address dealing with ‘race’ and ‘race thinking’ with their learners. The prime approach is one of deterrence. And thus a warning is given, in the text, to contemporary learners, against repeating mistakes of the past; they are urged to heed lessons from ‘the events of the 1930s’. Substantial use is made of pictorial evidence: a dictatorial blow-up of Hitler in mid-speech, superimposed
upon a graphic miscellany of images demonstrating the results of misguided acts of war: War-torn cities lie broken in bombed-out devastation; non-fascist politicians hover beside a poster protesting against fascism and fascists, while photographs representing the many nations of postwar immigration inset around the textual commentary. Making the point still further, an illustrated account of ‘racist attitudes’ - their characteristics and manifestations starkly vocal: ‘We need to understand what these racist attitudes are, how they are manifested and, through this understanding, check them at every level’. Examples range from name-calling, using derogative, negative, terminology to describe different groups of people, and against treating people as stereotypes. The column entitled ‘Formation’ (of racist attitudes) provides explicit explication:

The attitudes of white people in Britain today towards black people have been moulded by much more than the connotations of words [such as ‘black’ and its derivatives]... These attitudes are a product of the past ... a legacy of the unequal relationship between black people and white people established over centuries by Europeans in [subjected, colonial] lands overseas. Years of European supremacy have been used as a justification for maintaining attitudes of white superiority which are unfounded and deeply harmful.36

This section ends with a reassessment of this supremacist position, by the African American Civil Rights commentator essayist and author, James Baldwin. He demonstrates how much views of the present are informed by events of the past. For ILEA, this is a further marker for learners in avoiding repetition of past ills. It may just be that young learners, of all ages, somehow
remember and seek to reinterpret the sentiments expressed above as here, by the novelist commentator:

I think that the past is all that makes the present coherent, and further, that past will remain horrible for exactly as long as we refuse to assess it honestly.\textsuperscript{37}

While the evil nature of racism remains unchanged the Changing nature of the British population, sub-titled Post-war multiracial Britain and heading the larger part of the project, is introduced by an exploration of the meaning of ‘British’ as this refers to the peoples of Britain. It also explains that immigration has for long been a part of Britain’s experience - the country and nation having always ‘flourished on the strength of fresh ideas brought in by people from other countries’. The last two thousand years of Britain’s history is traced: taking the pupils through settlement of large numbers of Celts searching for fresh land, through the Roman occupation some four centuries later, an event bringing Britain into contact with yet more categories of peoples. ‘Waves of Angles and Saxons’ are shown to follow the Romans, themselves succeeded by Danes who ‘established themselves here’ in the seventh century, ‘as part of the Viking invasion’. Arrived at the Battle of Hastings, ‘successive waves of newcomers’ are allowed to occupy the minds of those already present, in terms of changes and developments in ‘the culture of the country’; change extending through developments in language, ‘different skills, customs and beliefs’ that were ‘slowly integrated into the ever-changing culture’.\textsuperscript{38} Brief consideration of cultural acquisition and exchange is followed by an exploration of the practice of immigration and the way indigenous populations react and interact with newcomers, over time. Particular attention is given to
understanding of how: ‘The way in which an existing population in any country reacts to newcomers is determined first and foremost by the particular social and economic conditions of the time’. The discussion then moves to reasons why people decide to leave their homelands; apart from economic concerns already referred to, pressures ranging from religious persecution, and the enforced recruitment of black servants by the rich, brought in ships ‘from lands with which Europeans had begun to trade’.39

Whatever the position of these peoples on the move, the disadvantage of their circumstances is made clear in the general interpretations made of them, and evident in the caption, Local tensions. Here again, concerns arising from the indigenous population’s feelings about the newcomers return. The newcomers are severally regarded as ‘parasites, taking the jobs of those already living here’, or as ‘money grabbing’, as in the case of Jewish money lenders of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Even the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, at the end of the nineteenth century, with its significant movement of populations, does not bring immediate improvement for all. Cheap labour being needed in the now expanding cities means that those who provide the labour are exploited so that profits may be larger. The eighteenth century having seen little inward movement of people into Britain, the demand for ‘cheap labour’ as the cities expand, in addition to increased need for accommodation to house the new labour force together demonstrate this further social issue relating to migration and settlement. A yet further conspicuous strain on the existing shortages was brought by famine in Ireland. The new Irish labour force arriving in England had no option but to
join their existing compatriots in their already unsatisfactory housing - leading to accusations that overcrowding was an Irish characteristic. Unfounded accusations would thus increase to the extent of the ‘undercutting of wages and taking sparse accommodation’.  

While British interests were developing abroad, a gradual increase of immigration to Britain grew apace. These developments were followed by recruitment of a labour force in India, Africa and China to work on British ships. Newcomers would ultimately settle in the dockland areas of London, Liverpool and Manchester - people from the colonies coming to the ‘mother country’, a natural new homeland. Yet, a factor seldom ever appearing to gain consideration, over time, was that people left Britain as well as entering its shores. A poll of “net migration”, showing people leaving Britain in 1977, stood at 208,700, while those entering stood at 162,600; this represented a deficit of some 46,100 in the inward group (numerically overestimated in-comers), despite perceptions being considerably higher.  

Taking the narrative back not only to colonialism but also to slavery the author-historians point up the place of race in these relations and how the past gives rise to the present: the early route of the Triangular Slave Trade, from Europe through Africa to The Caribbean and the Americas is traced in detail. Recognizing the charge of racism as a central part of personal interaction in contemporary Britain, the topic of slavery is prefaced with a citation, composed by a Caribbean scholar-politician and reputed statesman born into a nation marked by the practice of slavery by a mix of slave-runners, -owners and -entrepreneur national European beneficiaries: ‘Slavery was not born out
of racism; rather racism was the consequence of slavery’. The economics of slavery is examined - the dependence of Europe on an economic system, characterized by colonial trade, having been established. The experience of Britain provides an example of the ‘large-scale development of economic interests in the countries of its Empire throughout the world’, effected through ‘the enforced movement of black people to serve such interests’. These developments are taken from the early years of European exploration in search of ‘new lands and riches’, through the establishment of extensive colonies in the ‘New World’ first by sixteenth century Spain and Portugal, into the southern half of ‘the vast American continent’. The valuable crops of cotton, sugar and tobacco are selected for production and export to Europe, an undertaking requiring a reliable source of labour, initially ‘poor white or native Indian, to harvest the crop’. Links are made between this historical relationship to / with, the position of ‘black people in Britain today’, and the formation of ‘significant attitudes of tension between black and white people’ in today’s Britain.

In revisiting the dire events in Britain and other parts of Europe during the 1930s, The Handbook’s Approach to Economic Crisis comes in the form of a rationale aimed to show both the effects of an ailing economic situation on the lives of many people, and how successive governments attempted to deal with the growing social and economic crisis. Some chose the alternative political doctrine of fascism which grew and influenced events of the time. The author-historians’ intention was to make manifest the negative attitudes of people who accepted fascism as a dogma. In their extreme form these
attitudes resulted in acts of violence against particular groups of people. Reconstructing the terrifying events of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy served as a lasting reminder of the dangers inherent in allowing such attitudes to develop unchecked. It was noted that, while similarities in attitudes and actions existed between 1930s Britain, and the contemporary period, care was needed to the extent that comparisons should not be drawn too rigidly since present-day attitudes and events have been shaped by significantly different historical and economic factors.

This narrative’s Concluding Summary shows that part of ILEA’s aim in confronting racism was to convey the facts of Black immigration to Britain as existing before the end of the Second World War; to eradicate racism, prejudice, and the consequential injustice of unemployment, racism, sexism, and social disadvantage in general, from wider society. An anti-racist approach was important not only in the cause of a good education, but in creating a just and fair society, in which different peoples of distinctive origins and cultures might co-exist, safely, side by side and in harmony. Important to this end, it was essential that the important facts of Britain’s part in her flawed colonial relationship with the rest of the world be known: Britain’s economic gain from this relationship, her gains spreading beyond the shores of Britain, and, above all, the development of racist attitudes and behaviours to achieve its economic gains, through the system of slavery and the trans-Atlantic Slave Trade.

These aims are manifestly clear in the texts produced, primarily the sections of Marches represented and thereby, constitute first, an integral part in the
demonstration of history as a vehicle for teaching about ‘race’ and ‘culture’. Indeed, taking the heart of ILEA’s thinking through the period discussed, leading up to 1976 into 1988, this study acknowledges the impact of the national past, coupled with the institutional, its history, in shaping aspects of its present policymaking and its ultimate implementation. Second, in questioning how the Authority’s reading of ‘difference’ as disadvantage, works in principle through texts produced, this study sees that approach as educational counter-strategies, through which the Authority believes learners, and by extension society, might be transformed. Finally, third, I recognise the institution’s prevailing interest in challenging extremes as being sited within the ‘pathological’ conceptual frame, and akin to its interest in ‘difference’. This interest may be seen both as a function of its historical-geographical location and related experience, characterised by prevailing issues of the time and occupying the mind of wider society. Overall, these elements stand in some accord with observations, of social historical understanding of the particular period in question, made by Gerald Grace (1978), albeit not with direct reference to ILEA: ‘Education is social policy writ large and related to many of the current issues of politics and governance’.44 While ILEA’s intentions are clear, it is less clear whether the prime aim of the eradication of racism, to which the Authority’s leader was later and resolutely committed, could be achieved by the continual rehearsal of the perpetration of evil informed by ‘race’-hate. In the event, it is quite likely that perpetrators, and their supporters among wider society, readily build up a form of resistance, even to the harshest of behaviours by dint of their regular
exposure to the evils they commit. The same may be the case among learners of today, who will need to decide where they stand faced with the opportunity to be influenced, one way or another. Moving next to the final institution in the collective case study, the findings of all three will be discussed jointly in Chapter Nine, Conclusions.
Chapter Seven
Case Study Three: The Historical Association I

Revisiting the ‘Guardianship of History’: Accommodating Diversity

This chapter seeks to identify how the HA addressed the Black presence in texts produced during 1976 to 1988 and what explains similarities and differences between its approaches and outcomes here in comparison with the other two institutions. The primary aim is to determine the strength of my argument, that the historically grounded wider institutional HA cultures, ways of operation, in a fully informed disciplinary practice for history education impinged upon the consciousness of its constituent author-historians, to the extent that its traditional institutional modus operandi was substantively reproduced in serving the needs of Britain’s post-1948 diverse school population. Indeed unusually, the HA author-historians took up the ancestral mantle demonstrating general concerns, for fresh thinking, somewhat unlike the other two institutions. Accordingly, this chapter aims to identify and explore aspects of the HA institutional background, its foundation, history and early experience, which stand to have influenced the nature of texts produced in reforming history curriculum in post-1948 England, evident similarly among the other institutions of this collective case study. The narrative revisits the origins of the HA, the Association commitment to its foundation mission, the guardianship of the discipline and the pursuit of that mission through the study of the past – altogether constituting a legacy of great significance. Most influential of all was the nineteenth-century emergence of ‘historical thinking’, a factor pursued and advanced by the HA, following its initiation in 1906. Thus
in this investigation I make a historical review of milestones in the unfolding life of the discipline and of the Association. Necessarily I engage with present-day figures in the narrative, broadly, in some correspondence to the early establishment figures featured at the beginning of the institutional narrative. As noted by Grace Stretton, among the earliest of the HA membership and enthusiastic initiator in first drawing the attention to and recording the influence of literary progress upon this institution’s history:

> It was in the nineteenth century for the most part that the study of the past was revolutionized through the progress in [literary] criticism, the opening of archives and the great development of what we call ‘historical thinking’.¹

Indeed the nineteenth century was similarly lauded for the pragmatism of the historical approach, which ‘produced a transformation in many other branches of thought and scholarship’. Another similarly active field of thought, philosophy began to sense the rise of history and the likely challenge to its own hegemony, and thenceforward feared the loss of the throne which, hitherto, it impressively occupied.² (And this was true, as the 3rd Edition Collins dictionary put it) by philosophy ‘making explicit … the intelligibility of concepts through rational argument’. That sense of challenge is understandable to the extent that the HA, from the earliest, committed its corporate life to furthering the discipline History authoritatively and robustly. Yet, the historical origin of the HA has been a disputed fact, less so in terms of an agreed date for its having come into being, than in terms of just who, in regard to a given individual and not least a woman, held the position of initiator of the idea. Was it the proactive schoolteacher Grace Stretton, or
rather one of the substantive future Presidents of the Association, like Professor Tout? Or was it just as likely one of the other esteemed male historians, the more recently academically preferred recipients of the honorary degrees of Doctor of Letters, Professors Firth, Lodge and Pollard?³ These three were among a collective of young achievers of their time. This open question is manifest in the absence of any author’s name on the spine and / or title page, of the very volume celebrating the 1956 Jubilee of the historic institution. A more direct reference to Grace Stretton is to be found, however, in Professor, Sir Herbert Butterfield’s (1901-1979) Foreword observation, of October, 1957, to the effect that:

Many hands helped to produce this narrative, but the main researches were carried out by Miss Grace Stretton, and it was she who recovered the basic story.⁴

Contextually, it bears mention, here, that other ‘subject’- / disciplinary-associations existed before the HA. Already by 1906, a number of ‘subject’ associations were in existence. The Mathematical Association had been founded in 1870, the Geographical and Modern Language Associations in 1893 and the Classical Association in 1903. Thus, it is not surprising that the move for a Historical Association had borne in upon history teachers, who by 1906 were in any case beginning to form local groups. Two members of the London Day Training College [LDTC], now the Institute of Education [IOE], took the initiative in the discussions which led to the formation of a wider and more representative body. One of these, Dr Rachel Reid, left an account of the difficulties and problems which provoked some LDTC and school teachers toward related endeavours:
The need for such an Association to help teachers of history in secondary schools had borne in upon me, during five years’ teaching in four different schools. … I had literally no one to consult about syllabus, choice of textbooks, methods, et cetera; and I had to fall back on the books reviewed in the *Journal of Education*. … [Definitively], the Geographical Association had long been founded and was helping teachers, and I did long for a Historical Association to do the same for me and others placed like me.⁵

Responding to Reid’s persuasive plea rehearsed 1906, at the London Day Training College [LDTC], where she was now a teacher, and at a Conference for elementary school teachers, Miss M. A. Howard also a teacher and departmental Head of history at the LTDC, now the IOE, made ‘the first public proposal’ for the founding of an HA. Howard spelt this out:

> the profits to be gained from meeting from time to time to discuss the special problems of history teaching … what the organ of such an association might do to keep those who are working in schools in touch with work being done at the Universities … the attention that might be called to books and articles on the teaching of history, new text-books, illustrations, and other apparatus for use in schools.⁶

It was thus determined that the HA bring together teachers of history from primary (or elementary) schools with the fledgling university professionals. It was then left for Professor Pollard to take the chair at one such meeting, as pre-arranged, and to close with a speech indicating a wider purpose still for history: ‘that history should be properly recognized by universities, and that history should be properly taught in schools’,⁷ But from very early the Association ultimately acquired a further aim, expressed by Professor Tout in 1911, that ‘now we are becoming strong and well-established we shall not forget that we can also make ourselves an Association of students, a body
desirous of furthering the study and the investigation of history'.

Notwithstanding the above, there was another angle to thinking on the HA’s origin. According to the alternative version, Professor Pollard approached Professor Firth of Oxford and a few other historians, in a small committee at an informal meeting held at his house, and appointed them to collect the opinions of representative people, who would report back at a public meeting arranged by them. Initial expenses were met by voluntary contributions. A meeting was summoned by a circular letter which spoke of the 'present inadequate and haphazard provision for the teaching of History in England'.

A moment is now given to considering the manner and course of the Association’s creation. Notwithstanding the need for updated resources among isolated schoolteachers, the new body nevertheless, very readily assumed an imposing aura, reflecting the full panoply of Academe.

The summoning circular letter, mentioned above, further proposed the formation of an association which would not encroach on the province of the Royal Historical Society [RHS] or of the English Historical Review [EHR]. First published in 1886, the EHR is the oldest journal of historical scholarship in the English-speaking world. The public meeting took place at University College London [UCL], at 4.30 p.m. on 19 May 1906. On the motion of Professor Pollard, himself based at UCL, Professor Firth was appointed to the chair. And it was proposed by Professor W. M. Childs, and seconded by Mr C. H. K. Marten of Eton: ‘That this meeting resolve itself into the Historical Association’. After this had been carried it was moved by Mr Graham Wallas ‘That the object of the Association be the interchange of ideas and information
with regard to the methods of historical teaching." On the motion of Mr G. M. Trevelyan and Professor W. J. Harte, a committee of thirteen was appointed to draw up a constitution. This was adopted at a further meeting on 30 June 1906. Of the thirty-five members who attended the original meeting on 19 May 1906, Dr G. M. Trevelyan and Miss E. H. Spalding were [then] the sole survivors. At the meeting on 30 June, Professor Firth was elected President of the Association; and according to Professor Tout:

Firth spent an immensity of personal work in drawing up its early rules and visiting the branches, and seeing that the Association was well set up for the country."11

Highlighting the claim that the HA was born in the universities, the full list of its first Vice-Presidents contained university professors or men of like standing, as were eleven of the twenty-five members of the Council. In addition there were two principals of colleges, two (teacher) training college lecturers, and nine secondary schoolteachers. The first honorary secretaries were Miss M. A. Howard and Miss R. R. Reid, who had done so much to initiate the Association; but in October 1906 Miss M. B. Curran, secretary of the Royal Historical Society, was appointed part-time secretary, a position which she held until 1921. Similarly, early finances of the Association were managed by Dr J. E. Morris, who remained honorary treasurer for the next twelve years. These positions, of some importance, were carried out purposefully and contributed much to the stability of the Association. The steadfastness in the HA initiators’ resolve toward their founding mission was clear. Accommodation was secured rent-free from the Royal Historical
Society [RHS] at 6 South Square, Gray’s Inn. Significantly, the onset of the 1914 War saw the RHS transferred to 22 Russell Square, by which time the HA was better placed to afford rental costs for its premises. The RHS, founded in 1868 defended the scholarly study of the past and remains the foremost society in Great Britain promoting the interests and study of the discipline, www.royalhistoricalsociety.org.uk. In these pages full details of the wide and varied range of the Society's activities can be accessed.

Thenceforward, embracing all forms of history teaching, the HA's first mission statement objective in its purpose read:

a) The collection of information as to existing systems of historical teaching at home and abroad, by getting together printed books, pamphlets and other materials, and by correspondence;
b) The distribution of information amongst the members of the Association as to methods of teaching and aids to teaching (maps, illustrations, text-books and so forth.);
c) The encouragement of local centres for the discussion of questions relative to the study and the teaching of History;
d) The representation of the needs and interests of the study of History and of the opinion of its teachers to governing bodies, government departments, and other authorities having control over education;
e) Cooperation for common objects, with the English Association, the Geographical Association, the Modern Language Association, and the Classical Association.

From 1914 into 1920, and even later intermittently, the HA Council continued to think of the Association as mainly concerned with problems of teaching; but, from the earliest years there were many who, like Professor Harte, pressed to have it regarded as a body which would comprise all of whom
were interested in history, whether in its international or national and local aspects. And Professor Tout’s declaration of 1911 must not be overlooked:

Nearly all [our work] has been on the lines of an Association of teachers of History. But I hope that now we are becoming strong and well-established we shall not forget that we can also make ourselves an Association of students [indeed scholars], a body desirous of furthering the study and the investigation of history.\(^{14}\) [My emphasis]

Recollections are traced even further back, to the extent that the Council, at their very first meeting in 1906, had agreed that immediate steps be taken to encourage the formation of local branches. Necessarily, the purpose of this was, as initially, to ‘bring teachers together’.\(^{15}\)

But despite the earliest organisational structures for everyday operations, from 1969 it would be the teachers’ bulletin / journal, *Teaching History* – the HA’s decidedly, un-disputed ‘forum of debate’ that achieved most in bringing teachers together, academically, in spirit. This facility opened up pathways not merely for keeping abreast of current developments but toward fresh thinking and importantly, scope for experimentation and professional interaction. Whether it was the concerns of Mary Price over the likely disappearance of history, from schools’ curriculum, that triggered the HA into action in these regards, is unlikely. The possibility of a further journal corresponding to Academe’s *History* had been long on the agenda, judged from the intentions voiced in earlier years by the founding Association, in serving school-teachers’ needs. It may be that the time seemed more right in 1969, bearing in mind the varieties of change taking place across wider
society in post-war years, into the 1960s – demographically, socially, educationally and culturally, among other fields of thought. In terms of its outreach, *Teaching History*’s breakthrough was directed both closer at home and wider afield, globally.

Prior to the evident ‘multicultural’ breakthrough of 1979, at the time when schoolteacher members of the HA began to respond more directly to the changed school population and wider society, HA teacher-members in Higher Education were already contributing their historical knowledge skills to Africa and other territories abroad, as will be seen in this, and the following, chapter HA II. Some members had contact with migrated Britons from the Caribbean and other British colonies, and in Birmingham, London, York and inner-city areas elsewhere. Such movement, for Britain, was a largely urban phenomenon, with many newcomers providing their services in the National Health Service, schools, on buses, the railways and manufacturing businesses. Yet the HA, through *Teaching History* was active, interactive and proactive, in many ways, at home and overseas, for a substantive period of time. And yet, there was a sense that such activity as there was may not have seemed sufficiently relevant for some observers. Although contact with overseas resulted in articles from Australia and a long-standing relationship with Africa (with Killingray’s informed plea for respect for its cultures), these appeared not to chime sufficiently with what schoolteachers then, in England’s state schools, expected their learners would find directly relevant. ‘Relevance’ here refers to some recognition of the new diverse learner population, in state schools, who were apparently overlooked in some
quarters, well into the 1970s and potentially, into 1982. This latter date was the operative moment when author-historians contributing to the pages of *Teaching History* were invited to update ‘existing approaches to teaching and learning’ and the broader interpretation of curriculum by addressing the Black presence, evident in its high visibility quotient, of blackness, similar in concept to the IQ intelligence quotient measure, as this study perceives it. This naturally excludes the typological-biological sense once favoured by the USA.

Significantly, in this tradition-rooted, academically founded Association, suggestions of ‘linking learning with leisure’ demonstrate a laudable flexibility in the corporate institutional mind, whilst sustaining its founding stewardship over the ‘quality and the status of general history’.\(^1\)\(^6\) To even greater affect, although stated in the most nuanced of expressions in advancing the historical narrative, ‘having allowed some passage of time for achieving natural development’, both within the institution and discipline generally, as may be inferred from its chronicling, ‘progress in history was measured from the 1920s’.\(^1\)\(^7\) This timing in ‘measuring progress in history’ is telling and testifies to what may be seen as a quite gentle challenge to the 1913 and 1920s imaginative history-writing / story-telling practised by Muriel O Davis, for example, in her *Story of England, Part II: from James I to The Great War*, published by Oxford University Press, England, a general history series on the seventeenth to twentieth centuries, dated 1929. No doubt passed on to the average twelve-year-old, Davis’ imagined history may have been well received by enrapt learners and lives on, its roots unwittingly woven into other learned, though unfounded, myths.
Even more eloquent in these contexts is the tone of description that Davis
cajoled up of the proud Angles, from the safe distance of her Welsh
homestead. Many such qualities have nevertheless lived on, a potential
trigger in the drive for HA ‘scientific’ / ‘objective history’ pursued by the
Association’s foreign diplomacy historian, Charles Webster (1886-1961).
Thus, seeking to conceptualise ‘interactions between text producers and their
discourse (texts) and between text producers and learner-users’),¹⁸ I
envision a broadly contextualised period curriculum, exemplifying Davis as
the source of a projected early form of schooling, in history, likely to have
contributed to the prime traits which some observers like to think comprises
a British, English, identity.

This ‘metadiscourse’ - ‘network of interaction between producers, their texts
and their users’ as defined by proponent of empirical discourse, Ken Hyland -
demonstrates how external influences and or traditions (of ‘knowledge
content’ in action), may have worked for the HA and others, during the period
leading up to, and beyond, the HA foundation. By way of an illustration this
imagined construct, in a hypothetical event engaging an imagined early-day
HA member, is applied over the period roughly around 1906-1939, or so.
Here, I look beyond potential limitations in the actual institutional experience,
toward historical instruction and history writing for schools, in both the pre-
First, and -Second, World War period. Yet, bearing in mind ‘the story of
England and the English race’, as designated and defined in early school
history textbooks,¹⁹ marginally beyond the time of the HA foundation and
thereafter, as potentially conceived by contemporaries of HA members,
England then and the English represented an idealised integrated visionary community of (self-appointed discrete) peoples. The imaginative historian’s role, then, lay foremost in portraying a particular (singularly monochromatic) English identity, while still recognising their heritage and mixed ancestry.

Such representations, narratives of a conceptually heroic people of an imagined particular kind of stock, traits of character and purveyors of a special brand of knowledge and capabilities, lived on in the mind. Such episodes, at the dawn of English history, rehearsed by (somewhat imaginative) historians of the early 1920s or so, melded with stories of heroism, sea-faring missions and adventurous encounters, military achievement on the battle field. All this was the stuff of history, then. And thus, an impressionable fifteen-year-old student, of the time, as potentially also a future HA member, or later ancestral founder of the Association’s bulletin for school-teachers, Teaching History [TH], may well have studied England’s story as told, for example, by Muriel Davis in her Story of England.20 Indeed, education then, at the time of the HA foundation and into its long tenure to the present day, had witnessed expansion in the availability, structural development, and executive provision in the field. Such initiatives would hardly have gone unnoticed by existing or prospective members, serving to broaden their perspectives across the academic domain, with scope for even greater influence upon texts, at a later date. All this is testimony to the (mixed) achievement of the HA in its drive for ‘objective’, ‘scientific’ history to the present day.

Yet questions arise as to the depth and scope of the institutional interest in events of domestic significance. Striking in their absence at home are
narratives of disadvantage, more evident today, to the extent that questions are readily prompted as to where such forms of disadvantage lie, in the early HA’s narrative repertoire and experience. In this light one may well ask, whether there was no place for the less heroic events of the broad period before the HA foundation, and immediately after? How might this institution respond to life-experiences of the seemingly distanced disadvantaged ‘others’? What lessons may be learned from social events of a not too distant past, giving rise to concerns that ushered in the Poor Law Reforms that, in 1832 curtailed relief to the poor, to the extent that those sufficiently destitute and deprived would count as morally failing and deficient? Might the founding HA not have learned about events giving rise to the Aliens Act of 1905, just predating the Association’s founding? Could the mere habit of convention and adherence to tradition, accompanied by a learned caution somehow explain the exclusionary practices alleged to characterise the early HA? Insofar as case studies, of this broad period, structurally suggest continuities of the past following through into the present, and making links between ‘lived experience’ and future behaviours, might such events advisedly explain the updated HA position, today? Seeking within the institution the roundedness expected in the maturing human individual, discussed in the earlier chapters of this collective case study and narrative, a cautionary note to the institution seems apt at this particular moment. This sense arises from at least one author-historian and valued contributor to Teaching History and the HA, to the extent that a perceived and evidently fair qualification voiced is made through her knowledge, historically and educationally, as a valued contributing
observer. The purpose here is understood in Margaret Bryant’s terms and reflects the contexts within which her observations were made:

Many still thought of the HA as primarily serving only academics or the survivors of the old grammar schools and universities. It will be the task of the profession to consolidate the advance [heralded by TH editor, John Standen] for the establishment of history as an integral element in the liberal and technical education of every young person [today].

Bryant’s largely optimistic review of curriculum history, in the Teaching History Jubilee celebratory edition, Toward 100, stands against the sense of pessimism which had surrounded this journal’s initiation. The less optimistic inference, here, is of Mary Price’s earlier observations, elsewhere, about the questioned relevance then, of history curriculum in schools. However, John Standen’s wide-ranging experience in teaching across all phases is an educational feat and makes an unusual commendation for the position of first editor of Teaching History, in 1969. It also marks the structural development in collective British educational practice over time, up to the present day, as Bryant inferred in the first edition of TH in 1969. By directly addressing the place of the learner, arguably toward a more inclusive position in the education system, Bryant seeks to overcome the tensions believed to have been evident between some two or three types of learners, historians-in-the-making. Yet, as responses to questions on multicultural education leading to the EMS Project, SC I, of this study demonstrates, tensions may also need to be resolved in the mind of some teachers. Other concerns surrounded what threatened to be the disappearance of history from schools’ curriculum and post-war learners’ schooling. While such concerns arose, surrounding the
likely vacuum to be precipitated by the integration of history into the Humanities, there was also the sense of a supposed general lack of interest, on the part of learners of the later 1950s and 1960s.\(^22\)

For this group of seemingly reluctant learners, this event represents something of the riven nature of the educational system then, as perceived, marked by earlier division and distinctions whether of gender; unequal economic status associated with the public school sector; or other privilege of faith schools; or the mainly secular driven issues of schooling in the academic or the vocational, and so on. Adding to all this were the questioned post-immigration societal structures of assimilation, integration and cultural pluralism (the means of structuring the diverse society of the 1950s to 1960s or so), given to interpretations of coercion by some, but devised variously to accommodate the new immigrant populations. Evidently, the pull of convention and the push of tradition proved stronger, for a substantial period, than the will for definitive institutional and ‘cultural’ change. Indeed, the Nineteenth Century pragmatism of the historical approach which ‘produced a transformation in many other branches of thought and scholarship appears to be alive still in the minds and historical practices of the HA, in light of the knowledge that appears to have been acquired and passed on through the professional expertise and continued scholarship of the Association membership across generations, over time. Some reference back will be made to the historical review of significant milestones in the life of the discipline and of the Association, as necessary, from the time of its founding into the historical present.
Writing of the widespread change of this period, but retrospectively, and very much treating an interest of the moment (the national curriculum) Richard Aldrich and Denis Dean jointly and accordingly demonstrate how ‘a new awareness of the present and of the future necessitates a new awareness of the past’,23 They jointly mark the nature and extent of such change of the 1960s, as being necessarily, written into the contemporary (national curriculum) narrative. This surge in observations topically came similarly from the ‘newer institutions of higher education’:

From the 1960s the one “best history” if it had ever existed, was replaced, or at least significantly challenged and complemented, by a series of competing histories – for example Marxist history, neo-Marxist history, feminist history, skills-based history. [Indeed], courses reflecting these new histories became common in the newer institutions of higher education. Such changes in agenda and values were accompanied by changes in process and technique.24

But the HA continued its proven path in serving the interests of ‘objective history’. Coming to the fore, at this time broadly the 1960s, was a present-day contributor to discourses of such change, Jeannette B. Coltham, of the Department of Education of Manchester University, among discussants. She is remembered by members of the HA and readers of Teaching History, among others, for her particular contribution to ‘skills-based history’ through ‘Educational Objectives and the Study of History’, of 1972 [Teaching Objectives].25 This paper described ‘the attitudes, skills and abilities that the authors, Coltham and co-author, John Fines believed school children should display at all stages of learning history’. They sought to demonstrate, indeed
celebrate, how traditional history highlighted content, the periods to be taught and topics learned, but at the same time attempted to identify the particular practices associated with doing history as an educational activity. As they saw it: ‘Only as he/she masters the relevant skills will the learner come to know what historical method is - learning by doing’.26 Essentially ‘Teaching Objectives’ would serve as a check list for planning pupils’ learning and for recording the stages reached in the acquisition of substantive practical skills alongside factual knowledge learned. Beneficiaries would therefore be both the teachers and learners. The former would be able more accurately to record the progress of their learners, who in turn would benefit from more objective and informative records. Yet, ‘Teaching Objectives’ was not Coltham’s first appearance in print, particularly for the HA. Working toward the advance of the discipline, history and its teaching, in 1969, Coltham’s report, Assessing history textbooks,27 considered contemporary texts in the forum of a teachers’ workshop. In this, outcomes were seen in terms of delivering history curriculum, with emphasis on the nature of history and approaches necessary in its learning and teaching. The focus for this interactive group-participation workshop was all genres of textbook other than those classified as historical fiction. It was not clear whether historical fiction was seen at that time, as having potentially less rigour. Overarching interests ranged from identifying in broad categorisations / elements somewhat in the manner of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), particular Genres: types of book and issues, for example the Course book; Distribution: given audiences, with reference to learner ability levels in group
work; Consumption: uses available through given elements: including, index, glossary and bibliography; and the ratio of text in relation to illustration; format; and general visual impact. While questions raised were aimed to determine what contribution books can / should make to children's learning in history, the matter of Objectives in teaching and learning was only broadly mentioned, this being still in the pipeline and waiting to be floated.28

Some six categories of analysis were identified among a mix of literary, historical, and sociologically driven factors: description and treatment of textual data; chronology; humanity as society not a quality as, perhaps, 'mercy'; explanation and methodological skills; and finally, illustrations.29 These were further broken down into a linguistic and historical package of themes: Use of language; Special terminology; Facts; Treatment of facts; Concern for human beings; Views of society; Notion of change; Cause-Effect; Time; Illustrations; Possible activities and exercises; and Format. Inherent in the thinking underlying these categories was a sense, clearly, that using the conflated expressions of both Coltham and Margaret Bryant, author-historian and contributor to the HA at the time, ‘whereas there is an academic discipline “History”, there is also a school subject called history’, and they need not be looked upon as exactly the same thing.30 Importantly, Bryant went on to explain similarly that a “real” history may not necessarily be ‘mature’ but no less meaningful, for the young, in terms they could understand and appreciate.31 This paper arguably, has proved a further contribution to discourses of learning and teaching in history curriculum of the period and a useful starting-point in terms of structure, for Alan Blyth and his Team of SC
teachers under his guidance. Taking a line from Professor Keith Robbins of the University of Glasgow, other important considerations have been long overdue. He voices a long-held view as to the need for a re-assessment of the present-day institution.

Expounding his thesis to a captive body of fellow members of the HA, Professor Keith Robbins put a succession of questions to his audience surrounding a perceived need for the historically founded institution to re-assess its current position in some relation to its past. The occasion was Robbins’ commemorative lecture marking the 75th anniversary of the Association’s founding, in 1906, celebrated in April 1981. His concerns pressed were set out in a series of evident but pertinent interpolations: Do writers and teachers of history have a particular responsibility to the society in which they live to help it come to an understanding of its past? Can they reach agreement on its significant features? Is there a ‘common core’ which every citizen can grasp and to which he / she can relate his / her [particular] experience? Is there a “national character” and, if so, is it important that it should survive?32

Robbins’s queries were significant, to the extent that sectors among wider society, both the conceptually indigenous and the more recently arrived, continued to grapple with issues surrounding the meaning / relevance of Britain’s past to its present, albeit differently informed. Some questions still required answers. Some such, for the newcomers, involved Britain’s historical relationship with the colonies, others surrounded the social, political and educational changes that were still unfolding in the late 1970s and 1980s.
Even so, the extent’ of the challenges of a ‘multicultural’ historical education’, however defined, would ultimately engage the attention increasingly of teachers, no less in the pages of *Teaching History*.

Taking forward the narrative, this chapter seeks first, to identify and unpack the HA’s mode of institutional operations and second, to examine texts produced by teaching members with a focus on ‘race’ in their professional role as policy makers in (history) curriculum and in terms, as perceived, of their exercise of the historical convention of social responsibility, as interpreted. Accordingly the significance of this period is taken contextually, and definitively in this chapter and study as, the broad post-1948 social-political, historical, and emergent demographic, together with the related social, and educational, policy contexts in which given texts were created. This whole is taken in relation to the institution’s particular history and remit.

In seeking to identify and interpret the HA’s particular mode of institutional operations, post 1948, this study contributes by highlighting and demonstrating the unfolding of the institution’s (subsequently extended) deeper purpose (evident in *Teaching History*) as a forum of debate for school teachers. Earlier in the process, a deeper purpose similarly advanced the *cause* of history as an academic discipline traditional in the universities, which was made evident correspondingly, through the pages of the academics’ journal, *History*. As is now being made plain, this process was later applied and subsequently further advanced, through the curriculum subject in schools.
Expanding upon the HA’s existing role through the establishment of the Journal, Teaching History, in 1969, the work of teachers, and other educationists, of interest in their practice, was disseminated across historical interest groups, and in various schools in Britain and abroad - whether Primary, Junior or Secondary). Abroad, as in Great Britain, interest was reflected in the numbers and variety of contributors from given countries. In referring to international involvement I draw analogies between the institutional historical outreach at the time of Empire and the HA’s seemingly straightforward, considered, though in some respects somewhat delayed, response, to the ‘multicultural’ ideal. Its response appears to have been not so much a trend to follow, but an opportunity for the Association’s extended outreach, and continuing involvement, with developing countries. Some explanation of the place of ‘Teaching History’, in its capacity as a ‘forum of debate’, and its contributors to the institutional narrative, is added, in some distinction from the place of its counterpart journal, History, serving its academic proponents.

Yet, ‘Teaching History’ lived out its role in the cause of history teachers, in whose purpose it carried out its intended role rigorously. By way of gaining some insight into background structures for texts, teaching and learning, this section opens up brief references to key figures, teachers and schools involved in the production of texts being examined. More detailed commentary precedes respective texts, once the analyses of the journal’s texts begin, at later stages in this chapter. It is to be noted that due to the particular themed discussions, for example membership contributors – male
and female, and so on, chronology is not strictly observed at this stage. Historical precedence will be observed later in the subsequent narrative / themed discussion.

Necessarily, key HA historian players and their themes are retained close to their creations. Contributions derive from practising history teachers active in teaching history in schools, whether Primary Junior or Secondary, comprehensive or grammar. Interestingly school teachers, in this case study, would appear to be in a minority. However, this is not to suggest they are, necessarily, in the minority within the HA as a whole, or generally, as might be presumed from these particular multicultural educational contexts. It may well be that the preparation of classroom materials after a day’s teaching (as happens in some institutions) leaves little time for extra-curricular activities of this order. For whatever reason, the majority of teachers represented, textually, may be found to be academics in Institutes of Higher Education / University Colleges and /or Colleges of Education.

Some such contributors include men like Martin Booth and David Killingray, lately of University of London’s Goldsmiths College, and women like Margaret Slack, early on the scene in a First School and seemingly the sole female schoolteacher, for some time. This sole representation proved to be short-lived, however, and was resolved when numbers of women increased with the contribution of Mary Searle-Chattergee of Manchester Polytechnic, alongside Margaret Killingray. Margaret often partnered David, in HA publications, although she also publishes in her own right. Her appearance here, in February 1979 charts the appearance of Teaching History ten years

At the time of his writing, Teaching History 16, May 1979, the Journal’s then Editor, John Standen’s editorial posed the interesting question ‘Is the publication … a last mad fling?’ Offering the requisite response he continued: ‘I think not’. Pressing his point, the Editor sounded a note of caution against any complacency in the light of the high-point of membership and the range of activity earlier reached. He regretted that ‘school teachers [were] contributing fewer articles than they did five years ago whereas lecturers and teachers in higher education [were] contributing more’. However, Standen suggested that this eventuality might reflect the reality of increasing pressures upon teachers in the classroom. Standen cited the proportionate / simultaneous decline of local history teachers’ associations and the decrease in student numbers entering FE and HE (Further and Higher, Education) courses, which naturally provided that sector with more time for writing. Approaching almost one decade on, an increase of women authors was evident in a collective initiative featuring Different kinds of heritage (1985). Among these was Karen Done, a former history teacher using her then
current position, of Education officer at the Macclesfield Silk Museum to draw attention fittingly, to *An expanding breed of museum.*

Strongly represented, here, is the relatively new political concept then, and interest, in different ways of resourcing state education. This new concept, in the funding of state education was part of a wider tranche of interventions brought forward by Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister from 1979, and conscious of the ever increasing toll of the monopolistic hold (of local educational authorities) on the public purse. Her intervention demonstrated the PM’s interest in increased competition, of whatever kind, by interweaving the private with what was hitherto the preserve of the public (state). At the time an acknowledged industrial heritage, silk in Macclesfield, was deemed important for posterity, and the site was secured with funding from the Manpower Services Commission [MSC]. Indeed, this form of ‘fruitful collaboration between industry, the MSC, heritage and education’ was something that Martin Booth (in his editorial overview of this collective project) recognised as suitable for nurturing and developing innovations, on lines of an industrial monument - enthusiastically discussed by Karen Done in her textual narrative. Increasing the number of women contributing texts, Gillian Pearson, a former press officer at the Jorvik Viking Centre, had the advantage of first-hand experience, responsible for liaison with schools. Among the still somewhat smaller number of women academics, Mary Krug’s overseas contribution hailed from the Education Department, of the University of Zambia where she had been posted. Whether in Britain or variously abroad,
Margaret Killingray accompanied by David swelled the number of active women historian writers.

Testifying to the more substantial number of male author-historian academics, and whose professional life began with their early experience in schools, were men like Ian Grosvenor among a rising new generation of writer historians. So too was Mike Gibson (among the ‘heritage collective’) and who, in this role, demonstrates how ‘fragmentary evidence can be utilised and developed to engage pupils in problem-solving, hypothesising, and empathetic reconstruction, among other conceptual and practical skills’. 37

Again, broadening the experience of his pupils, and influential in forming bonds between further and higher education and schools, Martin Burgess, Head of History and Human Studies at an 11-16 comprehensive school, of 900 pupils, together with his department, established ‘an acceptable scheme for pupils’ both on traditional examination courses and ‘an imaginative alternative (prevocational) curriculum’. 38 Further still, in the same edition of *Teaching History*, diversity of a more divisive kind was demonstrated and discussed, by Victor Kelly, a well-informed former BBC broadcaster, lately history teacher, capitalising on his experience, knowledge and understanding of Northern Ireland’s sectarian ‘troubles’. Kelly considers which version of Irish history he should project, a common heritage or its prime distinctions, recognising the need both for a ‘faithful presentation of Loyalist and Republican viewpoints’. 39 Kelly wonders whether learners might not be better occupied by focusing on topics which unite rather than divide them, thereby invoking ‘an awareness of a common heritage’. With first-hand knowledge
and understanding of the subject matter, the Irish ‘troubles’, Victor Kelly is provided with a useful starting point as his topic, in an area rich for development, and equally telling if taken from other starting points. For Kelly, the aim is not to provide definitive answers, but rather to stimulate thought, with scope for learners also to consider issues deeply. Kelly wonders whether learners might not be better occupied focusing on topics which unite, rather than divide, and thus invoking some ‘awareness of a common heritage’.

Building on the range of thinking above, and referring back (as Booth further suggests, from his editorial perspective), a further innovatory mission responded aptly to the growing requests made, of teachers, to consider other approaches to curriculum constructs in the order of a core framework as proposed, or even required, by the City and Guilds Institute (largely providers of vocational / employment fostered, or driven, approved courses). Much scope was to be found by broadening the discussion, particularly to the extent that the society of the period was concerned about issues allied to ‘difference’, differentials, and how these influences might be countered. This thinking was similarly implicating, whether in terms of the industrial v. the social and or, environmental types of heritage – with similar connotations of hierarchy in terms whether of work-based initiatives that related primarily to vocational studies, and being seen almost at some distance from the academic with further connotations of occupational status / social position and other potential signifiers whether of a blue collar variety or white collar.

Social class, like ‘race’, was open to questions of contrasting positions – below stairs / above stairs, the lesser intellectually endowed and the more
gifted, the sophisticated and the gauche, whether socially, academically, vocationally, according to one’s heritage. And by writing about these aspects, some change in perspectives was expected to come about by creating the appropriate contextual climate. In terms of classroom organisation, the range and mix of institutions in which Primary aged children might be educated were, perhaps fortuitously, made evident in a footnote explanation provided, in educational statistics by Martin Booth. This came about in and through an earlier professional position in that phase of British education. Booth revisits school rolls of the Primary phase of 1 January 1969, detailing his Liverpool experience, which states: ‘First and Middle Schools, total: 387. First Schools deemed Primary (up to age 11): 702. Middle Schools deemed Secondary (11-13, largely in the context of Comprehensives): 601. Beyond this broad exploration, the narrative moves next, and operationally, to the uniquely non-fixed site of educational production and dissemination, *Teaching History* [*TH*].

**Scope of ‘TH’ operations**

In terms of the initiative manifested through *Teaching History*, a virtual operational location, its achievement is substantive, not merely in its establishment but more significantly in the scope, operationally through its contributing historians. By the second decade of its tenure, the original ‘Teachers’ Bulletin’ / ‘Journal’, *Teaching History*, of 1969, had intensified its influential operation as a true, historically designated, forum for debate to all
intents and purposes even by serving teachers and others beyond the shores of Britain. They actively pursued a role in the dissemination of texts by, and among, teaching historians well into the research period, 1976-1988, and beyond. In forwarding the cause, David Killingray, Africanist historian, teacher / lecturer and writer, known similarly to the SC as the HA, made a commitment whereby other historians might be encouraged to develop a capacity in showing a concern for others, and the cultures within which they were so intimately located. This would be achieved to the extent of his fellow historian teachers recognising the significance of the particular value of others’ cultures, for example, David Killingray, 1977.

Yet it would be the better part of two years before Margaret Slack, First School (broadly primary age) specialist history teacher, new to the ‘multicultural’ terrain, and working in Yorkshire - an LEA not new to the multicultural debate – entered the scene, relatively early, in 1979. Similarly bringing the wealth of his experience to the cause, in 1979, proponent historian emeritus of World History, J. L. Henderson took up the cause by demonstrably carving out its place in contexts of diversity. For Henderson, this was a second-nature experience which was ‘lived through’ as much as it was doubtlessly, discussed, in his academic expressions. Hence this study’s advocacy of World History and diversity, representative of this second phase of the HA’s narrative through The Teaching of World History, a moot choice of Henderson’s, in TH 1979, a period still of debate over the direction that history curriculum, like education generally, should take, reflective of the new diverse society.
Pertinent to both the early institution, and the new contemporary, demographically changed, British society (evidently comprising the citizens to whom Robbins earlier referred) underlying suggestions of ‘inclusiveness’ may be seen to signify the kind of society, and indeed history, of which contemporary historian, Ian Grosvenor, writes. Grosvenor thus builds upon what appears to have been Robbins’s open and explicit cue to historians, for greater inclusiveness, primarily of the shared historical narrative commonly lived through, in the re-written history of present-day Britain but, potentially, in the spirit of the commonality of wider experience, of all humankind. Spearheaded by Grosvenor, whose thinking heralded the third phase of inclusive writing, taken forward by a new generation of young historians, through his *History and the Multicultural Curriculum*, a breakthrough that came in a collection of writing in *Teaching History* 32, of February 1982, Grosvenor’s writing, like that of the collective of author-historians is acknowledged in an editorial of the same date. Indeed, this collection reflects the spirit in which the TH editors expressed their sentiments. And more importantly the outcomes of that editorial were of a high order and at a time when such a response was still needed.

Further, in *The global outreach*, the sub-theme representing prime contents of TH 41 February 1985, the HA reaches back into *Central Africa*, serving overseas teachers in the ‘English speaking countries of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean’, in the process conceptually revisiting *A Review Article* treating a large selection of school books on African history and which at that time was forced to challenge a frequent claim of a shortage of History books on
Africa. These tell, for example of: How Africans regarded slavery (at the time) and what part they played, how slaves responded to slavery in the Americas, to what extent African culture transferred across the Atlantic; all supplemented by ‘A full African history in the classroom’, penned by David Killingray, and ‘History in Central Africa’, by Brian Garvey and Mary Krug, both members of the Education Department, University of Zambia, with allied texts forming a part of the literary ‘spoils’.

Topping the account of this broad chronology of events, a brief tour of Sneh Shah’s Europe features in his History and Inter-Cultural Education. Here, Shah focuses on aspects of ‘equality for all groups’, discussing aspects in ‘accepting diversity as a source for learning’, ‘achieving equal opportunities’, and ‘opposing any [and every] form of discrimination’. His starting point is a definition of the criteria rehearsed at a seminar in the Netherlands, in June 1985. Shah takes time off from teaching at Hertfordshire College of Higher Education and revisits two decades of multicultural education, under various titles reflecting ‘race’ and anti-racism, and reminds readers that still in 1985 we read, in the Swann Report, that little attempt is being made in teaching history to reflect the diverse society. Onward, the textual (institutional) narrative follows through in the intrinsic interest of Mary Searle-Chattergee, student of social anthropology. She discusses ‘Lancashire Textiles & the Indian Connection: History teaching in a multicultural society’. Tracing a journey between India and the textile mills of Lancashire, Searle-Chattergee laments the unwillingness, of some who ‘know the facts’, to see them and report them as they are.
In these and other such circumstances, opportunities may have been delayed, if not altogether lost consequently, in more readily advancing the creation of a cohesive society, in the nation’s early uneasy widening demographic extension. Beyond pursuing this concept as one of the ‘What if’ variety of virtual counterfactual historical narratives (potentially a form of rhetoric, and speculative, if taken too far\(^45\)) a cursory observation is that such inclusiveness, lately discussed by the HA, from 1982, might have been more actively discussed, had the liberalising forces of the influential 1980s - crucial to heightening a sense of belonging among the new immigrants - been widely, brought to the general notice, as latterly, through Teaching History . The effects of the inclusive historical narrative may well have been better served by more adeptly forging a coherently unified nation, in harmony with itself. Such an approach may have engendered happier consequences, generally abroad, beyond the condemnatory tone adopted, against British society in particular, as instigated, for example, in the SC’s (ill-fated) Education for a Multiracial Society project and ILEA [robust executive interventions.]

Altogether the five themed, key moments, productively isolated and identified, constitute contributions that inform both the HA and the debate, through the historian writers, of the period, 1976-1988. Taken as a whole, and broadly manifesting the ethic of social responsibility as policy, the constituent whole of these five themed signifiers, kept in focus, bear rehearsal: first, Others’ cultures: conceptually embracing the new, represented by David Killingray and Margaret Slack, 1977 to early 1979; second, World History and diversity – the purposeful Teaching of World History, by J. L. Henderson, \(TH\) 1979.
Third are (a): History and the multicultural curriculum, explored by Ian Grosvenor, Teaching History 32, February 1982, and (b) Recognising our nearest neighbours (editorially initiated responses to the Scarman, and pre-empting the Swann, Reports), Teaching History February 1982. Fourth is: Diverse kinds of heritage, a Collective of 1985, Teaching History 41. This brings the narrative full circle fifth, to Sneh Shah’s Inter-cultural trans-European Initiative, Teaching History 48, 1987.

Whereas various individuals as also groups, among such being many of the teachers encountered in this study – members of the HA as we have seen as also some of the SC, notwithstanding the potentially more strongly academic approaches among the latter, many attempts at cohesion appear studied speculative and veering more toward the dutiful than resulting from a sense of shared sentiments / interests. This thinking will be returned to in the concluding elements of this study.

The resolution of this textual inquiry is further advanced in the second, of these twinned case-institutional chapters. There the focus will be on discussing the nature of prime contributions to the debate, of this period, by a growing number of teacher guardian member-representatives of the historic HA.
Chapter Eight
Case Study Three: The Historical Association II

Embracing the New: A Historical Education for the ‘Common Good’?

In this chapter the focus is on HA texts produced by author-historians working toward the reform of history curriculum during 1976-1988, a period marked by ‘race’-thinking, racialisation, among wider society. In taking up the narrative on the place of ‘race’ in HA texts for history curriculum, I seek in essence to reconstruct my understanding of how the Association regarded the place of a historical education its significance, pragmatically, in peoples’ lives. My perception are further informed by the Association’s institutional history. The inquiry extends also to the early Historical Association membership self-conceptualization as life-long scholars of the discipline history.

The Association at its foundation manifested a sense of working to promote history, for the benefit of wider society, in serving the common good. This sense extended to the preservation of the discipline itself for self-evidently intrinsic value. The term, the ‘common good’, familiar to readers with an interest in history teaching – explored by Barton and Levstik,¹ for example, is used here more in the sense of the historian-educationist Margaret Bryant’s discourse of a ‘mature history’, engaged by informed scholarship and beyond a less mature, but no less ‘real’, history,² undertaken by young learners in school. In terms of this study and chapter, expressly, the ‘common good’ refers to the driven ‘objective’, ‘scientific’, history discussed in the previous chapter, HA I, as posited by the early HA historian of international political
diplomacy, Charles Webster (1886-1961), among other early member-colleagues.

It must be said that any emphasis suggested by the international designation, in Webster’s title, should not detract from the level of his national interest at home, particularly in regard to the kind of ‘objective’ / ‘scientific’ history he advocated. Looking still to the introductory / background aspect of the preceding chapter, it must also be acknowledged that many of the early Association members will have had some direct experience in the study of the British Empire, both as pupils studying the subject in schools and / or in revisiting celebrations marking significant events in the nation’s calendar of Empire. Going back through generations, some prospective members may well have gained experience overseas, carrying out their public service in one or other positions of influence. Some distant forebears, similarly, may very likely have witnessed, at close hand, the machinations underlying Imperialist action, as in the Jamaica Rebellion at Morant Bay, in 1865,\(^3\) when Jamaican locals seized the day to retaliate against the behaviour of the invader Britons. Indeed, a broad amalgam of factors doubtlessly will have informed the Association’s particular historical world view, holistically, later being subject to modification.

This means the Association’s approach in addressing the Black presence in history curriculum is structured broadly upon their values and actively engaged with philosophical ideas. This was taken from the perspective of an ‘objective’, ‘scientific’, history promoted and pursued by the founding institution’s academics and pragmatically passed on over time, to the present-
day Association membership. The impact of this approach for present-day historian-authors was real, contrasting substantively with, for example, the less restrained approaches of ILEA. It was a more studied and academically intellectual approach with a less confrontational manner. The tenor of this writing was modified, in the strong tradition of the early Association’s past and with a sound understanding of the overarching disciplinary practices / skills, actively observed. Taken forward to its present-day advocacy, that course was followed from the earliest point of the Association’s founding. This included its formulation, visionary discourse onward, and effectively observing ‘historical thinking’ over time. This conceptualisation is realised in this unfolding account, aimed to equip learners with both the requisite disciplinary skills and behavioural attitudes through ‘race’ informed texts that reflected the diverse society.

Indeed, aware of early Association members’ call that ‘History needs to be more scientific if it is to be an aid to the elucidation of present-day problems’, historians of the present-day made real their ‘true’ belief. This involved the clear likelihood that history of their time would be invested with ‘a much greater objectivity of treatment’ of the past, in a robust British scholarship. Judged by the early Association and its present-day counterpart’s collegiate-spirited thinking, such historical British scholarship would be structured upon the systemic teaching of the technique of historical research in the universities, as favoured by Webster, thenceforward extending into schools. ‘Perfunctory and haphazard’ approaches were to be eschewed and the ‘more scientific … rigorous and objective approaches [embraced],’ particularly
where these were intended ‘to serve as an aid to the elucidation of present-day problems’. Indeed, whereas this ‘scientific’ approach has been extended, within the discreet discipline of history, there remains scope into the present time, for yet further development. This absence was evident in the nature of texts and external attitudes and behaviours during 1976-1988 and beyond. Such development might be achieved through a greater awareness of a ‘scientific’ base and by working through a rationale that is developed and deployed in schools, among wider social groups and nations.

Thus, among this example of later generation post-Second World War Association historians, contributing to Teaching History and ready to take their place in following the HA tradition of history writing, were British historians like Jeanette Coltham and John Fines alongside David Killingray. They actively sought to invest the history of their day with much of that early rigour and objectivity, their concerns for these qualities being actively manifested among practitioners in state schools and colleges as in the universities. Just after the establishment of Teaching History, Coltham used that very ‘forum of debate’ to demonstrate how learners in schools mastering the relevant skills would come to know ‘what historical method was and is - learning by doing’. Similarly, as foregrounded in the previous chapter Killingray, as an Africanist historian, was insistent in his objective claims on behalf of others’ cultures:

A prime concern is that teachers should “know what they are about” … an insular curriculum pre-occupied with Britain and British values should be tempered by a curriculum that is international in its choice of content and global in its perspective’. [My emphases]
This thinking, of Killingray, resonates greatly with Webster’s, albeit in slightly differing contexts and times. Not only did the pragmatism of the ‘historical approach’ - established by the early HA through Webster among others - ‘produce a necessary transformation in many other branches of thought and scholarship’, it contributed much in the practical pursuit of international peace and security in his and their time. While Killingray’s ambitions for his own contribution were superficially less far-reaching than those, for example, of Webster, bearing in mind the will for peace at the time of the latter’s writing, the significance / sincerity of Killingray’s ambitions will not have been any less marked than was Webster’s, at his time of writing. Indeed, both sentiments were structured upon thinking informed by a need for the understanding of contemporary international politics, of whatever level and aimed toward the cause of inter-racial / inter-cultural understanding. Indeed, underlying Killingray’s thinking was the belief that: ‘Other cultures and nations have their own validity and should be perceived in their own terms, and not judged exclusively in British or European terms’. Like the early HA membership, Killingray was clear that teachers needed to broaden their horizons and accommodate alike to the ‘new’ with rigour, in a similar way as learners. The narrative now turns to the discussion of provision made for learners’ reformed history curriculum following the changed post-1948 society and contexts in which pupils’ learning was taking place.

As if manifesting some recognition of Killingray’s concerns, Margaret Slack, briefly referred to in the introductory narrative of Case Study Three, HA I, and some two years on in time, entered the profession in Yorkshire as a First
School (primary age) specialist teacher of history. It bears noting that while Slack’s historical intervening curriculum breakthrough was still in its infancy – evident in her tentative approach, her constrained culturally diverse connections / understandings even oblique interpolations religious and cultural references alongside unsubstantiated generalizations (regarding the “girls’ unwillingness to join in simulated war games), the more confident lived-in contributions of a new generation of young men, author-historians, were coming into view, in a widened history curriculum.

Slack’s more generalised contribution in the HA drive to reform the history curriculum aimed to make learning meaningful and more objective for learners. I recognize the evident empathy and involvement she drew out from her charges, in her breakthrough. This was an important but understated message in the pathway she traced. It manifested a purpose of-a-kind, which this study perceives her to have been saying positively:

“We do not have to replicate / imitate their culture in order to educate them” and significantly, “an understanding of their background and our craft (of teaching) is essential to make learning meaningful for them”. It is in this regard that Slack’s approach is seen to have worked for her pupils.9 They manifest her increasing awareness of minority ethnic pupils’ culture and experience. A firm example came in a story-reading session uppermost, apparently, in the burgeoning First School10 teaching career. Among aspects discussed, about this visit with her pupils to the Halifax Piece Hall, in Yorkshire, Slack recounts a story about a Yorkshire weaver: ‘So real was the story to them that they assumed the story was universally known’.11 I include post hoc, Slack’s
momentarily mis-judged stereotypical lapse ‘in the manner of their kind’ in an otherwise encouraging appreciation of her Moslem pupils. Next, inside a mosque, and taking up the Imam’s invitation to the pupils to enter into prayer, Slack was concerned that the religious leader, the Imam’s invitation to pray was not accompanied by pupils clasping their hands in gestures of prayer, seemingly in Western style, and taking this to be some neglect on the Imam’s part. Thereupon, Slack acted upon the supposed neglect by directing her pupils to taking up the position. Somewhat less pointed however, while also demonstrating a useful, though unwitting, interpretation of ‘intertextuality’ was her observation / potentially uncertain assumption, of what may well have been her pupils’ naturally learned capability: ‘Trained to chant and remember large chunks of the Koran’, they were able to relate the exact details of how many villains and bordars [less advantaged early local peoples] of Dewsbury were in the story. In a further less positive frame, when invited to ask questions these revealed what, for Slack, amounted to her Moslem pupils seeing work as ‘an end in itself’ – apparently a sentiment constructed upon our perceptions of the ‘East’ and theirs about the ‘West’ with a questioning view toward ‘child labour’, somewhat in the realm of inconsistencies / cultural “incongruities” explored by Edward Said, and with a tinge of exoticism.

Again, our (Western) practice, of teachers’ prompting answers from pupils, drew what Slack saw as ‘a frenzy of apprehension’: they (the Moslem pupils) having thought their answers were predetermined and ‘having to guess what was in the teacher’s mind’ with the potential that (without empathy) objectivity
would less likely be sustained. Yet, the teacher assumptions seem somewhat out of proportion to the contexts they inhabit, and reveal a mind potentially working too hard for interpretations that were not necessarily there. Other similar observations derived from the pupils’ learned behaviours in the English classroom: ‘Well-schooled in creative writing, with the class teacher, they indulged in fanciful and not entirely accurate interpretations of (historical) material’. Here, Slack’s apparent appreciation of her pupils’ creative writing abilities appears, at the same time, to miss the real work (of their class teacher of English) behind their achievement. Evidently second-guessing her pupils, Slack’s observation was: ‘Once the idea was grasped, their deductive capacity was very creditable’. Whether these observations somehow suggest some uncertainty as to the pupils’ perceived abilities is unclear. This, seemingly, is a case where a face-to-face interview, Clifford Geertz’s ethnographical participant-observer’s view, may well have contributed new knowledge, un-available in a documentary research. It is also possible, correspondingly, that any question one may have as a researcher, in this regard, derives from a potentially overactive sense of fairness and balance invested in an over-driven search to achieve evenly weighted / balanced approaches, across the institutions. The unexpected arose from having decided to focus on inanimate classroom texts. However this unexpected methodological inconsistency, regarding pedagogy, requires consideration beyond the scope need and resources, of this chapter and study. For the moment, it must be conceded that learning is a continuing process there for achievement, similarly, among teachers.
Faced with such generalisations, it is notable that the early Association membership considered their founding project holistically. In addressing the inclusive approach toward diversity and ‘race’ in history learning and teaching, the latter-day Association’s had as a model the inclusive principles underlying its first mission statement. This embraced:

all forms of history teaching, the collection and distribution of information, providing local centres for the discussion of questions relating to the study and teaching of History and making these known to all who had a place in the control of education.\textsuperscript{17}

This entailed ‘cooperation in common objects shared with other similar subject-institutions’ and these would be re-echoed among future generations of HA membership. More particularly, it further entailed ‘keeping those who are working in schools in touch with work being done at the Universities’.\textsuperscript{18} This practice was naturally and purposefully adopted and sustained by present-day Academe.

1979\textsuperscript{19}

Adapting these given principles to the concept of World History as diversity, during 1979\textsuperscript{20} reflected what may be seen both as a personal, and inherently collective interest, in an apparently long-lived institutional cause. Indeed, the HA’s foregrounding of World History has been a sustained interest in arguably all editions of TH from its first publication in 1969 and like its counterpart publication for Academia, History, both publications covered aspects from the humble advert for a range of disciplinary “necessities” - historical texts / general resources, discourses on the simplest core of interests to the loftiest
of essays all toward an appreciation of the genre. These latter have been presented as monograph pamphlets by their given authors. And in keeping with the HA founding mission there was a regular flow of information to all quarters, ranging from maps, illustrations announcements of public meetings\textsuperscript{21} all open to interested readers, text-books or everyday events worthy of the pursuit of history-reading learning and / or, teaching.\textsuperscript{22} Returning substantively to the aforementioned Henderson reference, at this point on the “narrative calendar”, two substantive World History texts are featured in this investigation. These come stylistically from very different authors, confirming / reaffirming to an extent, the so far broadly based institutional practice, by the HA up to this point, of reading ‘diversity’ in Britain, of this post-Second World War period, as being ‘reflections’ of the global context during the period at least, of the lifespan of TH. Foremost among the author-historian output then was J. L. Henderson’s discourse on The Teaching of World History (1979). The above foregoing observation notwithstanding, this work of Henderson also signalled the end of World History, per se, serving as a signifier of a ‘multicultural’ and global developments.

By way of an intervening ‘stock-take’ of the period 1979 to 1982 on the paths taken by the HA as independent makers of (‘potentially private’) policy, affecting their own particular area and purpose, some account is given on a period of what seems to have been primarily, of reflection. Necessarily, the HA’s overarching promotion of history involved awareness of historical skills and their application, geared toward its understanding through factual knowledge, and interpretation, all achievable through a broad portfolio
committed to historical skills as inherent in historical thinking. These aspects continued as on-going concerns. Indeed, pivotal in the early HA repertory of ideas, branch meetings were also conveyed personally through conferences, set meetings and meeting-places, local and correspondingly, some distance away. The commonly prized discourse and the very constant, ‘forum for debate’ Teaching History, remains true to its traditional cause (of a universally-British historically-grounded education) notwithstanding its present-day beginning in-role as a unifying agency between both the past Association and the present Academy. The very institutional existence of TH, echoing its older academic counterpart History, confirms the reality of this concept.

For the HA, the period 1979 through April 1981, and into early-1982 was a period of particularly mixed action as well as being of varied institutional and educational significance. First, it represents the continuing importance of World History to the Association and second, it brings to the institution opportunity for a high profile institutional reappraisal of the Association’s past. This extended to ultimately strengthening links through a useful exposition of the impact of that past upon the history curriculum with the post-1948 society in mind. That past, duly celebrated on the 75th anniversary of the Association’s foundation, provided an important forum through which to advance the debate, in April of 1981.

Correspondingly, 1982 constitutes the ultimate advance upon that brief moment of transition following Killingray’s philosophical observations on others’ cultures, tentatively advanced by Slack. While Slack’s curriculum
breakthrough was yet in its infancy - evident in her constrained religious and cultural references, and un-substantiated generalizations of the girls' unwillingness ‘to join in simulated war games’- the more confident lived-in contributions of a new generation of young historians were coming into view in widened curriculum. Alongside this, the British convention of tolerance would be facing a potential threat to its given significance. This meant the voicing of doubts otherwise conceptualised. Writing during the “mid-term” mark of the HA tenure, at the high-point of its established tradition, Dyer’s History in a multi-cultural society, of 1982 [unlike that of Henderson] and located conceptually in a world of its own, presented something of a sting-in-its-tail. This stance shouldn't go un-noticed. Indeed, it pointed up a sense of British supremacy which stood to divide rather than bring groups together in the real world. By 1982, the February edition of Teaching History was outward-looking toward building bridges in a brief but spirited involvement in “multicultural” innovation (as popularly defined in ‘cultural practice’), albeit without the customary direct foray into ‘race thinking’.23

An established historian educationist of note in his own right, Henderson’s approach, unlike Dyer’s, is closely involved with the issues of learning and teaching in history (as advocated by the early Historical Association). This similarly gave particular regard to content and method. Conceding that this approach required a degree of value judgment, behind the decision to teach World history, Henderson suggests, in the manner of his founding counterparts, that every effort be made to counter subjectivity and achieve an element of objectivity. Speaking in a somewhat figurative voice, and quoting
social-historian, Arnold Toynbee, Henderson reasons that: ‘Living in a global village demands some knowledge of that village’s common ancestry’. The implicit reference to recognizing diversity is noted, insofar as it was expedient and, to the extent that it was possible to acquaint oneself with related knowledge available, in the absence of some formal provision. The implications, here, for the less well prepared teacher were real. Yet, mindful of the scope of the area with which he grapples, Henderson concedes that ‘Twentieth century history is literally unintelligible except on a canvas of the whole of Planet Earth’. And as if both justifying his advocacy of this genre and its place within contemporary British society - mindful of the particular prevailing new demography, Henderson again cites historian Arnold Toynbee’s Study of History:

Our own descendants are not going to be just Westerners like ourselves. They are seen as heirs to a range of thinkers, philosophers, statesmen and religious leaders, from Confucius, Socrates, and Plato, to Buddha, Gandhi, Lenin, Cromwell and George Washington.25

Even more relevant today, than it was no doubt seen to be then, Henderson’s ‘Whole Earth’ perspectives correspond, aptly, with Toynbee’s. More, pointing to an aspect of educational practice frequently edged out by considerations of space, Henderson’s pedagogy takes account of the psychological aspects of learning, breaking down his discussion into elements reflecting the different dimensions, according to age intake across the phases in schooling. Indeed, in line with standard practice / convention of this period, Henderson’s progression in approaches to teaching is closely married with former
sylabuses of external Examination Boards across Britain, and indeed abroad.

A brief look at the ‘Late secondary level’ element bears this out:

The obvious model for any teacher responsible for such courses is either to select one of the Advanced Level syllabuses already being offered, or to devise and submit one of his own for acceptance by an appropriate Examination Board. Cambridge has had a paper on World Affairs since 1939, while a London paper based on syllabus D offers World History since 1931.26

Tempering any inclination toward “inflexibility” in a context where there is much (formal) learning involved, and reflecting the wealth of his experience, Henderson includes project work and other less formal classroom techniques, including the use of literary works / historical fiction as well as the standard school texts. Continuous assessment serves to better gauge pupils’ progress by means of ‘periodic stock taking’… alongside the eventual knitting together of the separate pieces of individual and group research into a composite whole. By such means the teacher can ‘legitimately aspire, in one term’s work on these lines, to have enabled his students to fit in for themselves an extremely important piece into the jig-saw of world history’. A specific example of this is provided ‘in the European-African-American context’, relevant to students of the day. Not seeking to mask the less noble acts of the foremost ‘history makers’ of the recent past, such approaches were seen also to apply ‘in many parts of the world where the exploitation of slave by master has taken place, and if the question be ventilated – to the extent that some such still take place in the labour-camps of totalitarian societies’.27 There are evident links, here, with the University of Exeter
Professor Richard Overy’s Morbid Age: Britain between the Wars (2009). And here is a context relevant to such historians as those envisaged by the founding HA Professor Tout who so aptly envisaged an institution in which ‘we can also make ourselves an Association of students [scholars], a body desirous of furthering the study and investigation of history’, over time. Tout and his peers would have approved of Overy the long-standing historian scholar, designated in his own time as ‘a mighty figure, one of the great historians of the Second World War’.29

In some contrast to Henderson’s cumulative grasp of the World History project, Dyer, A. M. (1982), Head of History at St. Mary’s College, Strawberry Hill, through his History in a multi-cultural society enters the conceptual exchange by way of a challenge against British history being rejected by virtue of its being White, and thereby, as it were “throwing out the baby with the bath water”. His suggested re-definition of ‘world’ is inherent in pupils’ understanding of ‘the world in which they live - [in as much as] the world in which most people live most of the time is their home, their street, their place of work’. It constitutes that world which they must first understand. Potentially revealing his privileging of Britain or, the reality of what his / our ‘world’ may be seen to constitute, Dyer expands with what he sees as diplomacy:

The primary context of this world and the primary influencing factor in determining its quality is the country in which it is located – the way it is governed, the rights of its citizens, its customs, heritage and values, its economic state, its place in the wider world, the nature and origins of its citizens.30
Apt as this observation may be, particularly in the contexts of a 1940s or indeed, 1980s, or even present-day advocacy for courses in citizenship, there is room for an alternative view. Indeed, the questioning of multiculturalism, at the present time, and the growth of extremes in the foregrounding of people’s “own” cultural persuasions requires a re-balancing of Britain’s place in such contexts. The wheel has turned full circle. As Dyer put it, a ‘world history’ syllabus should not entail the fracturing of ‘the centre of gravity by scattering the content of history syllabus to a wide range of different countries all over the world’. Whether his justification may be found sufficient in today’s macro-technologically minded, knowledge-based and information-hungry world is uncertain. Even with all its riches (of the world’s cultures) ‘here in England’, containing ‘the richest source, the widest range and the most easily accessed historical evidence’ other riches might just as easily be reached, within or, outside England. Such potential abounds, particularly in the contexts of history and history teaching delivered objectively and by means even of pocket educational-media screens.

This is not to suggest, however, that new learning and teaching productively is not already afoot with actors being content merely to await a distant future. There is potential here even for problem-solving techniques toward wider understanding in today’s classrooms. Such activity-driven approaches may be taken from the design stage of given counter-activity programmes, toward the tools required for achieving decision-making processes. The matter of topics themes that learner-designers may expect to require solving may necessarily be introduced for given purposes in hand. Keywords like
‘diversity’, ‘empathy’, ‘difference’, ‘peer group’ arising from a brainstorm may be a useful start.

This may deny ‘race thinking’ the vitality through which it continues being sustained. It may well involve new ways of thinking and new ways of learning. Such aspects may be explored on transformational lines to the extent that ‘race’ ultimately withstands taking the lead in discourses of humankind. It is apparently in this light that proponent, Keith Robbins of the University of Glasgow, spoke in the early 1980s. This discourse followed the lines of thinker-philosophers from Confucius, Socrates, and Plato, to Buddha, Gandhi, Lenin, Cromwell and George Washington’, via Henderson, in the earlier reminder that: ‘Our own descendants [were] not going to be just Westerners like ourselves’. Thus taking this narrative back, opportunely, to Robbins’ attempts at making ‘some assessment of the Association’s understanding of its past’, Robbins reminded his audience that ‘many of the questions which were asked at the outset have been repeated in succeeding generations’. 32

A suggestion here is that such questions were somehow left un-answered or, not fully appreciated, earlier. Thus, seeking to uncover any connections, lessons that may be learned at the present time, from Robbins’ queries as framed, I examine the original tenor of historical sources he cites. Robbins’ queries on the Association’s story go back to the years 1962, 1958, and 1947. Indeed, as he suggests in the closing observation of his lecture: ‘Whether the Historical Association should again consider what kind of national past is
“usable” in present circumstances may be contentious’ … Yet such consideration can only be done ‘in the light of its own history’.33

The tenor of this whole represents a strong and lasting legacy of the past convention of social responsibility, on the part of present-day historians. In this vein, Robbins laments the fact that the issues of which he spoke had largely disappeared from the pages of History. Among his earlier references, from a key woman historian, Eileen Power (1889-1940), in her Teaching of History and World Peace was the strong suggestion that ‘no child ought to leave school without knowing something of the history of the world’. However, ‘it was just as important that he [/she] should understand the place of his [/her] country within the larger whole (TH 41, 1985), [of humankind], swept by great movements common at least to Europe’. There’s a tinge of irony, here.

Clearly, after a Second World War and other intervening world-changing events, the World [is now] even closer to, and within, the wider global reach and general experience, making Power’s observation34 even more pressing.

Referring to the ‘legion run of reports, surveys, recommendations and exhortations being published at different points across the nation, and thus creating a repository of “new” knowledge in multicultural curriculum’, the editors of TH 32 February 1982 draw readers’ attention to two of its strongest historian advocates for increasing diversity awareness, starting with contributors to this edition. There was recognition for the ‘inner core of committed teachers attempting to provide an education which caters for all children, including those who for one reason or another tend to feel alienated from society’. Two examples of projects, including one from Ian Grosvenor35
- then of the African-Caribbean support unit in the West Midlands, and another from Nigel File of the ILEA comprehensive, Tulse Hill School, in south London, among the 1982 collective, are rehearsed later in this chapter.

Other contributors in this TH 32 edition include, Margaret and David Killingray, whose contribution serves as a potential hallmark for the inclusion, or indeed hegemony, of British cultures alongside others. Purposefully discussing The Role of History in Multicultural Education, Edgington's active broadly 1970s to 1980s article, similarly represents different phases across the educational domain. Here, each contribution from 'new' writers, like all precedent, is followed by a brief biographical profile. These indicate something of the part played by personal subjectivity and biography in shaping both the individual contributions and the collective ethos / ethic, characterising both the producers and their texts. It also locates the author-historians within the scope of multiple culturally-informed thought, history writing and pedagogy. The collaborative Killingray piece flows naturally from the editorial addressing the wider issues and surrounding diversity. It is an approach which goes much below the surface issues, is more deep-seated in approaching the concept of ‘difference’ culturally, from the strong base of British institutions. This is manifest in the intertextuality, Fairclough’s aptly defined intersection of other developing cultural forms on the horizon. Yet:

An understanding of our cultural traditions and heritage is important so that our child can place herself in a chain of social development and begin to understand something of the society in which she lives and the way that institutions have evolved and are evolving. Thus some knowledge of British societies and history is vital … so that she will also be able to accommodate to and
at times challenge and attempt to change the social and political order that will be her lot after we have gone.\textsuperscript{37}

Aware of the wealth of other civilizations, at first hand, team Killingray is equally conscious of the need for a grasp of English history ‘to aid appreciation of their (English) heritage, under assault, because the microcosms with all their rich diversity make up the larger society’. Therefore history must be appreciated in all its variety:

‘History from above’ as well as ‘history from below’, also a study of the past must touch with respect, and integrate with more parochial interests, the great abundance of cultural riches that Asia, Africa, the Americas, as well as Europe have contributed to the common fortunes of mankind.\textsuperscript{38}

Reference to the riches of cultural heritage, here, appropriately signals the theme of a later editorial, TH 41, 1985, freshly exploring varying notions of ‘heritage’, with attempts to broaden its scope beyond the more frequently discussed symbolic status of a purely nationalistic, potentially hierarchical, kind of ‘heritage’. These written historical outcomes comprise the second collective of textual contributions from a further range of educators. They are involved in broadening the historical discourse beyond the immediate restrictions of particular stratified social groups, whether relating to social class gender, or indeed ‘race’. This overview heralds the broader analysis.

Extending influence in the appreciation of ‘others’ cultures, through the ‘Role of History in Multicultural Education’, David Edgington, a researcher at Sussex University, with connections to the Commonwealth Institute, 1978-79, studied history at London University. He taught in East and West Africa, in London
Comprehensive schools and at Avery Hill College. He is, at the time of his writing in Teaching History, holder of a Fellowship at SOAS. A member of the ILEA Central Advisory Staff, the thrust of his observations was that ‘history can be vital in enabling children to gain a more informed understanding of the complex world in which they are living. They should also gain a greater respect for other periods and other societies’. Of interest to my foregrounding of ‘attitudes’ in interpersonal behaviours is Edgington’s reference to the affective qualities. He sees a role for healing in history, for multicultural curriculum, clearly bearing in mind the various examples of inhumane action humans have committed upon each other over time. Similar to the concerns of Killingray, Edgington highlighted miss-information about other countries and cultures. Whether history ever reaches the point where it may be thought that such views are now outmoded is uncertain but in the 1980s, Edgington was still impelled to write against projecting the prevailing portrayal of Africa in terms of ‘a hot primitive land’… steaming jungles’ and other portrayals reminiscent of graphic cartoons of a fictional past. It was indeed in 1977, that Killingray wrote his cautionary note about seeing the validity of others’ cultures, texts and contexts.

For Nigel File, also sharing his ILEA perspectives with the HA readership, his experimental design of a Black Studies course, provided insights into a role for Black history in the context of multicultural education, also in 1982. Very much an insider’s view, File takes on board understandings gained from his pupils. He sees this role as enabling valuable insights toward ‘better understanding of the society we live in’.
drawn and to the point. What is striking, progressively evident across the featured texts, is how affected and touched these authors seem to have become from having been in contact with Black people, individuals and groups, of whom they write. Besides the ‘usual range of [historical] skills and concepts’, the Tulse Hill course aims to ‘inform the student about the roots of many of the issues to be faced in the world. Mindful also of the potential for ‘distortions of others’ culture and civilization - a negative legacy of Britain’s imperial past of ‘assumptions and stereotypes’ - the Tulse Hill course was concerned with narratives that were ‘challenging and dispelling ignorance’, looking at ‘major world societies in Europe, Africa, India, China, the Caribbean, North Africa and South America’. In terms of Britain’s long-standing contact with ‘non-whites as settlers in Britain’,^42 File collaborates with teaching colleague Chris Power, in producing a survey of earlier Black contact and settlement in the south London area of Lambeth, comparing and contrasting earlier trends with those of the present day. These range from Victorian education in Lambeth, development of transport in South London and an account of Black personalities linked with the area’, to reviews of past residents like Dr Johnson, associated with Streatham, his black servant and legatee Frances Barber, Shakespearian actor Ira Aldridge, composer Samuel Taylor-Coleridge, and Pan-Africanist Mayor of Battersea, J. R. Archer.^43 The point being made here is that these Black Britons were not simply a burden to the State but had much to contribute in their own right. A repository for the accompanying pilot collection of multicultural contributions, TH 32 February 1982 historian Ian Grosvenor’s multicultural course, while an employee of the
Sandwell Borough Council’s Afro-Caribbean Support Unit, referred to at his earlier introduction as a proponent of inclusive historical narratives of British history. Among Grosvenor’s wide collection of work is History and the Multicultural Curriculum: A Case Study, of 1982. This prefigured his later research projects highlighting, on the one hand, the historical consequences of the ‘racialisation’ of Black minorities in Britain, and, on the other hand, the positions of disadvantage endured by voiceless minorities of varying backgrounds. A part of this multicultural course included an archaeological dig in Trinidad holding much ‘valuable information about the earliest inhabitants, potential indigenes of the island’. Introducing the history of the Caribbean to pupils, in this way, was both an ‘interesting topic and worthwhile area of study’. It was important to make pupils aware of the nature of historical knowledge, the ‘propositions, procedures and concepts’ with which history is concerned’. In this the “know-how” rather than merely the “know-that” of the historical process was stressed as a contribution to a better appreciation of the historical process and the “objects”, aims / purpose, of its study. This entailed learners seeing how a real-life country like Trinidad was shaped, gathered together in a meaningful whole. It added coherence to the narrative with the found archaeological objects helping to illustrate the lifestyle of earliest inhabitants. At the same time for TH editors, it was imperative that learners should also come to know more about its people, living almost on their doorstep and across different parts of Britain. It was essential for urban youth also to know something of their more distant past as well as today. Projects like ‘an archaeological dig in Trinidad both inform and engage the
interests of learners. This notwithstanding, the new settlers must lose their sense of non-belonging, insofar as the recent social disturbances were believed to have arisen from not only the accompanying economic instability, but the non-recognition of the young people of minority-ethnic origin and their sense of non-belonging in Britain. The fact is that HA commentary on this situation, through TH co-editors, had indicated the need for an element of negotiation on all sides, inherent in which was a matter of ‘give and take’. However, there was a proviso:

This [was] not to suggest that the presence of ethnic or cultural (sub-cultural, for that matter) minorities should dictate what is [to be] taught in schools. But it is necessary that what is taught today, and not only in history, should attempt to equip youngsters with the tools, for understanding, and hopefully empathetically appreciating, the diversity and variety of the wider society in which they are going to live.47

By thus setting its store and playing its part, in line with other players in the HA initiative, ‘multicultural’ education, for the editorial team, had begun to come of age. Yet the demands of the project were not to be underestimated. This form of education was not only what went on in others’ classrooms. It also impacted directly upon the HA in relation to the needs of young people in Brixton, Southall and the other similarly ‘culturally-mixed’ areas, and in the challenges they posed to the whole country. Indeed, ‘rarely a week passes without some new statement about the need for curriculum innovation and new economic and social strategies to accommodate schools to a changed, and changing, society’

Much of this effort (toward change) is generated from the inner core of the larger urban areas where groups
of committed teachers and certain education authorities are attempting to provide an education which caters for all children, including those who for one reason or another tend to feel alienated from society.\textsuperscript{48}

Clearly, for Booth and Killingray, the HA needed to play its part in this role. Going further than had seemed possible some months earlier, the Booth-Killingray vision acknowledged HA history syllabuses as being ‘little changed in content [taken broadly], even if different in style and method’. More specifically, ‘all too often the picture presented in school history is of a monocultural Britain. St. Paul’s, Southall, Brixton and Toxteth might just as well be a thousand miles away’, so little thought was being given to these issues / parts of the country. Despite these limitations, or indeed, in the light of their being, the editors invited comments and reports of practice, as to how history might best be presented in schools to meet the challenges and needs of a multi-cultural society in the last two decades of the Twentieth century.\textsuperscript{49} That invitation would be taken up in weeks ahead. For the time being, the pilot contributions of Edginton, on the Role of History in Multicultural Education, Grosvenor’s case study, and Nigel Files’ special report represent a model introduction, and trigger, to the wider institutional project. These would ultimately usher in the ‘diverse heritage’ collective, demonstrative of not only the diversity being addressed in terms of the historical ‘art’ but of the variety of young people in the society needing to be reached, in the process.

Giving testimony to diverse kinds of heritage follows what were, effectively, the outcomes of the Booth-Killingray Editorial selling-point of TH 32 February 1982, in widened vistas on curriculum for the diverse others of society. The
more broadly interpreted ‘heritage’ collection that follows represents an advance upon an earlier, more narrowly ranged, understanding, of the term, somewhat archetypical to ‘National Heritage’. These further outcomes demonstrate an acknowledged interrelatedness between the various types of historical knowledge, apparently not considered hitherto. This collective represents a move toward dealing with what may be seen, on one level, as the core of the inner-most self, but part of the wider nation and hence may be understood, metaphorically and necessarily, as inherent in issues of belonging to the (British) nation. Outcomes represent a substantive addition, a balancing strategy to the more characteristic people-oriented contributions, of February 1982. The themed topic, heritage, is of particular relevance in its many guises, telling of a socially classless-oriented activity, as perceived.

On national identity?

Advancing that particular commemorative occasion above from the Institution’s foundation and early history, a review of the narrative re-traces decades of social-educational change, patterns of thought, and perspectives in social responsibility induced by post-war international determination for world peace. This sense would be further challenged by Black colonial immigration and concerns over British / English national identity. This feeling would be overplayed to the extent that ‘a single shared national narrative [became] the major constituent of national identity’. And the outcome of this thinking was ‘both a cause and consequence of the weakening of the hold of
the [British] nation state itself’, prompted by ‘the decline in the attraction and conviction flowing from these [negative] accounts’.

1985

Taking up the gauntlet in the evident challenge to teachers, Mike Gibson at the time of this publication was deputy leader of the B Ed Course, at Kingston Polytechnic. He researched the concept of development and the primary school child. In A Royal Palace, his starting point, Gibson shows how ‘fragmentary evidence can be utilised and developed to engage pupils in problem solving, hypothesising, and empathetic reconstruction’. In particular, Gibson demonstrates how ‘fieldwork outside school can motivate work in school, using texts and documents that many considered would be too difficult for pupils in the top class of a middle school’. One of the aims in treating the wide variety of locations is to open up learners’ understanding of the broad definitions both of ‘history’ and ‘heritage’. The terms are used inclusively, without being limited to particular concepts of status of any kind.

Advancing the theme in this light, Gillian Pearson, a former press officer at the Jorvik Viking Centre, has the advantage of experience at first hand, being responsible for liaison with schools. She presents this enrichment of the Nation’s Heritage through contact with and the resources of an immigrant community’s cultural and social interaction. This represents a substantive contribution to the nation, a moment of strong intertextuality and social enjoyment from a culture which left a legacy of a less happy experience, at its first point of contact. The point is made that, while activities may not easily be
emulated in the classroom, visits by thousands of school parties to the Viking Town at York provide concrete evidence, of the positive dimensions of immigrant interaction of this kind. With skilful handling, such an experience provides a successful means of developing children’s thinking. Out of the classroom, visitors can ‘take a real ride into the past and smells and sound can be induced’,\textsuperscript{52} a real means of satisfying ‘that ever-abiding historical objective – empathy’.

In a style of his own, Victor Kelly, a text contributor with experience in educational broadcasting was formerly a schools broadcasting officer, in the BBC Northern Ireland Schools Broadcasting Office. Here, with the sectarian ‘troubles’ in mind, Kelly considers which version of Irish history he should project, a common heritage or prime distinctions, recognising both the need for a ‘faithful presentation of Loyalist and Republican viewpoints’. Kelly wonders whether learners might not be better occupied, focusing on topics which unite rather than divide them, thus invoking ‘an awareness of a common heritage’.\textsuperscript{53} Clearly, the aim is not to provide definitive answers, but rather to stimulate thought, with scope for learners also to consider issues deeply. Nevertheless, with an informed knowledge and understanding of the subject matter, the Irish ‘troubles’, Kelly topically provides a useful area for development from other starting points, having witnessed “difference” studied by countless diverse community groups, over time. A common thread may be found in this sub-theme, alongside other forms of conflict in real life contexts, as in history writing.
Ian Jones, likewise, draws upon his experience as a school’s Deputy Head, in Penzance, with special responsibility for curriculum development and organisation. He discusses the limitations of a traditional syllabus in narrowly interpreting the past, insofar as it ‘often ignores working-class solidarity and underplays its achievements … an essential if inadequately recorded segment, of our national heritage’.54 This links thematically, with the industrial monument discussed by Karen Done, Done, a former history teacher uses her current position, as Education officer at the Macclesfield Silk Museum to draw attention similarly, to ‘An expanding breed of museum’ – the industrial monument. Silk is Macclesfield’s heritage, saved for posterity by funding from the Manpower Services Commission [MSC]. ‘Fruitful collaboration between industry, the MSC, heritage and education’ is something that Booth (in his overview of this collective) believes can be nurtured and developed.55 The point is made, without necessarily problematizing the matter of class: Inclusion and the valuing of others is what matters in this presentation. Textual analogies, in terms of social class, may be formed with ‘race’. For social class, like ‘race’ itself, is open to undertones of inferiority / superiority, the lesser endowed and the more affluent, the sophisticated and the gauche, whether socially, academically or vocationally, and onward. In an imaginative prevocational and examinable course Martin Burgess, Head of History and Human Studies at an 11-16 comprehensive school of 900 pupils, together with his department, worked out ‘an acceptable scheme for pupils both on traditional examination courses and an imaginative (alternative curriculum) prevocational one’.56 As Booth further suggests from his editors’
perspective, this approach answers well to those requests made of teachers, to consider other approaches to curriculum such as the core of a framework proposed by the City and Guilds Institute (largely providers of vocational, employment approved courses). Like Burgess, Booth considers it a version of heritage fitting naturally into the industrial, social and environmental category, of heritage. In The TVEI explored: History and the move toward the Vocational, Burgess enters into the topical domain of the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative [TVEI] confirming from his experience, that ‘History can survive the move toward the vocational, if teachers are on the alert with [similar] concrete proposals’. They further maintain that scope for ‘the successful integration of History into prevocational courses [is] more widespread than many history teachers appear to acknowledge’. More, ‘our English heritage, in the fullest sense … can add a rich dimension and History can still play an important part in the core curriculum of the 1990s if initiatives of this nature are widely emulated’. Clearly, multiculturalism need not be seen as consistent only with distant shores or ever-divergent pathways, nor even narrowly conceived topical areas.


Demonstrating something of the HA’s global outreach, and how understanding of the ‘local’ may not necessarily constitute a ‘common’ / ‘identical’ experience, Killingray’s paper ‘History Teaching in Central Africa’ indicates the wealth of material from one area of the developing world and
that ‘Teaching History’ also serves teachers in ‘local’ areas of the ‘English speaking countries of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean’. A previously established undertaking is revisited by joint Editors Martin Booth and David Killingray, with Margaret Killingray, who together, on behalf of the overseas reader ‘are also keen that the journal should become a forum for practising [overseas] teachers’. They invite ‘comments on the articles published, suggestions of possible topics and course contributions’. Thus, in broadening the discussions into representations of Africa’s many religions Richard Thames, on site, leads an engagement with many aspects of ‘Islam in history’, its resources, and educational sites of its practice. Among these are ‘African history in the classroom’, by David Killingray, and ‘History in Central Africa’, by Brian Garvey and Mary Krug of the Education Department, University of Zambia. Followed through the intrinsic interest of its authors, these aspects also demonstrate commitment to extending and sustaining the awareness towards cultures, beyond meanings immediately at hand.

Posing answerable questions from the few slave records available, David Killingray asks: How did Africans regard slavery (at the time) and what part did they take? How did slaves respond to slavery in the Americas? To what extent was African culture transferred across the Atlantic? His Review Article treating a large selection of School Books on African history challenges a popular belief, then, of a shortage of history books on Africa. These cover courses for post-colonial Africa, most ‘sensibly written, attractively produced and sensibly priced’. Some were highly recommended, others falling short by attempting to be too ‘comprehensive for a set text’. This resulted in large tracts
of narrative history being ‘devoid of extracts from the wide range of source material’. Discussing ways to approach the “popular” topic of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, Killingray’s range of suggested questions disproved claims as to the sparseness of source material, one reason for the prevailing European perspectives. A more distinctly individual view is taken by Lecturer in Multicultural Studies, at Manchester Polytechnic, Mary Searle-Chattergee whose paper, ‘Lancashire Textiles & the Indian Connection: History teaching in a multicultural society’ was mentioned in the Joint Editorial of the October edition of TH. According to joint-editors, Martin Booth and Sallie Purkiss, Chattergee’s article ‘raises questions as to the role of history in any multicultural curriculum’. Chattergee urges for the provision of a ‘good education, whether or not Britain is a multi-cultural society. Chattergee’s concerns surround the scope that exists in the shared enterprise, and aspects of which she describes as a ‘clash of viewpoints’. Each side of the shared project presents and presses their particular issues, from their respective viewpoints, with little inclination to compromise. She critiques the idea that multicultural education is a function of the presence of a Black community. Yet the fact that British state education needed the Black Presence before policymakers were prompted to include, in their education profile, aspects of the variety of humankind and their cultures, does not mean that such inclusion is for Blacks only.

In Searle-Chattergee’s view ‘the inadequacies teachers encountered, in their education, also contribute to problems encountered in school classrooms today’. She regrets the lack of knowledge of the history of the textiles industry,
particularly the ‘rise to greatness of the Lancashire cotton industry’ the silence of any acknowledgement of the ‘longstanding chain of interconnections with the Indian textile industry’ despite the series of machine inventions developed in the second half of the eighteenth century’ – the Industrial Revolution – which she cites as the reason for the Lancashire industry’s success. Chatterjee ends with a question: Can it be that by transmitting historical imagery of this kind we are contributing to the self-deception and head-in-the-sand mentality which, our rulers suggest makes us inflexible in a changing world? 65 Of equal significance is the tenor of the editorial, citing Swann’s concern over the lack of awareness, of ‘teachers in schools with few or no ethnic minority pupils and over the pupils’ corresponding lack of awareness. The editors similarly lamented the Swann Report’s not being ‘more outspoken on this subject’, to the detriment of “all-white” schools.66

At the time of publication, Sneh Shah was a senior lecturer in the School of History at Hatfield Polytechnic, Hertfordshire College of Higher Education, and Editor of History with a Sense of Purpose: classroom approaches. The aim here was to make such approaches appropriate to historical development. Entering the debate from a ‘multicultural, multiracial, and anti-racist’, perspective Shah addresses ‘relevant issues’ in History and Inter-Cultural Education. His focus is on four themes including: first, ‘The equality of all groups’, his second focus may be encapsulated as ‘Accepting diversity as a site for learning,’ the third embraces ‘Working toward achieving equal opportunities’ and the fourth addresses ‘Opposing any form of discrimination, racialism’. Shah’s starting point was a definition of these criteria revisited
following a seminar in the Netherlands, in June 1985, taken from the group definition of ‘inter-cultural’, which was seen to require fulfilling criteria and based on:

the equality of different individuals and groups; accepting cultural and linguistic diversity as a source for learning; avoiding ethnocentrism; aiming to achieve equal opportunities and [being] therefore opposed to any form of discrimination, racialism, etc.67

The last two criteria are seen as resulting from the first two, but are mentioned separately, and seen as learning about other cultures only insofar as ‘intercultural education will not bring about any change’.68 Shah draws attention to the two decades of multicultural education, under its various titles reflecting ‘race’ and anti-racism, observing that even in 1985 we were reading, in the Swann Report69 that little attempt was being made in teaching history to reflect Britain’s diverse society or to represent it in teaching.

Concluding observations

This chapter examined the founding principles of the Historical Association and texts produced by teaching members involved with groups holding an interest in, or having worked among, Black colonials newly settled in Britain. This element of the post-1948 diverse society also included potential representatives of the institutional investigations, of the period 1976-1988. Such interactive mix of experience will not have been considered likely at the time of the Association’s founding or even part of its early vision and purpose. As has been shown in the textual analyses, it was 1982 before the attention of joint-editors Martin Booth and David Killingray of Teaching History turned
toward responding to the needs of the new settlers, their education and enhanced sense of belonging. Nevertheless, in working toward the cause of history, and with a new generation providing scope for a new modality in thinking, toward reform in texts for history curriculum, the potential for innovative thinking and objective history writing was realised. Informed by the presence, post-1948, of Black and other minority ethnic, colonial / post-colonial, settlers, it was the establishment of the journal, Teaching History, which provided an influential ‘forum for debate’ giving teacher members access to texts carrying exemplars of good practice and fresh ideas in history writing and teaching. Insofar as this period (1976-1988) saw development(s) in education as structurally echoing social, demographic and political events in wider society, this chapter sought to uncover whether the extent to which, and ways in which, ‘race’ was being addressed in light of the diverse society proved influential.

Building on the structures set initially in addressing ‘difference’, it was found that the HA took the Black presence as an opportunity to make a difference across the British / English society. This extended to ways in which history writing and its teaching might be developed. As signalled, in the initial narrative, texts revealed an early uncertainty by author-contributors, pre- and into 1979. This was evident in their restraint toward potentially alienating discourses of race, their objectivity in discussion of teachers’ work among members and on behalf of learners in their charge, at whatever level of education. This style was coupled with generalised approaches in World History and members’ continuing involvement with developing countries.
overseas. More serious attempts at innovation were made between 1982 and 1987. Following the publication of the Scarman, and the Swann, Reports, and ‘pilot’ features by member-historians, other more directly ‘race’-informed elements entered the HA repertoire, particularly initiatives by Africanist-historian David Killingray, Ian Grosvenor and their peers. Some advantage was found in that many of these historians had had incidental experience of working among some of the newly settled immigrant peoples. The initial impact in writing was promoted and taken forward by TH joint-editors Martin Booth and David Killingray, from 1982 and into the later years of the research period.

In interpreting the HA position in this regard, connections were made first, between the historical / national convention of ‘holding back’ - not becoming involved in matters with which actors were not directly involved, but choosing the moment. This was particularly important in addressing issues of a ‘delicate’ nature. Second was the more positive convention, of social responsibility toward others, including the less fortunate and alienated groups.

Using some five themed signifiers to identify phases in the development of the institution’s journey, toward consolidating its evident sense of social responsibility, five phases marked the HA progress. These emerged to the extent that first: the institution’s operations were greatly structured around Teaching History, a ‘forum for debate’. That debate, secondly, was further advanced by the working knowledge freely gained through the involvement of the young historians, with the new settlers. Third, the HA’s constructive approach to ‘race’ assisted strategies set in place for the development of the
discipline and serving the cause of history productively. Tied in with these factors fourthly, was the direct acknowledgment of the Black presence historically, enhanced by convention through given demonstrations of social responsibility. This outlook ultimately became a natural matter of ‘healing’ (as identified by Edgington), countering earlier misdeeds like slavery and leading into, fifth, the otherwise prevailing sense of ‘race’ though less productively verging toward “outsider” group-alienation.

These elements were traced from increasing levels of textual response including, first: Other peoples’ cultures and embracing the ‘new’. The second, World History and diversity; third: History and the multicultural curriculum, led to fourth: History and Inter-Cultural Education: recognising our newest neighbours. Fifth, History and Inter-Cultural Education: diverse kinds of heritage ushered in the final, sixth: History and Inter-Cultural Education: trans-European Initiatives. These themes represent significant progress toward enhanced interpersonal relationships and attitudes among wider society, while providing scope in creating policy for learners in a changed social dynamic for history curriculum reform. It also becomes evident that extending upon the range of voices from ‘recruited’ author-historians like Edgington and Grosvenor provided a valuable thought-process that had formerly been absent. More, working on the positive side of ‘race’ stands to secure a rich and productive sense of real achievement beyond the more negative, soul-destroying, rehearsals of racist behaviours which, in themselves, tend to be negatively self-serving.
Chapter Nine

Conclusions

This study has focused upon the implications of ‘race’ in the disciplinary practise of history-teaching. The rapid growth in migration, post-1948, following the initial group of post-Second World War colonial servicemen arriving in Britain, both established and problematized the constituency of ‘race’ in very visible ways. I evaluated the work of key organizations concerned with history teaching: the Schools Council (SC), the Inner London Educational Authority (ILEA) and the Historical Association (HA).

In this closing chapter I draw together the prime outcomes of the investigation, explaining first how the SC, ILEA and the HA addressed ‘race’ in key texts. Second, I briefly review similarities and differences across the institutions their different contexts. Third from these findings, I draw a number of conclusions about these differences, which is to say, the ways in which the history, biography and culture of the chosen organisations influenced their contributions to the textual repertoire, in the history curriculum. The findings reflect influential aspects of each institution’s history and modus operandi, background circumstances, the interests of given historian-authors, and the personal and the institutional settings, which all had an impact upon texts produced.

The Schools Council
I highlight the position of the SC as both a potential leader in school curriculum and with its practice in-role historically as a ‘new co-operative machinery … of equal partners representing all the principal [British] education interests’¹ from its political inception.

I revisit the connections between institutions and history texts. Crucially, a key concern posed to the curriculum was that uncovered by the Schools Council Working Paper 50 pre-investigative project:

> We would welcome support in preparing children for life in a multiracial society for clearly, living as we do on the edge of an industrial city, most of these children will find their livelihood in a highly multiracial environment. Yet they are not growing up and being educated in, or to meet, this situation.²

Another response took a different angle in seemingly denying the importance of an educational response to race at all:

> There has always been a multiracial society in this country. Why should we suddenly start preparing children for it? To assume that any preparation is necessary is I think, to assume that our present society is inflexible, which it isn’t. Continuous discussion of our racial differences in culture and tradition serves only to perpetuate them. Children living together will create their own future.³

Evidently ‘feeding into’ the tenor and purpose of the coming major exploration of ‘race’ in the Education for a Multiracial Society project, 1981, such observations were but the start in a progressively unfolding range of further conceptualisations that were coming to the fore.

Significantly following the course of other SC ongoing textual events, beyond the body of work under close examination here, various subject specialists contributing to a conference in 1981 on the theme, ‘Improving the System':
Examing in a Multicultural Society’, were commissioned to write detailed reviews of their respective 16+ examination responses within their subject areas. This theme referred particularly to the needs of a multicultural society. The outcome was a body of work relating to general and subject-specific national criteria for new examinations. Publications included Nigel Files’ Assessment in a Multicultural Society, History at 16+: A discussion document, 1983, itself a robust work. And issues surrounding other preceding works, as above, were brought together and discussed, by Files. Similarly, Willey’s ‘Teaching in Multicultural Britain’ 1982, constitutes a digest carrying teaching initiatives by and for teachers. Overall these texts bear out the reality of a diverse society already in existence. A number of key texts have been analysed in relation to my key themes.

SC History-Humanities Integrated Project, 8-13 led by Alan Blyth and colleagues and based at the School of Education of the University of Liverpool (1971-1975) followed a seemingly measured approach distinct from the more outwardly anti-‘race’-thinking directness of the Brittan-Townsend (later solely Brittan) Education for a Multiracial Society 1973-1976. The information-gathering forerunner of the major EMS product, SC Working Paper 50, covering a six-month period in 1973, proved influential. Having assessed the need and scope for discussing ‘race’, the resulting project recognized the wide implications for multiracial Britain.

Yet other exploratory and instructional SC institutional texts included Alma Craft’s Multicultural Education, 1982; Schools Council Pamphlet 18: Multi-ethnic Education: the Way Forward, 1981; and Schools Council Pamphlet 19,
Education of Children from Ethnic Groups, 1982. All of these covered aspects of teaching ‘race’ in a positive manner. Similarly instructive, the Schools Council Programme 5 Series of major projects, ‘Improving the System: Examining in a Multicultural Society’, the outcome of a conference (Report 1981), with final publication in 1983. Contributors comprised a cross-curricular group of educationists, representatives of the GCE and CSE examining boards, teachers, HMI, and others actively engaged in multicultural curriculum and related examination development. Significantly these discussed the relationship between examining and the needs of a multicultural multi-racial society. Following this conference, various subject specialists were commissioned to write detailed reviews of 16+ examination responses in their subject areas, with particular reference to the needs of a multicultural society. The outcome of this was a body of work relating to general and subject-specific national criteria, for new examinations. Among the outcomes were Nigel Files’ Assessment in a Multicultural Society, 1983. Issues surrounding the preceding works above, were brought together and discussed, by Files. Overall these texts, alongside Willey’s 1982 digest, bear out the reality of the initial post-Second World War diverse society.

The extended body of published texts indicate the relevance, purpose and ‘race’-informed nature of the SC contribution to the history curriculum for a diversifying society. The convergence of history / humanities curriculum into an effective disciplinary category was demonstrated. This understanding impacted upon the development through the accompanying examination-related texts. It illustrated the extent to which social diversity was coming to
influence many other, if not most, aspects of everyday life and institutional educational practice.

Again, institutional texts such as ‘Place, Time and Society 8-13’, 1975 / ’76, and SC Humanities Project, 1976, Curriculum Planning in History, Geography and Social Science, the Project’s introductory guide / ‘basic publication’, bear out these developments. The contributing team-writers, Elliott, Waplington and Sumner, were specialists in Geography, History and Social Science respectively. Their joint resonant portrayal of ‘movement’ in two concise units of the PTS project provided pertinent details of the post-war immigration experience of ‘People on the Move: (a) The Irish to Liverpool’ 4 alongside (b) ‘A West Indian Family Moves to Birmingham’. 5

‘What is History?’ 6 Schools Council History Project 13-16 [SCHP 13-16], with a Teachers’ Guide (Holmes McDougall Ltd., of Edinburgh), 1976 and Introductory Unit: People in the Past was one key text. Another was SC History 13-16 Project: A Handbook, representing the range of themes and issues studied, alongside the 1979 Modern History Series. Together these introduced a series of topics and new educational attitudes directed toward the history curriculum, and became a vehicle to promote heightened disciplinary discussion.

The narratives address people entering Britain from different countries, some discussing their everyday experiences in their former homelands prior to migration. Addressing ‘race’ also meant expressly teaching current affairs, providing geographical narratives, whether distant or close at hand, of the Middle East or Eire.
The ILEA

In the 1970s, having acknowledged the colonial immigrant presence in a relatively conventional (‘race’-free) mode, the ILEA then articulated ‘race’ in new directions. Textually its early content was apparently objective, essentially free from the confrontation of the subsequent decade. The 1970 World History geographical-historical social-scientific series was strongly representative of a somewhat social-historical and geographical background, approach. Topics ranged geographically from the Caribbean to Papua New Guinea in attempting to be historically representative of the various peoples and world cultures already recognised by or entering Britain. As was inferred from historical BBC education commentary, incomers held in common the experience of mass immigration being received with a ‘curious’ welcome or restrained rejection.

Post-1970/75, ILEA narratives explicitly recounted ‘race’ to the newly arrived Black British colonial in Britain as well as existing cohorts. The many seeking homes to rent faced direct confrontations resulting from their unwanted presence. Indeed, for ILEA teaching about ‘race’ meant pupils learning the ‘harsh facts of the historical past’, in the ‘Marches’ trilogy and revisiting Britain’s less humane part in the story, from slavery through Empire into the 1970s. It was imperative to ‘confront racist behaviours’ directly in order to help expunge them from schools and wider society. Yet, ‘race’ and immigration was about the visual history of neighbourhoods over time, for example Brick Lane and the changing ‘face’ of neighbourhood buildings such as a protestant church being transformed into a mosque or other social meeting place.
Those arriving from colonies and former colonies served as a signal reminder of Britain's past history. Their physical presence was equally significant. This was evident in ILEA itself with its particularly confident educational approach. This situation underscored the persona of the Authority in its spatial historical location and its broader place within the metropolis. Equally evident was the extent to which its strategies were informed by ‘multicultural’ thinking, understood broadly in terms of ‘race’. Further, in studying the role and educational purpose of ILEA, connections emerged in the way it served the interests of wider society and the school population. More specifically this study suggested connections between the Authority's historic institutional environment and its outlook upon the texts produced. Somewhat in terms of historian Denis Judd, 1996/2004, such continuity, discussed in the ILEA II narrative, represents the 'long-lasting experience of Empire that affects the way ... people in Britain viewed themselves and those over whom [colonial masters] ruled'.\(^7\) This influence arguably has affected the Authority persona and wider institutional stature, to the extent that 'the schools of the inner-city areas today are both arenas of change and repositories of continuity and as such reflect the social configurations of the localities in which they stand'.\(^8\)

*The Historical Association*

In its commitment toward providing a sound grounding in history education the HA gave a heightened disciplinary focus to present-day learners’ needs in history education distinct from the armoury of the SC and ILEA. This was evident in its approach to history especially post-1976, with seemingly
transformational approaches in learning. This would play a major role in bringing about attitude change and programmatically, a more discursively measured attempt at ‘healing’. Yet texts produced by the HA membership in the 1970s and 1980s purposefully reflected the founders’ mission and the long-standing professionalism in the guardianship of history. Empowered and bolstered by its academic tradition and heritage, the HA manifested sustained levels of scholarship that served as a conduit through which new historical content and skills would be delivered. The guardianship of history had traditionally been held in history-teaching discourses and early-Association character-forming ideals. The later constituency of transformational ‘healing’, of Edgington, was distinct from previous approaches to Empire but were refined and passed-on, through mediation and reconciliation, into present-day HA authorship research.

**Similarities and differences between the texts**

As to what accounts for textual similarities and differences, whilst all three institutions demonstrated that history was about people and their lived experiences and recollections, both past and present, it was the HA which first highlighted the importance of historical practice and skills. Early establishing what history was about, the HA tailored its teaching of requisite skills to the nature and scope of the discipline and its continued development. Indeed, it was founder member Grace Stretton’s recognition of the connections between the nineteenth-century ‘discovery’ of literary criticism and the development of ‘historical thinking’ that led, ultimately, to the
influential foregrounding of a ‘scientific’, objective and robust profile across the discipline. With its own foundation in 1906, the HA grasped the advantage in following the paths of its nearest disciplinary forerunners, modifying their structures, practices and functions according to the needs of the discipline of history. Thus, advancing the disciplinary cause, teachers of history in secondary schools opened up access to existing archives and other new-style learning and teaching-facilities, alongside cross-disciplinary interaction with similarly-positioned subject groups. Such ‘objectivity’ was thereafter advanced through the steadfastness / agency of the Association’s foreign diplomacy historian, Charles Webster (1886-1961) discussed in SC HA I. And nearer to our own time Jeanette Coltham and John Fines updated the HA founding mission by setting out objectives in history teaching and publishing the skills-based history teachers’ companion, ‘Educational Objectives and the Study of History’ in 1977. Overall, significant aspects of the HA historical-educational practice were comprehensive in their scope and purposive in their scholarly perspectives which withstood the test of time.

The HA addressing ‘race’, through texts by Edgington and Grosvenor for example, arguably saw their present-day role as a function of a longstanding developmental outlook and directed toward some amelioration of the nation’s earlier, substantively self-serving excesses of Empire. This understanding is informed by the post-imperial UK interest in a greater outreach in public service and being pragmatic toward former colonial territories world-wide, understandable in the face of longstanding un-equal privilege. Yet on closer consideration, it may be seen that the public service profile has equally been
an early HA convention intensifying up to the present day. This was demonstrated, from its foundation, in the attention given to extending the practice and enjoyment of history to ordinary people as a worthwhile pursuit for their leisure time.

While the SC and ILEA observed disciplinary-driven standards of their own, they looked toward breaking new ground and questioned the nature of the discipline and its distinctive processes by raising the question, ‘What is history?’ Their vision was to harness their institutional capacities toward consequential outcomes, reflecting the “true” constituencies of the discipline. This meant the re-constituting the discipline’s nature and distinctive process, into a ‘new’ stronger constituency.

Overall, the SC, ILEA and HA reflected their institutional culture, history, background and lived experience in texts for the history curriculum, often referring to ‘race’, with their respective outcomes essentially manifesting the particular nature of each founding institution. For the SC and ILEA, this was achieved apparently without a fully developed strategy for learners’ personal and general transformational development beyond, as was the case for ILEA, learners’ empathetic attitudinal development. This line pursued by ILEA, in its active position of social well-being, was an institutional way of being while serving actively as its accustomed modus operandi.

In appraising the conclusions in relation to the research questions, the data on the three background-informing case-study chapters and their respective textually-analysed outcomes demonstrate the strength of connections made
and systematically arising between the institutional background histories, ‘lived-experience’ and textual output of each institution.

This broadly means that, according to prima-facie evidence of respective case-study chapters, the issue of the Black presence in texts produced for the history curriculum in state schools, by the SC, ILEA and the HA is relatively clear. This position is in line with the respective histories and practices of each institution from the period of Empire into 1944 / post-1948 and the onset of Black colonial immigration. And this imperial impact has registered within all areas of life, from the political through into the social, educational and historical.

These connections are manifest in the range of contextual events explored in the data of each of the given pairs of background-informing biographical chapters, and their respective disciplinary-grounded texts. This direct but freshly interpreted knowledge dispels my initial underlying caution surrounding a possible mismatch between the chosen institutions.

First, that whereas the differing educational backgrounds, the biographical-profile of the three organizations – the SC, ILEA and HA, their roles and responsibilities seemed an unbalanced starting-point in an open un-quantifiably grounded enquiry, my reservations were ultimately discounted. Second, a generalised judgement is now possible insofar as the individual institutions’ educational responsibilities bear less significance, operationally, than the professional capacities and qualitative actions of their given personnel. Those professional capabilities ultimately inform, define and
support the working environment of the institutions and their input into policy-implementation.

Third, inherent to ways in which ‘race’, the Black presence, was addressed by the three organisations, and how similarities and differences were exemplified, demonstrated how the inherently personal qualities, “endowments”, best served the institutional and textual outcomes. Those qualities ensured the institutional commitment to learners’ attitudinal development toward ‘race’ over time. This event, indicative of the scope for enhanced personal developmental qualities assured the soundness, of the first and second findings above of the individual organisations, SC, ILEA and HA. Fourth, the contemporary HA, in defining the nature of the discipline history in the period, 1976-1988 provided a lead in the ideals, operational principles and procedures of history-writing across ‘generations gone before’, and firm in its stewardship of history. Notably acknowledged conceptually over time, Aldrich (Ed.1991), with Dean 1991, and by himself 2006, held fast respectfully, both in his awareness of the contemporary mission and its ‘duty owed to past and future, generations’.

Fifth, a less significant limitation of this purely documentary study was the lack of scope for the follow-up question. In Chapter 8, the texts and their inanimate constituency were directly manifested – against the otherwise taken-for-granted facility of a face-to-face inquiry. Yet, the procedural flaw did not greatly undermine other benefits of the intensive application in the dedicated historical-interpretive inquiry. Indeed, this historical-interpretive approach contributes to existing knowledge by demonstrating how the
practice of ‘race’ / race-thinking is reproduced and its replication generated, through social / educational policy-making contexts. Yet, mention of one methodological discretion invites further expansion upon another key element – case study itself. Here the prime (though potentially understated) model being after Michael Bassey, conceptualised as an audit-trail. Thus, insofar as, sixth, a progressively advancing ‘audit-trail’ entailed action geared toward the completed narrative, I provide an accompanying account of the process. This progresses from its rationale, through the premise advanced; an enquiry plan; identifying the purpose; institutional and textual selection; sampling of texts; data collection; analysis & interpretation (engaging with ethical issues, form-and-meaning processes); and synthesising findings toward concluding observations (Bassey, 1995, 1999). This whole was informed by disciplines within the field of education – the historical, philosophical, the sociological, the psychological and the ethnographical / social-anthropological, the whole seeking, severally to identify across the institutional texts, patterns of similarity, contrast, individualities, and scope for theory generation, from a base of contextual and institutional evidence. Subscribing fully to ethical observance constituent in the modern democracy of British society, therefore, I kept alert to interests in freedom of speech and a tradition of tolerance toward diversity, while showing a regard for truth, every observation of these ideals necessarily being observed in my response to the inanimate texts. Further, the same holds necessarily, in recognising the institutions’ and respective text-authors’ original ownership (of their texts) being drawn upon. All are interrogated and
examined as the “human” element within the research. In conducting this ‘empirical research’ and keeping alert seventh, to a possible replication of a study such as this, the given historical-interpretive applications are deemed re-employable in a range of social-political educational contexts. And history as process need not be sustained / entertained only by the discipline of history, although its purpose here has upheld the cause several times over. This was achieved while looking even toward achieving a global historical / humanities outreach beyond borders. While this study did not directly question or confirm the inevitability of ‘race’ in educational discourse in Britain, it did foremost, substantiate the impact of the history, background, lived experience, biographical culture of the institutions upon the texts produced while shedding light on its place in the broader social-historical narrative, all the while pointing toward the potential for other discursive engagement across topics themes and disciplines.

**British values and SMSC**

Convention on Human Rights significantly upholds British values of justice, tolerance – the foundation of citizenship. These are concerned with development across the collective of elemental requisites: the spiritual, moral, social and cultural.

Now paying much attention to SMSC, Ofsted decides whether your school is 'outstanding', 'inadequate' or 'somewhere in between'. *School Inspection Handbook from September 2015*
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Society's Conference of December 1978, on 'Post-War Curriculum Development: An historical Approach', which is both informative and relevant to its period.

Margaret Slack continues the narrative of her experience in teaching ethnic minority pupils Teaching History 23, 1979: p.21

After Fairclough, thinking across cultures as well as textual genres

Villains were the peasant farm workers, less advantaged early local peoples of Dewsbury, with some freedoms, bordars who worked on the land for keep only, were tied to the land they worked and also to the farmer – they were basically slaves.

Margaret Slack As practised across all texts represented, after the initial reference, further referencing is selective, insofar as each text discussed represents the same project and derives from the author as named individual, often within the page ranges initially indicated


Geertz, Clifford (1973), originator of the participant-observer concept discusses various aspects of social anthropology in The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays, New York: Basic Books

Stretton, Grace reflecting the collective membership of the early HA (1957), The Historical Association 1906-1956: 9/10, The HA, 59A Kennington Park Road, London SE 11

Ibid

The contrast between events unfolding at this point in the narrative stand in strong contrast to the events in real time in the preceding chapter but without significance

The World History genre reflects individual interest beyond any apparent dictate

Stretton, Grace et al (1957): 9, HA, Kennington Park Road, London, SE 11

Much of this range is referred to in HA I pp.225/26 of this study, deriving initially from Stretton, Grace et al (1957): 9, HA, Kennington Park Road, London, SE 11

TH joint editors Martin Booth and David Killingray took heed of the mood that accompanied events at Brixton, Toxteth and other inner-city locations, setting the tone for a series of texts marking the beginning of what was to become a worthy Project overall.

Ibid: Henderson cites Toynbee


Ibid: passim. *There are evident links with Richard Overy’s Morbid Age, 2009*

Stretton, Grace and the collective membership of the early Historical Association (1957), *The Historical Association 1906-1956*: 9/10, The HA, 59A Kennington Park Road, London SE 11

British journalist and lauded writer: Appleyard, Bryan (2009), the *Sunday Times* 9 May


Ibid. Eileen Power is remembered as having been patronised by male historians who have dominated the discipline. Here Power’s sentiments are rehearsed by Robbins: the inferences are drawn

TH 32, February 1982: 18

TH 32: p. 14

Ibid

Ibid

Ibid: 3-5

David Edgington, *The Role of History in Multicultural Education*: 11-13, a fuller version of this work published by SOAS (Extra-mural Division) explores attitudes, also in TH 48 June 1997

TH 32: 2, 1982

Ibid

These aspects are also published in a book co-authored by File and Power

TH 32 February 1982, History & the multi-cultural curriculum: a case study: 18/19

Ibid
Joint Editors, Martin Booth and David Killingray, *TH 32*, 1982: 2. Interestingly, the editors appear to have evenly weighed the moment for taking the required action, no comment having been raised at an earlier date, despite their being in office for the six years prior to 1982. This was a period in which other educationists / commentators were actively promoting and practising multicultural education in some form, some considered extreme, or otherwise taking steps to accommodate toward the changed school population and wider society. See also *Editorial, TH 41*, 1985


Mike Gibson, B Ed Course deputy leader, Kingston Polytechnic, *TH 42* (1985)

Chapter 9: References

1 Mann, John, First SC Chairman, 1974, *The First Ten Years: 1*


3 Ibid

4 Issues addressed cover the network of social practices beyond the grammars of language: discourses, genres and styles; the engine being the 'social organization and control of linguistic variation; how 'causal powers', effects, or a social event, or chain of social events latterly, subjected to a reversal in status to 'registered' British citizens, newly designated comprising the text, may have 'shaped' the texts, the positions adopted by their authors, whether through social structures and social practices, or social agents, the people becoming involved as through institutional affinity.

5 Among matters discussed are, for example, role of the teacher, the question of position, whether being 'an authority' or 'in authority', with related styles of teaching whether 'progressive' or 'traditional'. Similarly of interest are concepts inherent in discourses of 'race', of enslaved oppression, or colonial subjects rights having been compromised / violated, or latterly subjected to a reversal in status to 'registered' British citizens, newly designated as, presumably, of 'second class citizen' status.

6 In spite of the different groups of Projects within the scope of 'history', these are all understood to bear the same defining principles

7 Page 190 of this study
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