

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION - UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, HUMANITIES AND PHILOSOPHY:

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SECTION

NAME: PHILIP JAMES STEVENS

SUPERVISOR: PAT WHITE

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

TITLE OF THESIS: EDUCATION, CULTURE & POLITICS:
THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION OF RAYMOND
WILLIAMS: ~~EDUCATION, CULTURE AND~~
~~POLITICS.~~

DATE OF REGISTRATION: APRIL 1985



Abstract

As far as I have been able to discover Raymond Williams's writing on education has not been the subject of an extensive study. This is surprising since Williams's educational writings, although not presented systematically, represent a considerable contribution to thinking about education in the late twentieth century. Since Williams's death in 1988 several articles have been published dealing with specific areas of this aspect of his work (1), but although useful, these provide only the beginnings of an account of Williams's philosophy of education.

Williams has been described as the 'single most masterly, original cultural thinker in Britain of the twentieth century' and his work has invoked comparisons with writers of the stature of Sartre and Habermas (2). Of the thirty or so books, hundreds of articles, and radio and television programmes Williams wrote over forty years, most contained a sustained interest in education. Raymond Williams, as Professor of Drama at the University of Cambridge, was an academic. He was also a literary critic, social and cultural analyst, novelist, playwright, and political activist. Most of all, through the medium of his writings, Williams was a teacher. The task of this thesis will be to reveal a theory of education from this substantial and varied body of writing which crossed the boundaries of 'discrete' discourses and subjects. At the heart of this theory is the claim that education and politics are inextricably linked.

In the Introduction I outline the major areas of Williams's thought, link these with the development of his professional life and his influence as a teacher, and discuss the difficulties presented by

Williams' notoriously complex writing style. In Chapter 1 I identify and discuss the key concept in Williams's writing in relation to education, i.e., culture. Chapter 2 is concerned to examine Williams's writing on education and to link these with the key concept outlined in Chapter 1. The principal aim of Chapter 3 is to identify the major issues which taken together form the basis of a political theory and a theory of political education in the work of Raymond Williams. Chapter 4 is a key chapter in which I attempt to 'translate' Williams's abstract and complex writing style into amore accessible form, through an analysis of his major themes relating to politics and education, i.e., solidarity, community and ecology. Chapter 5 includes a discussion of two examples of educational programmes decisively influenced by Williams's writing, i.e., Cultural Studies and Urban Studies.

As a philosopher of education Williams was a generalist; that is to say, he was concerned, in the tradition of Dewey, with broad educational issues. An example of this approach would be the way in which he attempts to link education with democracy. It is in the spirit of this tradition that the thesis is written.

Notes

1. J. McIlroy, 'Border Country: Raymond Williams in Adult Education, Part 1', Studies in the Education of Adults, Vol. 22, No. 2, October 1990; and, Part 2, Vol. 23, No. 1, April, 1991; Prof. R. Fieldhouse, 'Oxford and Adult Education' unpublished paper, University of Exeter, 1990.
2. T. Eagleton, 'Foreword', Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture and Politics, ed. A. O'Connor, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Table of Contents

	Page Number
Title Page	1
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	5
Acknowledgements	6
Introduction	7
Chapter One	40
Chapter Two	74
Chapter Three	141
Chapter Four	190
Chapter Five	250
Conclusion	383

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Joy Williams for her kindness in making available to me a collection of Raymond Williams's occasional writings on education. I am particularly grateful to Pat White for her encouragement and helpful suggestions and advice over a six year period. I must also thank Simon Bailey of the Archives Office, University of Oxford, and the staff of the Bodleian Library for their kind cooperation. The thesis could not have been written without the constant encouragement and support of my wife, Linda. Lastly, my thanks go to Raymond Williams whom I met several times in Cambridge to discuss the ideas contained in the thesis.

The thesis is dedicated to the memory of my father, craftsman and trade unionist.

INTRODUCTION

Raymond Williams died suddenly in 1988. Born in 1921, the son of a Welsh railway signalman and active trade unionist, Williams became Professor of Drama at Cambridge University in 1974 after fifteen years working as a teacher and organiser in adult education. While an educator in the formal sense Williams was an astute and committed political analyst who would have been encouraged by the political events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in 1989 and 1990 which have begun to reshape political thinking;

Williams's contribution to thinking about these events would have been invaluable.

Williams was brought up in Pandy on the Welsh border within a family who were steeped in the trade union and labour movement. Henry Williams, Raymond's father, was secretary of the local Branch Labour Party and involved in the General Strike of 1926. The young Williams entered Trinity College, Cambridge in 1939 where he studied English. He continued the family political tradition by joining the student branch of the Communist Party and began a lifelong engagement with Marxism. In 1941 Williams was called up to the Royal Corps of Signals and in 1942, the year of his marriage to Joy Darling, he was commissioned into the Royal Artillery and posted to the 21st Anti-Tank Regiment. In June 1944, Williams went with his regiment to Normandy and in July of that year their first child, Merryn was born.

Williams returned to Cambridge at the end of the war to resume his studies gaining a First in English in 1946. After a short time teaching part-time for the Workers' Educational Association (WEA) in East Anglia the family moved to North Devon where Williams planned to write his first novel. The novel remained unwritten at this time and in September 1946, Williams accepted the offer of an appointment as Staff Tutor for the Oxford University Tutorial Classes Committee, otherwise known as the Oxford Delegacy and later the Extra-Mural Department. At the age of twenty five Williams embarked on an educational and intellectual journey that was to take him back to Cambridge University as a Lecturer and Fellow and later Professor of Drama. During the course of this journey Williams published twenty major theoretical works, seven novels, several television and radio plays and countless articles and essays. From 1946 to 1988 Raymond Williams, through his theoretical writing and his political interventions inspired at least two generations of teachers and students towards an understanding of the relations between culture, society and politics, and during this time his work formed a major contribution to European intellectual thought.

Williams developed his philosophy of education while working in adult education in the period from 1946 to 1961, firstly in Sussex then in Oxford. In the period from 1962 to 1988 Williams wrote extensively, if not systematically, on education. The focus of his attention shifted to secondary, further and higher education but adult education remained the cause to which he was most committed. This commitment to adult education, and the unconventional and radical educational opportunities it offered, stemmed from Williams's life experience and in particular the socialist politics of his family and neighbourhood, a politics to which he had a

life-long attachment. In 1946 adult education was about to engage in a period of intense, often bitter, debate about its aims, methods and purpose. Throughout the 1950's Williams contributed to this debate both personally and professionally through the style and content of the courses he designed and delivered. A useful way of identifying the basic elements of Williams's philosophy of education is to consider the arguments in this debate and Williams's position to them.

The conflict between the aims of adult education and the aims of socialist or communist politics was the cause of bitter and prolonged dispute during the period in which Williams worked for the Oxford Delegacy. Williams himself saw the conflict between the opposing sides as a 'local version of the Cold War'. The issue at the centre of the debate was the alleged attempt by some Staff Tutors to 'indoctrinate' their students through the methods and content of their courses. John McIlroy describes the period as a 'dangerous' time in adult education,

"The general tendencies which moulded adult education in the 1946-61 period ... were given specific weight and form by the onset of the cold war and problems which began to develop in consequence soon after Williams arrived there. It has been estimated that by 1947 nine out of thirty full-time tutors as well as Hodgkin [Secretary of the Oxford Delegacy 1945-52] were Communist Party members or fellow travellers." (1)

The Communists were also accused of recruiting both students and existing tutors to the Party. The opposing factions, the Communists and

sympathisers on the one hand and the 'right wing' tutors and the government on the other hand, embarked on a period of internal conflict which led to the non-renewal of the contracts of several left-wing tutors and the eventual resignation of Thomas Hodgkin. The Oxford Delegacy received funding from the Department of Education. In return for this funding the department insisted that all course syllabuses should meet its criteria. These included academic impartiality, an insistence on students producing written work, and the requirement that courses conform to conventional subject parameters, e.g. courses in English Literature were acceptable while courses in Communications, Trade Union Studies or Political Education were resisted and the syllabuses returned. If a syllabus was returned then funding for the course was refused. Williams felt the force of this 'early British McCarthyism'. he wrote,

"... the very notion that an Adult Educator was contributing to the process of social change became suspect. This was so especially in the period of the forties and fifties when almost everybody put their intellectual resources well under cover. For it was a politically dangerous time." (2)

The tutors in North Staffordshire who failed to 'put their intellectual resources under cover' failed to have their contracts renewed. Williams had left the Communist Party by 1946 but felt the force of the pressures to constrain adult education by,

"... the anti-educational notion that you should soften the terms of the discussion; the anti-educational notion that you should exclude controversial current material. There was also the support of certain subjects, in that period and since, precisely because they moved people away from these areas which would put the status and nature of official learning in question." (3)

It is quite clear from the evidence that the 'right wing' emerged as the winners in this dispute between communists and their supporters and the conservative elements of the Labour movement, at least in the short term (4). Williams did not play a leading personal role in this dispute as did the communist, John Vickers, who lost his post in North Staffordshire for the alleged marxist bias of his teaching (5). Williams's contribution was more subtle, and perhaps more enduring through the way in which he adopted innovative teaching styles, initiated new areas of enquiry and set about providing these with a strong theoretical foundation. In the years 1946-61 Williams and others (6) set themselves the task of developing a philosophy of adult education which was to have a revolutionary effect; firstly, on the curriculum and teaching methods in adult education, and secondly, on particular areas of Secondary and Higher Education. Examples of the latter would be the establishment of Cultural Studies, Media and Communication Studies, and Urban Studies in schools, colleges, and universities. Through this subtle and painstaking approach to reform, Williams's contribution outlasted the Communist Party's overtly political dogmatism and the Labour Party's negative reaction.

In the period under discussion Williams did not belong to any political party. Throughout this period he was politically at some distance from the Trade Union Congress, the Labour Party and the post-war Labour Government. His political instincts were for democratic socialism which made him an ally of communists, although these same instincts led away from what he perceived as the centralism and discipline of the Communist Party of Great Britain. In the 1970's and 1980's Williams was to find a version of continental marxism more to his political and ideological taste (7). In the 1950's Williams withdrew from formal political work and began to develop his work on cultural politics which was to be his most significant political contribution, although he made numerous political interventions on behalf of trade unions and anti-war groups during the 1960's, '70's and '80's.

The origins of Williams's philosophy of education can be traced to two sources. Firstly, the documentation of his employment with the Oxford Delegacy held in the Oxford University Archives (8); this documentation can be divided into three sections, the Minutes of the meetings of the Tutorial Classes Committee (TCC) (the Delegacy's governing body), details of class syllabuses compiled by the TCC, and Williams's personal file. Secondly, Williams's published work of the 1950's, Reading and Criticism (1950), Drama from Ibsen to Eliot (1952), Preface to Film [with Michael Orrom] (1954), Drama in Performance (1954) and Culture and Society (1958). These sources reveal an attempt by Williams to develop a coherent philosophy which was able to inform the courses he wrote, his teaching style, and his research. The five books Williams had published in the 1950's indicate the direction of his thinking

and I will try to show how this can be linked to the content and teaching methods of his courses.

The first courses Williams's offered after his appointment to the Delegacy in 1946 were 'Culture and Environment' in 1946; 'Literature, Culture and the Environment' in 1947; and, 'Culture and Society', 'An Introduction to Film' and 'Public Expression', in 1951; together with several courses on the 'appreciation' of novels and poetry (9). All of these were short, or preparatory courses, designed to prepare adult students for the three year tutorial courses, and all contained a strong foundation in literary criticism, even if this was of a type which provoked opposition among traditionalists. There can be little doubt that these courses were progressive innovations in adult education in particular and a contribution to new thinking about education in general. In these courses Williams began to develop the foundations of what was to become his theory of cultural politics, later formalised as Communications and Cultural Studies. Similarly, it was in the design of these course that he began to formulate the ideas that were to be included in CS. The way in which Williams was beginning to fuse literary criticism, a wider cultural criticism and political analysis can be seen in the following detailed syllabus of a preparatory course entitled, 'Literature: Culture and Environment' offered as a preparatory course in Sussex in 1949.

"Literature: Culture and Environment: The study of culture and environment is one of applied sociology but the method of application is cultural, based on literary analysis.

The Culture of a society, in its broadest meaning, is the index of the quality of living within the society.

A The Foundation of Education

- Transmission of Culture

- Awareness of Environment

B Word Functions

- the problem of exact language

C 1. Advertisements

2. Newspapers

3. Cinema

4. Theatre

5. Fiction

6. Radio

7. Politics

D Problems of Community

- ideas of organic society

- industrialisation and leisure

Reading List

Incl. Leavis, Caudwell, Huxley, Wilson.

George Brown (Autobiography)

Ginsberg, Mannheim

" (10)

Williams designed and taught a course entitled 'What is Culture?' in 1949 which included the following topics;

relaxation; who are the masses?; why do we read newspapers?; is cinema an art?; why do we believe propoganda? (11)

Although the ideas and questions raised in these courses were to form the bases of Communications and Cultural Studies two decades later, it is quite clear that they were not acceptable in the terms of either the TCC or the Department of Education (12). There is no evidence to show that these courses, with their focus on the relation between literature, society and environment, were offered after 1952. From 1952 to 1961 Williams concentrated on teaching classes in Literature, Poetry and Drama. However, Williams continued to develop his thinking about the effects of education, newspapers, film, radio and, later television, on the formation of attitudes and opinions in his writing and the results can be seen in LR and Comm published in 1961 and 1962 respectively. It has been claimed that the founding of Cultural Studies and Media and Communication Studies can be dated to the publication of certain key texts of the 1950' and '60's, e.g. Hoggart's Uses of Literacy (13), Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class (14) and Williams's Culture and Society and The Long Revolution. All three writers were working in adult education in this period and produced numerous articles and essays to support these major works. Williams preferred to attribute the founding of these new 'subject' areas to an earlier date. Reflecting on this question in 1983 Williams wrote,

"We are beginning, I'm afraid, to see encyclopaedia articles dating the birth of cultural studies to this or that book in the late fifties. Don't believe a word of it. The shift of perspective about the teaching of arts and literature and their relation to history and to contemporary society began in adult education, it didn't happen anywhere else." (15)

The point Williams wishes to make here is that the founding of these new discourses could only have happened in adult education, the books emerged from the experience. This was because the democratic nature of adult education classes with the more equal relationship between tutor and class, where the students often made decisions on content based on their own 'lived experience', encouraged the emergence of new forms of discourse. Of course, this was always dependent on a tutor committed to both the democratic approach and to new forms of enquiry, or to use Tawney's dictum, 'to take the argument where it leads'. Clearly, however, Williams, Hoggart and Thompson were exceptionally gifted and committed young academics well placed to make the most of this radical philosophy of adult education.

The courses noted above ceased to be offered after 1952 and only formed a very small proportion of the Delegacy's programme before then but Williams continued his innovative methods in the more traditional and conventionally defined area of literature. Moreover, if the ideas for Comm, LR and C originated in the above courses in the years between 1946-52, then the origins of RC, CS, DP, DIE and MT can be traced to the various courses in literature Williams designed from 1946-61 (16). Williams's philosophy of education was formed from the combination of planning and teaching these two types of courses. As John McIlroy has pointed out this combination together with his theoretical work provided Williams with a clearly defined dialectical relationship between his thinking, teaching and writing (17).

Williams introduced new methods into adult literature classes largely because he was dissatisfied with the way in which the subject was taught. Prior to 1946, and often after this date, literature was taught in the context of a historical and sociological background. The emphasis was on

the biography of the author and a survey of the author's work. The method used was simply lecture and discussion. With this method a term's work would cover perhaps two authors and between five and ten novels. Williams altered the emphasis from transmission to student-centred participation. Borrowing from Leavis's method of 'practical criticism'(18), Williams based his method on close reading of the text and student responses to this were then related to their own 'lived-experience'. He planned a course which began with students reading short pieces of writing before eventually moving on to read whole novels. Quite sensibly, Williams also argued that students coming to a three year tutorial course should not be immediately confronted with difficult, abstract and lengthy texts, but should be introduced to this work in a paced and progressive manner, again particularly as they had to produce written, presumably assessed, work.

Williams's two works of the early 1950's, RC and DIE, were derived from the method of teaching literature he developed in these classes. These books can be considered as textbooks for his method. They can also be seen as a provisional statement of his philosophy of education which was, over the next thirty years, to undergo extensive revision.

Williams's radical teaching methods attracted criticism from traditional contextualists, tutors who believed they had a more radical vision and, not least, from students. The traditionalists, who taught the survey method outlined above through lecture and discussion felt that literature should be made to 'resemble social history, or philosophy, or logic, before it could be fully accepted in adult education'. (19) The influence of the

traditionalists was in any case waning under pressure from younger tutors such as Williams and at Hull, Richard Hoggart. A more serious and lasting criticism came from adult educators who felt that the method of 'practical criticism' concentrated too heavily on the 'words on the page' at the expense of context. Williams replied to such criticism in this way,

"I am always glad to see classes in, say, the history of the theatre, the psychology or social position of the artist, the anthropological origins of poetry, the social history of a period of literature and so on. But my own classes are in the reading of particular works of literature and my use of context is confined to problems that arise from the reading." (20)

Williams's belief that literary criticism should not be de-centred in favour of social context or the biography of the author seems at odds with the inter-disciplinary method he defended in later years. The view Williams was expressing in the early 1950's, and formalised in RC, was that authentic integrated enquiry should proceed through literature. This defence of the autonomy of literature was to undergo extensive revision in ML. It is important to note that Williams was interested in close, but paced and formative reading, the autonomy of the text, and the 'lived experience' of the learner because he felt that much of what was being taught in adult education and in particular in the Faculty of English at Oxford was irrelevant to his students. He writes that,

" ... the tutor may not know how his discipline looks like to people outside; may not know the gaps between academic thinking and actual experience among many people, he may not know when, in the pressure of experience, a new discipline has to be created." (21)

The 'new discipline(s)' were later to be codified as Cultural Studies, Urban Studies and, Media and Communication Studies. A further 'new discipline' was literary theory which grew in influence at the expense of literary criticism during the 1960's and '70's.

Adult education, without formal syllabuses and examinations gave Williams and others the autonomy to develop this new work. As he writes,

"University teaching is extraordinary stimulating but it is remarkable how much it excludes: both in the simple sense of the syllabus where this kind of work is only just beginning in England to enter the university field; and in the more complex sense of the cultural atmosphere of a university, in which there are strong pressures to confine oneself to the traditional interests and habits of minority education so that issues affecting the majority tend to fade." (22)

This was Williams writing around 1960. His democratic instincts invited a justifiable criticism which Williams took account of in his work from ML. This criticism was based on his belief that the 'lived experience' of his students should be incorporated into the substantive content of his

courses. The criticism was based on the problematic use of the term 'experience'. As John McIlroy has argued,

"The relationship, in any adult education which aspires to democracy, activity and individual growth, between immediate experience and wider discursive and conceptual knowledge is always a difficult one." (23)

It is argued that there are forms of understanding, areas of knowledge, discourses, etc. which are inaccessible to immediate experience. Similarly, Williams's method of focusing entirely on the text was unhelpful because it failed to relate the text to important external mediating factors. Williams eventually took note of this criticism as his later work indicates.

Williams's method was not always accepted by his students. As Richard Hoggart has noted (24) students were very often happy with the lecture and discussion method because it placed less demands on them than the more rigorous seminar approach with its emphasis on close student reading. However, this cautious conservatism was gradually overcome and the method became the model for adult education.

Trade Union and Workers' Education

There has been some argument as to Williams's involvement in this aspect of adult education during the period of his employment with the Oxford Delegacy. (25) This argument has to be viewed within a general debate about the extent to which the work of the Oxford Delegacy and the WEA was engaged a genuine attempt at the political education of members of the organised working-class. Accusations that Williams did not contribute to the developing area of workers' education question his political commitment at the time and also help to foster the image of Williams as a remote academic and a disinterested teacher.

Inspection of the TCC's record of class syllabuses from 1946-61 reveals some interesting information regarding the development of workers' and trade union education in the Delegacy. A reading of the TCC's minutes for this period also reveals some debate on this question. However, minutes are not always the most reliable source of information. According to the Report of the Extra-Mural Delegacy of 1948 (26) the Delegacy offered eighty seven course of which one was a trade union course. There was a significant increase in such courses from 1955, particularly in the form of residential Summer Schools. In the early 1950's many of these courses were held in cooperation with the Workers' Educational Trade Union Committee (WETUC) but details of the TCC's minutes reveal some dispute between the Delegacy and the WETUC over the content and teaching methods of such courses which held back this work from 1950 (27). A further factor to take into consideration is that there were a number of reports on Trade Union education in the 1950's (28) which resulted in a flurry of this kind of activity within the Delegacy. It is fair to say that the Delegacy did not have a coherent policy regarding Trade Union and workers' education and the work that did exist in this field was the result of the efforts of a

very few committed tutors whose subject specialisms were Industrial Relations or Economics, but, interestingly, not Politics or the Humanities. Most Trade Union education at this time was being developed outside the work of the Delegacy, by the Trade Unions themselves and the TUC.

In the late 1930's a third of student's attending WEA classes were manual workers, of which a quarter were attending the three year tutorial classes in which written work was expected. By the late 1950's only 15% of students were attending these courses and less than one fifth of these were registered for the longer classes. As Williams remarked,

" ... the WEA started to become heavily used by the middle classes as forms of leisure and education. There was nothing wrong with this, except that in socially mixed communities they induced a quite different cultural atmosphere from that of the working-class student. You had to positively encourage specific working people's classes around trade unions and so on. This was done. But all the time there was constant pressure from the university; you must improve academic standards, you must get written work ... The effect was to tend to eliminate people without secondary education." (29)

As an adult tutor for the delegacy at this time Williams has recently been criticised for a lack of involvement in this 'authentic' workers' political education (30). His critics argue that Williams, as a socialist and educator committed to political change, was not involved in designing and delivering these course. This was, his critics say, a particularly regrettable omission on Williams's part since he was the Delegacy's most reputable and distinguished academic. His critics are wrong in at least two respects as the Oxford University Archives show. Williams was involved in

trade union education. In the 1950's he taught on four one-day courses for trade unionists in Sussex on day release. There is also photographic evidence in the Archives to show that from 1954 to 1957 Williams was a tutor on WEA Summer Schools at the University of Oxford (31). These photographs include Williams pictured with the North Staffordshire Miners' School in 1954 and 1957. Williams also taught classes in Public Expression for the Hasting Trades Council in the early 1950's (32). There can be no doubt that Williams was involved to some extent in

trade union education despite what his critics allege. Unlike Arthur Marsh and others Williams was employed by the Delegacy primarily to teach literature. This would undoubtedly have restricted his efforts to involve himself in other areas. Additionally, Williams remained unconvinced that the type of courses offered in trade union education could be said to be genuine forms of workers' political education. Williams preferred a broader educational approach to teaching trade unionists, given their restricted educational background. He urged that,

" ... education organisations must be prepared to offer courses in the use of English as an ordinary liberal study for trade unionists." (33)

Williams recognised a distinction between,

" ... the business of the unions to train their members as union members and the business of the adult education movement to educate trade unionists and others in the most general way." (34)

Williams was much more interested at this time in the way in which adults learn and develop political attitudes in relation to such 'teaching' agencies as the newspapers, television, radio and film, a question he began to address in his book Comm, published in 1960. This book indicates the distance Williams had travelled from the 'practical criticism' method of teaching literature outlined in RC in the late 1940's,

to arrive at the emergent, inter-disciplinary, cultural studies approach of Comm. This work, which was Williams's contribution to workers' political education addressed the increasingly important questions of political consciousness and political alignment.

Williams as Teacher

A further criticism made of Williams was that, particularly in his time as English Lecturer and ultimately Professor of Drama at Cambridge University, he produced his extensive and prolific published work at the expense of his teaching (35). This was clearly not the case during his period of employment for the Oxford Delegacy for this period was notable for a significant growth in the Literature courses of the Delegacy (36). As John McIlroy points out,

" ... there seems to be unanimity among his former colleagues that his prolific scholarly output was not purchased at the expense of his teaching or the number of his classes." (37)

A letter on Williams's Tutor's Personal File in the Oxford Archives pays tribute to his qualities as a teacher,

"Williams is more inspiring as a teacher and a person than he is as a writer. To say that he was successful as a tutor is to understate the case ... In later years he was too successful, and one or two of his classes became more like Extension Lecture Courses. In later years some of Raymond's colleagues were better than him as a tutorial class teacher in the sense of drawing out individuals. Still he had something else ... not just an academic brain, but the personality and purpose of an inspired educator." (38)

In 1946-47, the academic year Williams joined the Delegacy, he inherited one Tutorial Class and four Sessional Classes. In the year Williams left Sussex for Oxford and later Cambridge, he had increased this to seventeen Tutorial Classes and five Sessional Classes. It should be remembered that Williams also published three books during this period and wrote his first novel, while gathering material for future work. Small wonder that his contribution to trade union education was limited. Adult tutors had teaching responsibilities, but also administrative and organising duties. Their teaching was usually undertaken in the evenings, often in rural areas with inadequate local transport. This was Williams's working routine for fifteen years.

Williams appointment as Lecturer in English at Cambridge followed the publication and success of CS. He did not apply for the Post and knew nothing about it until he received the appointment letter. In an interesting insight into the workings of the university Williams has said that the interview letter for the post arrived a week later (39). It is fair to say once Williams had made the decision to leave adult education

for Cambridge he concentrated on writing rather than teaching. As a colleague of Williams at Cambridge has written,

"In the university I have always thought of him as a writer and an intellectual before a teacher." (40)

However, it is rather crass and insensitive to overstate the case of Williams's shortcomings as a university teacher, as has David Hare (41), given his record of achievement in the sixteen years he spent teaching in adult education. It is fair to say that Williams recognised Cambridge University as an elite, class-based minority institution, and he also recognised the irony of a socialist educator teaching there. However, he took his teaching duties seriously and continued to be an inspired educator (42)

Cambridge 1961-88

Williams spent his years at Cambridge developing and extending the main themes in his work. These included cultural theory, historical semantics, and the relation between literature, writing and society. After 1961 Williams began to address problems in his work which, he felt, could only be solved through an engagement with Marxism. Among these problems were, a

lack of an account of materialism, his reliance on 'lived experience' as a theoretical concept for understanding the development of forms of consciousness, and, following from this, the need to incorporate a theory of ideology into his work. Williams's educational writing from 1961 included perspectives on Secondary and Higher Education although he retained his interest in adult education. The LR contains a sustained historical analysis of education in Britain and his work for the Open University is evidence of Williams developing interest in language use and theory. He continued his work on communications and in particular the way in which newspapers and television have become 'teaching' institutions.

It is to be expected that a socialist thinker and academic would need to engage with Marxism at some stage in his development. Williams was no exception to this and the result of this engagement, his theory of Cultural Materialism, was a distinctive contribution to Marxist thought. Cultural Materialism was influenced by Lukacs (43) and in particular, Gramsci (44). Williams presented this stage in his development in ML, PMC and CC. A theory of education, I would argue, is an important element of Williams's revised thinking.

Williams continued with his political writing and political analysis during his time at Cambridge. Apart from a brief spell as a member of the Labour Party Williams remained outside formal politics but his position at Cambridge and his growing academic reputation gave him a platform to make important contributions to political debate, for example, on the Vietnam War, on Nuclear Disarmament and on industrial and social disturbance in Britain. Williams also became particularly interested in the question of Welsh and Scottish nationalism at this time.

The academic appointment at Cambridge provided Williams with the time and opportunity, not available to him during the time he spent in adult education, to develop his theoretical work. I would argue that his work for the Oxford Delegacy and the WEA provided him with the raw material on which he based his later theoretical work. This is true in the case of education. Williams developed his ideas on education in the 1960's, '70's and 80's but the essential principles, in particular those of the voluntary WEA, remained those which informed his teaching in the late 1940's and 1950's.

Philosophy of Education

Even those familiar with his work might be surprised, although perhaps interested, to see Williams's work included within philosophy of education. This work has been conventionally categorised as cultural theory, literary criticism or literary theory, but not usually philosophy of education. Williams once said that he had seen his work included in reading lists for literary criticism, cultural theory, semiotics, sociology, anthropology, literary theory, political theory and aesthetics. It is not my intention to argue for a privileging of his work in favour of any of these 'subjects' or 'discourses'. The tasks I have set are more modest, i.e., to indicate the contribution Williams's work can make to philosophy of education, and to assess the relevance of this work to education in Britain in the 1990's.

David Hargreaves has written,

"A teacher once asked me recommend to her the most challenging, persuasive and original book known to me which might help her to understand our educational history and provide her with a vision for the future of the comprehensive school. Without hesitation I suggested Raymond Williams's Long Revolution, first published in 1961, and especially the chapter on education and British society ... By nearly two decades Williams anticipated our contemporary concern to design for the comprehensives a core curriculum." (45)

This recommendation of the LR is encouraging but it would not be helpful to consider Williams's work on education in isolation from his other work. Williams ideas on education should, I would argue, be related to the major features of the main body of his work. For example, his work on education must be linked to his work on language, materialism, ideology, culture as well to as his political theory. This is a difficult and complex task, particularly given the problems of style in Williams's work. I have identified four main themes from which to construct a philosophy of education from the complexity of the main body of Williams's extensive output; education as cultural criticism, and the themes of solidarity, community and ecology. Where possible I try to identify and assess the way in which Williams's ideas have influenced the work of other theorists of education.

Since I began my work on Williams in 1984 I have had the good fortune to discover some of his unpublished writings on education. I was also fortunate to receive from Joy Williams a comprehensive list of Williams's less available published articles and essays on education; this material has proved invaluable. Film, video and radio are not usually accepted as admissible evidence in philosophical argument. Nevertheless, I have used

transcripts of films and radio programmes Williams has been involved with in addition to his more conventionally presented work. I will argue that this material, taken together, represents an important contribution to thinking about education in the late 20th Century.

Raymond Williams was at home in the intellectual 'border country' between the disciplines. His work is inter-disciplinary and to a significant degree, integrated. As one of his collaborators has recently written, 'he was a habitual transgressor of convention' (46). Williams wrote nearly 30 books in 40 years of intellectual labour. Among these were his half a dozen novels which he insisted were primary and not peripheral. These novels, from the Welsh Trilogy to his last work, People of the Black Mountains include sustained political, cultural and historical analysis; a politicised concept of education is close to the heart of this analysis. With the exception of Border Country the novels were all written during Williams's time at Cambridge. It is in the light of Williams's inter-disciplinary method that I invite philosophers of education to view and assess his work.

Raymond Williams's status as an educational thinker lies in the influence his work has had on course planners, particularly in Adult and Continuing Education, and on successive generations of students. Nearly one million copies of Williams's books have been sold in Britain alone, and his work has been translated into more than twenty languages. Despite this obvious popularity and importance his books seldom appear on reading lists for courses in philosophy of education. Williams was not well enough to accept an invitation to give a seminar in the Department of Philosophy of Education, University of London in 1987, an invitation he was keen to

accept (47). His untimely death in 1988 has ensured that at least one field of enquiry remains uninformed by his penetrating and challenging intellectual project.

Since his death Williams has been described as 'the outstanding intellectual in British culture this century', 'the most distinctive and original mind of British intellectual life', and a 'guru for successive generations of socialists'. It has been argued that Williams anticipated Habermas (particularly in the area of communication theory) and that his work was more at home in the rarified air of continental theory and philosophy where it had most appeal. Williams was not a left wing academic writing from the confines of academic institutions but a socialist intellectual actively committed to political struggle and change. The irony of these claims would not be lost on Williams in a time characterised by Fred Inglis as the,

'... murderous competition for the unequal allocation of the great finites of life: earth, air; fuel, food; capital... and governed by ... those malign agents whose ugly combination will distort the lives of our children and wrench them out of human shape.' (48)

Problems of Style

Raymond Williams's reputation as an academic, a political analyst and visionary was gained despite the notoriously complex way in which he presented his ideas. It is this difficulty of style which has done most to promote the image of Williams as 'detached', 'reclusive' and as a teacher, uninterested in his students(49).

By general agreement Williams's work is opaque, dense, almost impenetrable. The eminent historian, Gwyn Williams, a contemporary of Williams, has defied anyone to read ML without 'going round the bend' (50). Terry Lovell describes the question of style in Williams's work as a 'problem of address' (51). Lovell argues that the density of Williams's writing, the way in which he follows qualification with qualification, is a demand to be vigilant; that we recognise complexity and difficulty in the context of a structurally unequal culture. However, this undoubtedly presents problems of communication. Lovell suggests that Benjamin's dictum; 'A thought must be crude to come into its own in action' might be opposed to Williams's tortuous reasoning. However, he finally offers the following formulation of the problem of communication and complexity,

"How can we overcome the barriers to communication attendant upon a structurally unequal culture without compromising the necessary complexities of an adequate socialist theory." (52)

Williams's style was reflective and contemplative rather than in the manner of conventional research writing. His work is most often devoid of footnotes, cross references and the usual apparatus of learning. As Raphael Samuel has suggested his mode

of reasoning 'relies for its resonance on the echoes it awakes in the reader rather than the proofs of the words on the page' (53). As Williams himself remarked, the whole process of his writing was one of almost constant theoretical redefinition and reformulation.

How was it that given this difficulty of style, Williams was able to command such respect, even veneration, the symbolic 'father' to a whole generation of socialists? To what does he owe his reputation and popularity? In defining Williams's legacy we ought to recognise his whole theoretical project on the one hand, and on the other, the resources he left behind with which to continue and extend that project. Terry Eagleton has described Williams's project as providing the 'resources for a journey of hope' (54). Jenny Taylor claims that Williams's articulation of Marxism, cultural materialism, provides the necessary framework for an analysis of the private and the personal, and further, the way in which the private and the personal are interconnected to the public and political (55). Feminist thinkers, e.g. Carolyn Steadman, have begun to engage sympathetically with Williams's work on education (56). The appeal of Williams, particularly to the young, was that he used the connection between theory and what he referred to as 'lived experience', as a touchstone for the whole of his work. The importance of his work for the future is that it provides a framework which dissolves many of the divisions that afflict, socialist, feminist and cultural theory.

Williams's work on education has been influential. By general agreement Williams was the central founding influence for the area of Cultural Studies, also, Urban Studies draws heavily in theoretical terms from CC, in the same way his books Comm, Tel and Cul have provided Media and

Communication Studies with a theoretical foundation (57). A constant theme of this work is the way in which Williams juxtaposes customary or ordinary values with educated values and comes down heavily in favour of the former. This is a judgement he shares with Noam Chomsky who writes of his relationship with 'ordinary' people,

"Because - ordinary people have pretty much the same values and I think the reason is, they're innate. It takes a lot of education to drive them out of you." (58)

Behind this judgement of the values of ordinary people lies the assumption that most of what constitutes contemporary education is, in fact, anti-educational. In this argument the values and learning of customary life (culture) are at odds with those of official education and learning. What is interesting about this to philosophers, I think, is the underlying theory supporting this claim; learning and human consciousness are associated with community and communicative action rather than with the development of individual and autonomous minds. Official or imposed education, as a defined block of knowledge and set of procedures, is seen, in this argument, as ideological and imperialist.

After 1988

Since Williams's death in 1988 there has been a series of essays, articles and books on various aspects of his work. Much of this new work has been in the form of collections of previously published work (59) or consists of essays written in tribute to Williams's memory. As far as I am able to discover only one of these publications has been on Williams and education, John McIlroy's essay on Williams's time at the Oxford Delegacy, 1946-61 (60). I have referred to this work where it has been relevant or suggested new insights. As McIlroy has remarked, '... the man and his work, will eventually become the subject of a definitive, original treatment, integrated in a longer biography' (61). Such 'original' work has yet to be written. This thesis is a contribution to the understanding of Williams's perspectives on education.

Notes

1. J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, p.137.
2. Williams, 'Adult Education and Social Change' in What I Came to Say, p.158.
3. Ibid. p.161.
4. Oxford University Archives (Oxford), DES/M/2/1/2-3. 1954-62.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid. In particular Arthur Marsh in Industrial Relations.
7. Of particular interest to Williams were the Italian theorist, Sebastiano Timpanaro and the French philosopher, Lucien Goldmann.
8. See Williams's Personal File, Oxford DES/F/10/3/4.
9. See Oxford, DES/SB/2/1/29-44., 1946-47.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Oxford, DES/M/2/1/2-3.
13. R. Hoggart, Uses of Literacy, Penguin, 1957.
14. E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, London. Pelican, 1963.
15. Williams, What I Came to Say, p.162.
16. Oxford. DES/SB/2/1/2-3. 1946-61.
17. J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults.
18. F.R. Leavis, Culture and Environment, London, 1933. Letters in Criticism, London, 1974. 'The "Great Books" and a Liberal Education', Commentary, Vol. XV1, July 1953 - December 1953.
19. Williams, 'The Teaching of Public Expression' Highway, April 1953.
20. Williams, 'The Idea of Culture', Essays in Criticism, 1953, p.21.
21. Williams, Open Letter to Tutors, The Workers' Educational Association, 1961.
23. J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, p.154.
24. R. Hoggart, 'Teaching Literature to Adults' in Speaking to Each Other Vol. 2, London, Chatto and Windus, 1970.
25. Williams's Personal File, Oxford, DES/F/10/3/4.
26. Oxford, DES/SB/2/1/29-44.
27. Ibid.
28. Report on Trade Union Education by the Director of Studies, University of Oxford Delegacy for Extra-Mural Studies, 1952. The Clegg Report on Trade Union Education, 1959.
29. Williams, Politics and Letters, p.80.
30. See Professor R. Fieldhouse, Oxford and Adult Education 1946-61, unpublished paper, University of Exeter, undated, and J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, 1990.
31. Oxford, Williams's Personal File.
32. Oxford, DES/SB/2/1/29-44.
33. Williams, 'Public Expression', unpublished paper for conference on teaching methods in trade union education, 1956.
34. Ibid.
35. D. Hare, The Guardian, June 3, 1989.
36. Oxford, DES/SB/2/1/29-44.
37. J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, p.141.
38. Oxford, Williams's Personal File.
39. Williams, 'My Cambridge', reprinted in What I came to Say, 1989.
40. S. Heath, 'Modern English Man', Times Higher Educational Supplement, 20 July 1984, p.17.
41. D. Hare, The Guardian, 1989.
42. Oxford, Williams's Personal File, letter 8 January 1962, F. Pickstock to W. Style.
43. G. Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness, London, Merlin, 1971.
44. A. Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. Hoare and

- Nowell Smith, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- 45.D Hargreaves, The Challenge for the Comprehensive School, London, RKP, 1982.
- 46.F. Mulhearn, The Guardian, January 29, 1988.
47. Interview with author, 1988.
- 48.F. Inglis, Times Higher Education Supplement, 5 February 1988, p.12.
- 49.D. Hare, The Guardian, 1989.
50. Prof.G. Williams, television interview in 'Raymond Williams; A Tribute', 1990.
- 51.T. Lovell, 'Knowable Pasts, Imaginable Futures' conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
52. Ibid.
- 53.R. Samuel, ' 'Philosophy Teaching by Example': Past and Present in Raymond Williams.' History Workshop Journal, 1989.
- 54.T. Eagleton, Raymond Williams: Perspectives, London, Polity, 1989.
- 55.J. Taylor, 'Long Revolutions: Gender and Generation in the Work of Raymond Williams', conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
- 56.C. Steadman, 'Writing, Teaching and Learning', conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
57. Williams, The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists, ed. T. Pinkney, London, Verso, 1989, Introduction.
- 58.N. Chomsky, Times Higher Educational Supplement, 3 February 1989, p.15.
59. Williams, Resources of Hope; The Politics of Modernism; What I Came to Say.
- 60.J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, 1990.
61. Ibid. p.131.

Chapter 1. Introduction

The aim of this first chapter will be to present what I have selected as the primary concept of Williams's theoretical work as applied to education; culture. As I pointed out in the Introduction, Williams's abstract style puts a high priority on the task of clarification. With this in mind I will attempt to clarify this concept where possible. The new sources which have become available since Williams's death will provide the basis for the discussion.

Chapter 1 Culture and Education

A theory of Culture is at the centre of Williams's thinking about politics and education. In his book Cul Williams offers a detailed account of this theory and there are comprehensive references in CS, Comm and elsewhere (1). Since Williams's death in 1988 a number of previously unpublished works have become available. These are in the form of articles, transcripts of lectures and talks, and film and video. Some of this work was written in the 1980's and clarifies earlier positions. However, much of this work represents new thinking by Williams on both familiar and unfamiliar concepts. Examples of these new concerns are the relation between personal, cultural and vocational education, visual education and the connection between industry and education. The material in which these issues are confronted by Williams is to be found mainly in contributions he made to Open University radio and television programmes and to the content of OU courses (2), and in the form of collections of articles (3). This newly available work is particularly useful in the task of unravelling the complexities of Williams's theory of culture and its application to education. I will use this recently published and unpublished work as the basis for an exposition of Williams's theory of culture.

'Culture is Ordinary', 'Culture and Communication', and 'The Idea of a Common Culture' are lectures and articles brought together for the first time in a book entitled Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy and Socialism, edited by Robin Gale (4). These first chapters of the book offer a clear and succinct expression of Williams's Cultural Theory and its

application to education. At the centre of this theory is the claim that culture and education are 'ordinary'. Alongside this claim is the associated assertion that culture, politics and education, conventionally regarded as distinct entities, are inextricably interwoven.

There are several sources where Williams outlines these claims and assertions including those already mentioned. I will also use unpublished sources, i.e., the transcript of an OU film, Worker, Scholar or Citizen?, part of the Society, Education and the State course (5). The justification for using these sources rather than more familiar ones, e.g., CS and Cul, is that the new and unpublished work refers specifically to education. It is not an exaggeration to say that this work taken together provides for the first time a coherent and unified expression of Williams's philosophy of education. These new sources also have an extraordinary topical relevance. In the film, Worker, Scholar or Citizen?, made in 1980, Williams's views on culture, politics, and education are set alongside those of the Polish educational philosopher, Bogdan Suchodolski. I will attempt to use these sources as a unity rather than take each in turn.

In attempting an exposition of Williams's ideas on culture and education two questions come to mind. Firstly, what precisely does he mean by culture? Secondly, what does it mean to say culture is ordinary? In answering these questions we can begin to grasp the nub of Williams's philosophy of education. Nearly thirty years ago Williams wrote,

"The way in which education is organised can be seen to express consciously and unconsciously the wider organisation of a culture in the society. So

that what's been thought of as simple distribution is in fact an active shaping to particular social ends. The content of education which is subject to great historical variation, again expresses, again both consciously and unconsciously, certain basic elements in the culture. What is thought of as education, being in fact a particular set of emphases and omissions." (6)

Both for Williams and Suchodolski the form and content of education are determined by the culture of a society, nation or state. As culture is a term which can mean widely different things to different people we need to clarify the meaning which the two writers assign to the term. Williams and Suchodolski are in agreement as to the meaning and use of the term and its practical and theoretical application to education. For these two educational philosophers culture is bound up with the way in which a society sees itself and the individuals within it. In this definition culture is not only forms of art, literature, etc., but relates to the whole life of the society, including its philosophical basis. The culture of a society, reflected in its system of education, is derived, consciously or unconsciously, from its conception of what it is to be a human being. For Suchodolski, living in a socialist society, the link is fundamental. He outlines what he thinks is the socialist conception of man,

"..... a socialist conception of man is truly a European conception of man, based on the very rich tradition of utopian thought. Karl Marx once said that there are real men and true men, the real men exist, and the true

man does not exist. The socialist is the conception to eliminate this conflict, between the true and the real." (7)

Suchodolski proceeds to describe the educational process in Poland which has created a people's intelligentsia a considerable part of which is of working class or peasant origin. This has replaced the bourgeois intelligentsia of the pre-socialist period. Suchodolski details the way in which permanent education has become a real possibility in Poland with strong social aspirations having been stimulated for further education and further participation in culture. The Polish educational system, according to Suchodolski, has clear ideas on the type of human being it is intent on developing. These ideas are linked to the conception of the general culture. It is interesting that Suchodolski sees the Polish university, democratised and given a social purpose, as the principal agent in this process. Suchodolski links culture and education in Poland in this way,

" The education can only co-operate with social policies in the solution to important problems, especially those having to do with culture and personality. In our educational system we are trying to tell the young men that they must work not only to earn their living but also to fulfill their personality, that they should use their leisure for inner enrichment, through participation in culture and pursuits of personal interest we are trying to reduce egoistic motivation in behaviour and stress the social one, to develop feelings of sympathy and of kindness. We know how very hard life is in our time and how much cruelty and stupidity there is on our globe." (8)

Suchodolski tells us that in Poland it is the universities that are called upon to contribute to a new harmony in the world and a new harmony in men. This, of course leads to the problem of an educated elite. However, Suchodolski points out that the Polish educated elite is a fully open one accessible to all. In any case, he argues, an educated elite is the best elite. There are a number of questions that arise out of this account of the Polish system of education and its related conception of socialist man and Suchodolski is quick to seize on these. We will shortly see how Williams identifies similar problems in the relation between culture and education in Britain. Largely, these problems arise from the balance of the relation between education and the culture of economics of a society. In education itself, the problems are manifested in an 'inevitable' tension between vocational, cultural and personal education. Or, to use the title of the OU programme, between man as worker, scholar or citizen.

These problems are of a philosophical, cultural and educational nature. Suchodolski, believes these problems or contradictions come mainly in two forms, he puts it this way,

"They (the problems) have to do with the pressure of secondary school leavers who want to continue their education, but from the point of view of the national economy there is no need for the many people in higher education. A conflict is therefore emerging between the decisions of the planners to restrict the number of higher school graduates according to the needs of national economy, in order to prevent over production and unemployment and aspirations of the young who want to enter higher schools." (9)

It is worth pointing out at this stage that Suchdolski's contribution to the debate is in the form of a transcript of his spoken English. However, the sense of what he is saying is perfectly clear.

The second problem, for Suchodolski, has to do with the general culture. As he claims, 'learning is very important and not the preparation for jobs'. He is referring here to the conflict involved in the primary aim of the culture, and therefore education, of creating the socialist, harmonious and non-egotistical man and the pressure of implementing economic and social policies that threaten this primary aim. It is this problem of the relation between the culture, including education, and the economy, according to Suchodolski, that is the most urgent problem in contemporary Poland.

It is conventional wisdom in Western capitalist countries to see these developments outlined above by Suchodolski as very particularised Eastern European/Communist concerns. Tensions between economics and education, between education and conceptions of man are regarded as abstractions to work through or develop theories about in Western countries, apart from one or two notable exceptions (10). A central feature of twentieth century politics is certain to be the outcome of the debate in Poland between demands for increased political democratisation on one hand and on the demand for a more efficient capitalist style economy on the other. A further question arising from this is the extent to which the Polish commitment to a socialist conception of man is compromised through developments in the economy. All this has tremendous consequences for education in Poland.

Like Suchodolski, Raymond Williams has developed a theory of culture which incorporates education, the nature of a country's economy and a related conception of man. In Williams's early works he was concerned with the relation between bourgeois theories of art and his own and Marxist ideas of aesthetics and cultural analysis. In his later and unpublished work he applies his developed theoretical position to the links between culture, philosophy, politics and economics. As with Suchodolski, Williams's position on these questions can be contained within the three notions of worker, scholar and citizen. Actually it is better formulated as a question, worker, scholar or citizen? Each of these terms is related to the culture of a society. The Polish educators have a clear idea of what a citizen in a socialist society should be. Similarly, workers in the Polish system have greatly benefited from egalitarian policies.

In the LR Williams outlined his ideas on the history of British education. He identified three types of educator, the 'old humanist', the 'industrial trainer' and the 'public educator'. In the Worker, Scholar, Citizen? programme Williams applies these categories to contemporary education in Britain. In another programme made for the OU, Industrialisation and Culture (11) Williams extends these categories in an analysis of politics and education in China and the Soviet Union. I will consider this programme shortly in a slightly different context. The tension between these three categories, put another way, aims of education, can be seen as the tension between economic and non-economic aspects of national development most clearly visible in the case of socialist states attempting to direct their education system, both to bring about rapid economic growth and to produce a radically different kind of person. In Worker, Scholar, Citizen? Williams is able to get to the problem and tension through consideration of the

relation between industrial and humanist interests in the curriculum. For example, in the 1960's the pressure for economic change and the industrial relevance of education took the form of a very supportive view of progressive methods of education. The argument goes that discovery methods in the curriculum were a preparation for accelerated change in a future working life. For Williams, The Plowden Report (12) was heavily backed by people who had the economic interests of the country at heart. The 1970's saw a reversal of this process. Insistence of economic relevance has not been supported by progressive methods but the very opposite. In the 1980's there has been an imposed return to 'traditional standards', teacher accountability, an attack on progressive methods and, the introduction of a national curriculum and rigorous and regular testing. Williams's interviewers in the programme are keen for him to explain why in one decade economic growth should be a liberating and yet a decade later seem much more reactionary? Williams's answer has important implications for culture and education and its philosophical basis.

Williams argues that in the 1960's and early 1970's economic growth was combined with notions of individual fulfilment and individual liberation. Free-thinking individuals were necessary to develop the technological revolution that would produce rapid economic growth. However, according to Williams, progressive educational methods made individuals question the whole system in which work was organised rather than achieving the desired effect of producing flexible workers and a competitive economy. Williams develops his argument to explain the return to more reactionary methods in the late 1970's and 1980's. Governments and industrialists, he argues, began to prepare for an economy in which there will be some 'highly skilled people and there will be some definitely skilled people, and otherwise a

lot of people who are not going to participate in the economy'. Williams believes that it is at this point that education takes on its disciplinary character. In all sectors of education, including the formally independent universities, industrial interests are being accommodated.

The debate over priorities and methods in education during this period, Williams asserts, has been dominated by the 'old humanists' and the 'industrial trainers'. This has tended to obscure the arguments of the 'public educators' who are interested in reshaping a curriculum so that it equips people with the ability to make decisions based upon a full knowledge of how the society and economy really work. Or, as Williams puts it,

"..... the job is still public education and only the continual production of knowledge and free enquiry inside those (educational) institutions directed towards this public world is sufficient for people to make responsible decisions." (13)

Industry, politics and education are all major components which go towards forming Williams's theory of culture. Politics is a particularly influential component, especially in the form of the State. In the Worker, Scholar or Citizen programme Williams's ideas on culture and education are set against those of Government Education Minister, Mark Carlisle. It was put to Carlisle in an interview that while it seems appropriate in British culture to talk about the notion of scholar, it seemed less appropriate to talk about an intelligentsia in the way in which Sochodolski did.



Similarly, somehow the notion of speaking of education for citizenship, or education to create a different kind of citizen is alien to the British, it is not part of their culture.

In reply, Carlisle conventionally equates education for a new type of citizen as 'brainwashing' he expands on the need to teach students civics,

"Equally citizenship or civics is a basic fundamental subject or knowledge which is imparted to children. So I think we've renounced anything that might be suggested as brainwashing." (14)

Civics, for Carlisle, is the way in which Building Societies and mortgages work, etc. When asked whether he would welcome something called Political Education onto the curriculum, Carlisle replies,

"I don't think it needs to be introduced. My impression is that with the help of such bodies as the Hansard Society that quite a lot is already being done in this area." (15)

Williams, reacting to Carlisle's opinion that the state can pick out the issues that need discussing, e.g., understanding mortgages or understanding politics through Hansard (16), claims that in education there are other ways of seeing politics. These other ways, as outlined by Williams, give an indication of his whole theory of politics and concern the 'experience' of

pupils, particularly older pupils, parents and teachers. As Williams writes,

"There is another way of seeing politics with the experience of what are often now, you know, mature adolescents, young adults and parents involved in it; and this so much more active process, public decision about public education one has to look at it, although the barriers to it are still very high and all kinds of interests mobilise against public interest really talking itself, working itself through." (17)

'Experience' of 'mature adolescents', 'public decision about public education', are terms which indicate this other way of seeing politics. Williams is highlighting in this transcript the cultural and political divide which separates educators and politicians from their client group. These educators and politicians fail to recognise the central importance of the 'lived experience' of different groups of students when forming the curriculum. This failure produces alienation among students and erects a barrier between teachers and taught because what is offered appears irrelevant and meaningless. For Williams, as I will try to show in Ch.2, the cultural experience of different student groups, e.g., women, ethnic minorities and working class adolescents, needs to be accommodated into the curriculum. Further, these groups should have a major voice in the decision making process in public education. This ultra-democratic practice, encouraged by Williams, is echoed in every part of his cultural theory, e.g. economic democracy, political democracy and cultural democracy. This 'other way of seeing politics' has nothing to do with the study of

institutions. It is to do with the practice of people being actively involved in making decisions about the kind of education they want for themselves and for their children. This is in itself a valuable political experience.

In Worker, Scholar or Citizen? Raymond Williams outlines his ideas on the relations between culture and education, between 'experience' or 'customary life' and the values of the 'educated', and between the various aims to which education has been put. In his defence of a full public and democratic education against the industrial trainers and the 'old humanists', he recognises the gains and losses of industrial society. Williams supports the idea of a democratic industrial society whose priorities are publicly discussed and decided upon. It is an industrial society whose educated citizens are fully involved in the process of deciding which values should inform what and how we should produce economically. In answer to the question Worker, Scholar or Citizen? Williams supports education for a new and radical citizen or human being. For Williams, this cannot be achieved until we begin to see that education is inextricably linked to the political and economic culture of the society. We must rethink and question the values and assumptions of the economic and political culture and transmit these to the educational process. Williams's conception of 'citizen' is a radical and socialist one, it echoes the concept of the 'citoyen' of the French Revolution and is a cultural phenomenon.

The transcript of the OU programme under discussion is an important source for analysing Williams's ideas on the influence of culture on education. The programme is also important source for seeing how Williams links

education and politics and where we can discover the first strands of a theory of political education which I will develop in later chapters. In the remainder of this section of the chapter I will examine several other newly available sources on Williams's ideas on the relation between culture and education. In these sources I will attempt to examine his claim that education and culture are 'ordinary', and finally, to consider Williams's ideas on the links between philosophy, education, culture and industrialisation.

One Pair of Eyes

In a film made by the Independent film company Large Door, entitled One Pair of Eyes, Williams pursues his theme of the existence of a divide and distance between teachers and students in schools and, between the conventional curriculum and the unrepresented experience of students and their parents. In this film Williams develops a theme that runs throughout his theoretical and creative work, that of 'the border'. The 'border' serves as a metaphor for this gap or divide between the aims and offer of education and the experience of many of those to whom it is offered. Without question this 'border' acts as a metaphor for what is more commonly referred to as a class barrier. There is evidence for this in the film when Williams and the writer Dennis Potter contrast the pure class-based system of education in England with the less socially divisive system in Wales.

For Williams and Potter crossing the 'border' is not only a geographical and political crossing from Wales into England but the crossing from one set of cultural and customary values to another. Put in more political terms the crossing of one class into another. In One Pair of Eyes Williams compares the experience and expectations of education in his native village of Pandy and those of the University of Cambridge where he went first as a young student and then later as a Lecturer, before he became the University's Professor of Drama.

In the film Williams talks to the Head of the Primary school in Pandy who points out that those children who go on to Further or Higher Education will have to move away, either into other parts of Wales or more commonly crossing the border into England. For Williams this is not simply a geographical movement but a cultural one involving exposure to different and inferior values. In a parallel investigation in the film Williams talks to the people who work in the Cambridge Colleges as cleaners, cooks and waitresses. These people still described by the University as 'servants' talk about the attitudes of the students towards them in extremely unflattering terms; a further example of the 'border' operating in English education. From this investigation Williams contrasts the Cambridge of the University with the Cambridge of factories, work and 'ordinary' people. The visual contrasts are vivid and stark, the comments on the contrasts are equally revealing. Williams interviews a Labour Councillor who describes the political and economic power of the University in the town. This power, according to the Councillor, is undemocratic and elitist; it is, in fact, a case of class and cultural domination of a minority institution over a town with a population of a quarter of a million people.

In another interview this time with a person who has crossed the 'border' from a working life into St. Johns' College as a mature student, Williams is told of the experience of 'crossing over' from one set of values to another. This student, a man of fifty or so, describes this new educational experience in terms of others' perceptions of his change. His friends and family describe his new life as a student in terms of 'moving up the ladder' or 'getting on'. For Williams, these are typical reactions to the experience of ordinary working people moving into education.

The film moves from these interviews to a literature seminar Williams holds with a small group of students. The group are discussing the role of work and working people in the English novel. The discussion ranges from the novels of Dickens and Hardy to Austen and Bronte. The conclusions reached are that work and working people hardly exist in these works at all. When they do it is in the rather specialised case of Hardy. When education comes into the novels of Dickens and Hardy it is used in a negative sense, e.g. Hard Times and Jude the Obscure. Again the idea of the 'border' is present in these novels when the topic is education and work. Education is counterposed to customary values of 'neighbourhood' and 'community' and, work to the life of romantic and contemplative ideals.

Williams illustrates his argument in the film by articulating his own experience of crossing the 'border' from the life of a working class community and its set of values to the world of education. On arriving at Cambridge Williams was told that the University was the repository of 'whatsoever is pure and true' and that the values of knowledge and education were superior to the values of a working class family life that he had learnt. Moreover, he was informed, Cambridge University was an old

place and that he should be in awe of this. In the film Williams remarks that, actually, he had come from an older place and was not to be taken in by this intended position of superiority. The process of education which Williams and others had experienced was, he believes, that of climbing a ladder, a solitary activity he contrasts with his own feeling that this process should more resemble a common highway which can be collectively negotiated.

Two points come over very clearly in the film. Firstly, that education as presently constituted in England, particularly in minority institutions like universities, offers a different set of values to the cultural experience of many of those to whom it is offered. Williams further contends that education is class-based and dominated by powerful elites. Secondly, that this need not be the case. The second point Williams takes pains to stress is the value of learning, but not in the individualised way in which it is now presented. He believes that the learning should be a collective enterprise with collective aims. The cultural values of working people should inform the basis of curricula and the way in which institutions are organised. The 'border' is a useful metaphor for describing the divide between the cultural experience of working people and the values offered by the educational process. In a moving piece of the film Williams describes the physical experience of walking up the Black Mountains where the path becomes narrow and can only be walked alone. The air turns colder higher up the mountain as the terrain becomes less hospitable. Williams then describes the feeling of returning to the base of the mountain and the comfort and reassurance of his village. This description of the movement up the mountain can be interpreted as a metaphor for the journey from customary and working life into higher education. As I have mentioned,

Williams values the learning and concludes that borders are there to be crossed. In later chapters I will examine alternative forms of education which embody the values Williams wishes to strengthen.

The successful crossing of the 'border' can only be achieved through radical change. Williams's real motive is the obliteration of the existing 'border'. This change can begin to be achieved once we realise that culture and education are 'ordinary'.

Culture is Ordinary

A central claim of Williams's theory of culture is that culture and education are ordinary. Before we can explain and assess these claims we need to put them into context. Williams has written a number of theoretical works on the subject of culture and cultural theory (18). I do not intend to look at them here because they do not refer specifically to education. However, in the interests of clarity it is necessary to rehearse some arguments contained in these general works. Williams's whole theoretical work on culture has two influences and concerns; Marxism and the cultural theory of F.R. Leavis(19).

Williams's particular theory of culture is an attempt to develop a synthesis between these two influential positions. Williams both rejects

and accepts something in these different cultural theories, which taken together have proved powerful influences in British intellectual attitudes to culture and education.

Williams accepts the element of Marxist cultural theory which stresses that economic production and cultural production have a direct relationship. An example Williams offers is the way in which in capitalist societies newspapers and television reflect the cultural biases of their industrial sponsors through advertising. A more general Marxist argument that Williams broadly accepts is that the major art and literary forms of the capitalist epoch reflect the dominant values of the capitalist class. This is the straightforward Marxist idea of the ruling ideas of an epoch being determined by the form of economic production, in this case, capitalism. Williams also accepts the Marxist contention that education and economic production have a direct relationship. This argument runs that education in capitalist societies is restricted in the ways in which I have suggested above.

Williams rejects as much as he accepts in Marxist cultural theory, including the argument that,

".....since culture and production are related, the advocacy of a different system of production is in some way a cultural directive, indicating not only a way of life but new arts and learning." (20)

Williams points to the practical disasters to this kind of argument, especially with the cases of certain writers in Eastern European countries. It is just impossible and 'insane' to predict the way in which people think or the meanings which they might make. The other point Williams makes against the Marxist position is that it makes out the mass of the people to be mere compliant 'wage slaves' devoid of intelligence and finer feelings, the 'doped mass' argument. Williams points to the achievements of working class cultural organisations and to the cultural interests of the people of his own Welsh village to refute this claim of Marxism. This has been a necessarily brief and general discussion of Williams position vis-a-vis Marxism but helps to put his cultural theory in the context in which it was developed.

Leavis's cultural theory is less complex than that of Marx and therefore simpler to present in a brief form. As with Williams, Leavis stressed the importance of the relation of culture to education although the two reached different conclusion as to the nature of the relation. Leavis developed a version of what is wrong with English culture that, Williams argues, is rapidly becoming orthodox. It is worth quoting Williams's summary of Leavis's analysis of English culture at this stage;

"There was old, mainly agricultural England, with a traditional culture of great value. This has been replaced by a modern, organised, industrial state, whose characteristic institutions deliberately cheapen our natural human responses, making art and literature into desperate survivors and witnesses, while a new mechanised vulgarity sweeps into the centres of power. The only defence is in education, which will at least keep alive,

and which will also, at least in a minority, develop ways of thinking and feeling which are competent to understand what is happening and to maintain the finest individual values." (21)

Williams accepted Leavis's contention that the dominant culture was corrupt. He was not prepared to take the further step of accepting that the 'mass' culture was inferior and valueless to those of the pre-industrial period. In fact Williams was unhappy with the notion of 'masses' altogether. Williams further rejected Leavis's hatred of industrial society.

Williams rejected the Leavis notion of an ignorant mass; his own experience supported him in this rejection. At a lecture on Shakespeare Williams attended along with Leavis the point was made, and supported by Leavis, that 'neighbour' no longer meant what it did to Shakespeare. Williams stood up and argued that to him it did. In Culture is Ordinary Williams supports his argument in this passage,

"When my father was dying, this year, one man came and dug his garden; another loaded and delivered a lorry of sleepers for firewood; another came and chopped the sleepers into blocks; another - I don't know who, it was never said - left a sack of potatoes at the back door; a woman came in and took away a basket of washing." (22)

Leavis believed that industrial society inevitable brought with it a mass society. Popular education, rather than the elite version Leavis supported, would, in this argument, lead to a culture 'low and trivial in taste and habit'. I will shortly, try to show how Williams defends working class culture against these criticisms and, also, to outline the values which support Williams's version of what he takes working class culture to consist of. Leavis's conclusion was that short of returning to a pastoral England, an elite education would ensure the continuation of the organic but threatened values, e.g. harmony, composure, gentility, etc., he believed were indigenous to English culture. Williams, with similar concerns, supports a particular form of industrial society and popular education. Williams puts the case for industrial society this way,

"The working people, in town and country alike, will not listen, and I support them, to any account of our society which supposes that these things are not progress: not just mechanical, external progress either, but a real service of life. Moreover, in the new conditions, there was more real freedom to dispose of our lives, more real personal grasp where it mattered, more real say. Any account of our culture which explicitly or implicitly denies the value of an industrial society is really irrelevant; not in a million years would you make us give up this power." (23)

Williams is referring to the material things habitually ridiculed by a 'higher culture'. Although he supports the gains of industrialism Williams is quick to point out the dangers. These dangers have to do with power; power over cultural production and power over industrial production.

Williams believes that capitalists have abused both forms of power. In T2000 he offers an outline of a socialist industrial and cultural society. I will consider the latter in a later chapter. Leavis's error was in believing that industrialisation per se was alien and corrupt. The second and consequent error was in supposing that because people were physically massed in towns this meant they were then the 'masses' or the 'mob' constructed in our minds as 'the other'. Williams claim the 'culture is ordinary' is an attempt to correct these errors.

The necessarily brief discussion of Marx and Leavis on cultural theory helps to locate Williams's position on culture in its theoretical context. Both Marx and Leavis, like Williams, recognise the relation of culture to politics, economics and education. It now remains in this section of the chapter to look more closely at precisely what Williams means by claiming that 'cultural and education are ordinary'

Williams wants to particularly stress the richness and depth of working class culture and its values, he writes,

"There is a distinct working-class way of life, which I for one value - not only because I was bred in it, for I now, in certain respects, live differently. I think this way of life, with its emphases of neighbourhood, mutual obligation, and common betterment as expressed in the great working class political and industrial institutions, is in fact the best basis for any future English society." (24)

Williams continues,

"So when the Marxists say that we live in a dying culture, and that the masses are ignorant, I have to ask them , where on earth have they lived. A dying culture and ignorant masses are not what I have known and see." (25)

We shall see shortly how education has impeded the development of working class culture in English society. Firstly, I will consider further Williams claim that 'culture is ordinary'. He rejects the observation that the 'badness' of a widely distributed popular culture is an accurate guide to the state of mind and feeling, and quality of living of its consumers. As I explained in the Introduction, Williams again turns to personal experience to support his argument,

"It is easy to assemble, from print and cinema and television, a terrifying and fantastic congress of cheap feelings and moronic arguments." (26)

He continues later,

"... a few weeks ago I was in a house with a commercial traveller, a lorry driver, a bricklayer, a shopgirl, a fitter, a signaller, a nylon operative, a domestic help." (27)

Williams tells us that he hates describing people in this way, for in fact these people were his family and family friends. He was unable, talking to his friends, to make the equation offered about popular culture. He continues,

"I can only say that I found as much natural fineness of feeling, as much quick discrimination, as much clear grasp of ideas within the range of experience as I have found anywhere." (28)

Williams does not underestimate the power and influence of the dominant culture and is unsure about the psychological power of print and image. But he wishes to emphasise that there are no masses only ways of seeing people as 'masses'.

Williams turns to a more concrete and political argument to support his claim that 'culture is ordinary'. He attacks both communist and elitist notions of the 'mass',

"..... I got angry at my friends' talk about the ignorant masses: one kind of communist has always talked like this and has got his answer, at Poznan and Budapest, as the imperialists, making the same assumption, were answered in India, in Indo-China, Africa." (29)

In 1989 one might add to this Tienanmen Square in Beijing and Gdansk in Poland. Williams recognises the power of the dominant culture, with its powerful literary, educational and social institutions and that most ordinary people are excluded from this. What he is not prepared to accept is that working people are excluded from English culture. They have their own institutions and much of the strictly bourgeois culture they would reject. Williams is dismissive of the bourgeois culture of the late twentieth century. He believes that this culture has been drained of any ethical content. In a particularly vituperative passage Williams remarks,

"The smooth reassurance of technical efficiency is no substitute for the whole positive human reference. Yet men who once made this reference, men who were or wanted to be writers or scholars, are now, with every appearance of satisfaction, advertising men, publicity boys, names in the strip newspapers. These men were given skills, given attachments, which are now in the service of the most brazen money-grabbing exploitation of the experience of ordinary people." (30)

For Williams, culture is ordinary, it includes the nature of a society's economic arrangements, its education system, its commitment to learning and the arts, and its political culture. It is not possible to understand the meanings and commitments of a society unless we understand its culture in this particular sense. The education system of a culture also has to be understood in the way in which it connects with the other elements of the culture.

If, for Williams, 'culture is ordinary' so is education. Williams wishes to deny the claim, made by Leavis and others, that the introduction of popular education was the occasion for the development of a mass and inferior culture. Williams argues that the new commercial culture came out of the social chaos of industrialism; the connection between it and popular education is vicious. Williams believed this dubious connection was used by, among others, Lord Northcliffe in his introduction of a cheap popular press financed by mass advertising. The connection between popular education and mass culture is false and Williams provides statistical evidence,

"The editions of good literature are very much larger than they were; the listeners to good music are much more numerous than they were; the number of people who look at good visual art is larger than it has ever been."

(31)

Williams makes a related point about the nature of the dominant culture,

"We now spend £20,000,000 annually on all our libraries, museums, galleries, orchestras, on the Arts Council, and on all forms of Adult Education. At the same time we spend £365,000,000 annually on advertising. When these figures are reversed, we can claim some sense of proportion and value."

(32)

Williams claim that 'education is ordinary' is based on the rejection of the idea of a 'mass' culture, the belief that 'mass culture' arose out of the introduction of popular education, a critique of the values of the elite and dominant education system, and a 'faith', based on experience, of the demand for learning of ordinary working people. Throughout Williams's work on education he stresses the conceptual difference between 'learning' and 'education'; the difference is one of value. 'Learning' is what is sought, 'education' or 'official learning' is what is offered; here Williams is referring to the 'gap' which he believes exists between the learners' educational needs, particularly those of adult students, and the perception of these needs by educationists. Ch.5 contains an extended discussion on this question through an analysis of Thomas Hardy's distinction between, 'educated' and 'customary' values. Williams proceeds from this critical stance to describe what form he believes an 'ordinary' education should take. He writes,

"I wish, first, that we should recognise that education is ordinary: that it is, before anything else, the process of giving to the ordinary members of society its full common meanings, and the skills that will enable them to amend these meanings, in the light of their personal and common experience." (33)

and, again,

"I believe, myself, that our educational system, with its golden fractions, is too like our social system - a top layer of leaders, a middle layer of supervisors, a large bottom layer of operatives - to be coincidence."

(34)

later,

"I cannot accept that education is a training for jobs, or making useful citizens. It is a society's confirmation of its common meanings, and of the human skills for their amendment. Jobs follow from this confirmation; the purpose, and then the working skill." (35)

he continues,

"... I ask for a common education that will give our society its cohesion, and prevent its disintegrating into a series of specialist departments, the nation become a firm." (36)

lastly, speaking of the educational 'ladder',

"We must emphasise not the ladder but the common highway, for every man's ignorance diminishes me, and every man's skill is a common gain of breadth." (37)

In this section of the chapter I have attempted to present Williams's theory of culture as applied to education. This is a necessary task because a theory of culture is at the centre of his whole intellectual project. Culture, for Williams, includes all the processes of the economy, politics, art and education of a society and of their inter-relation . I have not tried to go into Williams's educational theory in any detail because this is a task I will undertake in later chapters. At the centre of his theory of culture is a critique and a prescription; the critique is aimed at the dominant class-based culture and educational provision, the prescription offers a radically new, democratic theory of human being which the form and content of education is given responsibility for revealing. The society which Williams perceives is modern, emancipatory, fully democratic and egalitarian.

I will complete this section of the chapter by briefly considering the philosophical basis of Williams's theory of culture. This has largely to do with questions about the essence of man, industrialisation and, when these questions are settled, the aims of education. Williams is set against the idea that the 'essence' of man is in a sense something permanent, which the processes of industrialisation that have been noted above, have somehow altered or corrupted. In other words, industrial man, whether communist or capitalist is in different ways a mutation. This is a view expressed in literature particularly by Lawrence. In this Lawrentian view the human is

the individual. From this position Lawrence, particularly in The Rainbow, is then able to pit the helpless and alienated individual against the force of industrial society; industrial society produces a spiritual mutation of the human essence.

Against this Williams rejects the idea of industrial man as individual mutation in favour of an interpretation of the human in new terms of mutuality, co-operation and the collective. The spiritual mutation conclusion, developed as a basis for a theory of education by Leavis, excludes the resilience, inventiveness and capacity for new kinds of co-operation and new kinds of institutions. Williams is referring here to the organisations of the working people, the co-operatives and mutual educational institutions. All of these mounted resistance to the priorities of capitalist industrial society. This analysis by Williams of man under industrial society echoes Marx who did not see a human essence distorted, but recognised the complex process of men being made in profound ways, men as involved in a historical process, making and remaking the world.

Williams argues in the OU programme, Industrialisation and Culture, that the philosophical system underpinning the Industrial Revolution was Utilitarianism. The Industrial Revolution gave rise, according to Williams, to the 'greatest clash of philosophical systems that we've ever had'. The two philosophies developed against Utilitarianism and its philosophers, Bentham and Mill, were the Romanticism of Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris and, two types of Socialism, Fabianism and Marxism. These are clearly generalisations but offer an example of the integrated method of Williams who connects, philosophy, economics and culture. Williams has a definite role in this 'clash' over the nature of man under Industrialism. He accepts

its human and technical advances but rejects its capitalist priorities which diminish the democratic and mutual impulse of ordinary people within the new economic arrangements. For Williams, education should reveal and foster this cultural impulse rather than promote capitalist priorities.

Notes

1. See Politics and Letters, Resources of Hope, Politics of Modernism, What I Came to Say and Critical Perspectives.
2. Open University. E353 State, Society and Education (Worker, Scholar, Citizen?), 1980.
OU. Open Forum 65 1981.
OU. E361 Education and the Urban Environment, 1978.
OU. A/100/33 Industrialisation and Culture, 1973.
OU. D102/10 Language and Authority, 1982.
OU. A312/03 The Nature of Wuthering Heights, 1981.
OU. D283-1 Sociological Perspectives, 1971.
OU. D209/01 The State in Society in 1984, 1984.
3. See footnote 1.
4. Williams, Resources of Hope.
5. OU, E353, 1980.
6. Williams, Long Revolution, p.145.
7. OU, E353, 1980.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. See Bowles, S. and Gintis H., Schooling in Capitalist America, London, RKP, 1976.
Harris, K. Education and Knowledge, London, RKP, 1978.
Matthews, M.R., The Marxist Theory of Schooling, Sussex, Harvester, 1980.
11. OU, A/100/33, 1973.
12. Plowden Report, H.M.S.O, 1867.
13. OU, E353/02.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. See Principles of Political Literacy: The Working Papers of the Programme for Political Education, ed. A. Porter, University of London, Institute of Education, 1977.
17. OU, E353/02.
18. Williams, Politics of Modernism.
19. F.R. Leavis and D. Thompson, Culture and Environment, London, 1933.
F. R. Leavis, Letters in Criticism, (ed J. Tasker), London, 1974.
F. R. Leavis, English Literature in our Time and the University, London, 1969.
20. OU, E353/02.
21. Williams, Resources of Hope, p.9.
22. Ibid. p.9.
23. Ibid p.10.
24. Ibid. p.8.
25. Ibid. p.8.
26. Ibid. p.12.
27. Ibid. p.12.
28. Ibid. p.12.
29. Ibid. p.7.
30. Ibid. p.6.
31. Ibid. p.13.
32. Ibid. p.15.
33. Ibid. p.14.
34. Ibid. p.14.

35. Ibid. p. 14.

36. Ibid. p. 14.

37. Ibid. p. 15.

'Education and British Society' is the title of a chapter of LR and was written in 1961. The chapter represents Williams's early thinking on education and focuses on the historical development of the British educational system. Williams concludes in the LR that the way in which education is organised can be seen to express, consciously or unconsciously, the 'wider organisation of a culture and a society'. In this argument the aims and content of education are subject to historical variation. 'Education' is not a settled body of learning and teaching which has then to be distributed throughout the culture. It is a 'particular set of omissions and emphases' that reflect certain 'basic elements' of the culture. This is particularly the case with the content of education; the choices involved in the selection of content reflect choices about the way in which society is organised. Lastly, Williams contends that the aims, content and organisation of education are inextricably linked within an 'organic' relationship. He writes,

"If we are to discuss education adequately, we must examine, in historical and analytic terms, this organic relation, for to be conscious of a choice made is to be conscious of further and alternative choices available, and at a time when changes, under a multitude of pressures, will in any case occur, this degree of consciousness is vital." (1)

In 'Education and British Society' Williams examines this 'organic relation' and, identifies the available choices.

In Chapter One and in the first part of this chapter I referred mainly to Williams's later work on education because of its contemporary relevance, and because it represents a coherent body of educational theory available for the first time. However, it is important not to omit analysis of earlier work. The chapter in the LR as a provisional statement which has received later amendment and alteration. That this early work has contemporary relevance is stressed by the educationist, David Hargreaves. He writes,

"A teacher once asked me to recommend to her the most challenging, persuasive and original book known to me which might help her to understand our educational history and provide her with a vision for the future of the comprehensive school. Without hesitation I suggested Raymond Williams's The Long Revolution, first published in 1961, and especially the chapter on Education and British Society". (2)

Hargreaves continues,

"By nearly two decades Williams anticipated our contemporary concern to design for the comprehensive school a 'core curriculum' (which he referred to as educational 'essentials') and outlined a highly imaginative programme which has been surprisingly neglected in recent curriculum debates." (3)

Hargreaves was writing in 1982. The chapter in LR under discussion is divided into several sections covering different, but connected, themes; the history of British education, a proposal for a new curriculum, and a discussion on the question of education for democracy. I will take each of these themes in turn

2.

For Williams, the history of education in Britain is closely related to the economic and political developments of the country. He argues that these developments have led to the establishment of a society divided on clearly distinguishable lines of socio-economic class; education, as a central element of these developments, also shares these divisions. To illustrate his argument Williams identifies three primary aims of education which hold for all educational systems. He then proceeds to subject these three aims to historical analysis. This historical exercise leads to an analysis of contemporary educational 'values and methods'.

The three aims or purposes of education are closely connected. These three aims are; firstly, a general social training, secondly, a specialised 'skills' training, and, thirdly, a 'general education' or 'education for culture'. Williams writes,

"Schematically one can say that a child must be taught, first, the accepted behaviour and values of his society; second, the general knowledge and attitudes appropriate to an educated man, and, third, a particular skill by which he will earn his living and contribute to the welfare of his society." (4)

Williams connects his three aims in this way,

"In fact, just as the particular skill and the accepted behaviour and values are necessarily related, so, we shall find, both are related to, and help to determine, the kind of general knowledge and attitudes appropriate to an educated man." (5)

If these three aims of education are common to all cultures and societies the questions then arise as to what distinguishes one system of education from another, and, what determines the character of each particular system? The answer to these questions lies in the nature of what Williams refers to as the dominant 'social character' by which the society lives. The 'skills training' and 'general knowledge and attitudes' take their form from the 'social character'. The 'social character' of one culture differs from that of another. What then is the 'social character' of a culture or society? Williams defines 'social character' in the following way,

"... the social character is always and everywhere much more than particular habits of civility and behaviour; it is also the transmission of a particular system of values, in the field of group loyalty, authority, justice, and living purposes." (6)

For Williams, the 'social character' is not only a set of dominant values, beliefs and accepted modes of behaviour, but also, a commitment to a system of authority that legitimates these things. The 'social character' is maintained through the tacit acceptance of this authority. Williams argues that this authority is class-based in capitalist societies. Hence, his argument that the dominant 'social character' is but one of a number of possible 'social characters'. The dominant 'social character' in capitalist societies is that system of beliefs, values and modes of behaviour that are transmitted and legitimated by the dominant class. The 'social character' of the ruling capitalist class, for Williams, is opposed to the 'social character' of the working class; Williams believes the values of the working-class are essentially democratic. They are the values which would also form the basis of a fully democratic education. In 1959 Williams, working as an adult education tutor, juxtaposes the two opposed 'social characters' in an article in the journal, The Nation,

"Then why the insistence on the working-class as such? It is not a matter of any temporary way of living, but of fundamental ideas of the nature of social relationships. We base our values on the working class movement because it is the main carrier of the principle of common improvement as against individual advantage. The working class movement, in its

characteristic institutions, offers the example of community, collective action, and substantial equality of condition, as against the prevailing ethos of opportunity and hierarchy. We believe, in fact, that the spirit of these working class institutions - the cooperatives, the trade unions, the numerous voluntary associations - is the best basis for any future British society. This is the British working class culture we value: the institutions of democracy, equality and community." (7)

One very effective method of transmission and legitimation is the education system. Education is a major means of training members of a society to the 'social character'. Education towards the 'social character' is then seen by society as a 'natural training' which everyone must acquire. Williams allows room for dissent within the dominant system, he writes,

"Yet when, as often happens, the 'social character' is changing, or when, again, there are alternative 'social characters' within a given society, this 'natural training' can be something very different, and can be seen, by others, as 'indoctrination'." (8)

Throughout this discussion Williams's stresses that the 'social character' receives its legitimation from education and other areas of the culture, for example, newspapers, television and advertising. The 'social character' is, in fact, a choice. However, it does not seem like a choice because of the process of legitimation; it is accepted in terms of its value. Williams describes the process in this way,

"If we believe in a particular social character, a particular set of attitudes and values, we naturally believe that the general education which follows from these is the best that can be offered to anyone: it does not feel like 'indoctrination', or even 'training'; it feels like offering to this man the best that can be given." (9)

The relationship between the dominant 'social character', the three primary aims of education, and the variations of 'the best that can be given' in terms of available choices, becomes clearer if we turn to Williams's historical analysis of education in British society. Williams argues that this analysis will necessarily lead to an analysis of contemporary educational values and methods.

Williams's description of the historical development of the education system begins in Roman Britain, but for the purposes of this thesis I will take the Nineteenth Century as the starting point. It is important to emphasise that, for Williams, the contemporary education system is to a considerable extent determined by traditional patterns of thinking. He writes,

"The fact about our present curriculum is that it was essentially created by the nineteenth century, following some eighteenth century models, and retaining elements of the medieval curriculum near its centre." (10)

It is important to remember that Williams was writing in 1961, but as I will try to show, his claims retain contemporary relevance. Although the

nineteenth century system of grammar schools has been largely abolished, Williams argues that the historical reasons for these schools, 'the grading and treatment of a given quantity of raw material, to supply the expanding professional, administrative, and industrial process' (11) persist. This is evident, as we shall see, in the contemporary curriculum. Williams points to the introduction of the comprehensive schools and innovations in the curriculum and the organisation of secondary education as potentially democratic initiatives. These educational initiatives echo political changes in favour of democracy based on universal suffrage. However, in this argument, innovations in education retain the nineteenth century instrumental concerns. The traditional influence is maintained in the curriculum. I will now consider Williams's views on the contemporary curriculum and how it retains a traditional bias and fails to reflect the wider political movements in the culture.

2.

Williams identifies the central question in education as,

"... that of curriculum and teaching method, and it is difficult to feel that the present grammar school curriculum, or its partial imitation and local extension by the secondary modern school, is of such a kind that that problem is merely one of distributing it more widely." (12)

Of curriculum in general terms, he writes,

"An educational curriculum, as we have seen again and again in past periods, expresses a compromise between an inherited selection of interests and emphasis of new interests." (13)

Williams believes this compromise is usually muddled and long delayed. The 'inherited selection of interests' are those instrumental concerns expressed earlier, e.g. vocational, economic and commercial interests. These interests reflect the aims for education of the 'industrial trainers' to which Williams earlier referred. Other inherited interests include those of the 'old humanists', e.g. the classics, where they are retained. The 'emphasis of new interests' would include, initiatives in anti-racist and anti-sexist programmes in schools where these are introduced across the curriculum and reflected in a 'whole school' policy.

It is quite clear that in this early work Williams believed the curriculum in the early 1960's strongly reflected the 'interests' of the industrial trainers rather than those of the 'public educators' with whom he identifies. In the first part of this chapter I attempted to show how Williams argued that the ideological supremacy of the industrial trainers in education remains decisive in the 1980's. Evidence for this argument can be found in the educational policies of the Conservative British government in the 1990's. The weighting given to science and technology programmes at the expense of Humanities subjects, the introduction of Pre-Vocational Education, and the establishment of City Technology Colleges are all

examples of the culture of the 'industrial trainers' hegemonic dominance. For Williams, these programmes are 'anti-educational', anti-democratic, and represent justification for his argument that the British system of education remains rooted in the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

In the LR Williams points to the absence of 'social studies' in the school curriculum. Williams defines 'social studies' as the,

".. a detailed description of the workings of parliamentary and local government, of the law and public administration, of the organisation of industry, of the evolution and character of modern social groups, of the techniques by which a modern society is studied and influenced... " (14)

Today this definition of social studies appears outdated, even quaint. However, it remains the case that every child will certainly not reach even an elementary understanding of the above. Williams is clearly convinced that his definition of social studies forms part of a minimum requirement of what should form a democratic education.

As with social studies Williams believes that an understanding of the arts should also form part of a democratic curriculum. He writes,

"In the art, similarly, it is a meagre response to our cultural tradition and problems to teach, outside literature, little more than practical drawing and music, with hardly any attempt to begin either the history and

criticism of music and visual art forms, or the criticism of those forms of film, televised drama, and jazz to which every child will go home."

(15)

Williams reference to jazz here betrays his own personal prejudices, but his point that most children receive little training in this kind of critical thinking and appraisal despite the introduction of examination options such as, for example, Media Studies, is valid. In English, he argues that,

"... despite the efforts of many fine teachers, most children will leave even grammar schools without ever having practised the critical reading of newspapers, magazines, propaganda, and advertisements, which will form the bulk of their adult reading." (16)

Williams also makes a very brief reference to science education,

"Meanwhile, in science, the vast and exciting history of scientific discovery and its social effects will have been given quite inadequate attention." (17)

Williams does not provide a detailed criticism of the British school curriculum in the LR but the criticisms he makes are familiar ones nearly

thirty years later to those interested in achieving a full democratic education. The traditional and instrumental aims of selection, or 'sorting and grading' for training and employment, persist. The dominant 'social character' ('a training in reliability, the willingness to take responsibility within a given framework, and the notion of leadership'), was, for Williams, developed in the public schools and has been widely and successfully imitated in the state schools, despite the efforts of some teachers to provide an alternative.

Williams does not deny the necessity for training for employment but insists that training has been conceived in terms damaging both in practice and at the level of theory. Williams puts the problem this way,

"Instead of the effort to reinterpret contemporary culture, and to define a general education for our society as a whole, the emphasis, both in the organisation of institutions, and in the thinking of educators, has been on the processes of sorting and grading." (18)

At the end of the chapter in the LR Williams begins to outline his alternative to the established curriculum in terms of theory and practice. He writes,

"... we cannot in our kind of society call an educational system adequate if it leaves any large number of people at a level of general knowledge and

culture below that required by a participating democracy and arts dependent on popular support." (19)

Williams outline proposal for an alternative curriculum rests on a number of 'educational essentials' selected in terms of 'needs' rather than, as at present, based on inherited models. Williams adds that there is no consensus as to what these essentials might be because educators have not, in general, been thinking in this way. Williams offers the following 'essentials' as the minimum aim for every educationally normal child,

" a) Extensive practice in the fundamental languages of English and mathematics;

b) General knowledge of ourselves and our environment, taught at the secondary stage not as separate disciplines but as general knowledge drawn from the disciplines which clarify at a higher stage, i.e.,

(i) biology, psychology,

(ii) social history, law and political institutions, sociology, descriptive economics, geography including actual industry and trade,

(iii) physics and chemistry;

c) History and criticism of literature, the visual arts, music, dramatic performance, landscape and architecture;

d) Extensive practice in democratic procedures, including meetings, negotiations, and the selection and conduct of leaders in democratic organisations. Extensive practice in the use of libraries, newspapers and magazines, radio and television programmes, and other sources of information, opinion and influence;

e) Introduction to at least one other culture, including its language, history, geography, institutions and arts, to be given in part by visiting and exchange."

(20)

As Hargreaves has suggested, these 'essentials' may appear conventional in the late 1980's. However, closer analysis reveals much more radical possibilities than those offered by the contemporary curriculum. Radical alternatives appear as 'knowledge of ourselves and our environment', 'landscape and architecture, practice in 'democratic procedures', 'sources of information', and introduction to all aspects of 'one other culture'. These are far from conventional educational questions and are formulated as 'essential' tools for developing critical consciousness in the effort to 'reinterpret contemporary culture'. Education for a fully participatory democracy is at the centre of Williams's educational 'essentials' and these go beyond the introduction of an alternative curriculum; institutions themselves require revision.

This last point reveals Williams's doubts about the ability of schooling and school-age learning to achieve the kind of major changes he recommends. The British Government have introduced a National Curriculum to be

operative in all State schools by 1990. There is not space here to pursue this development in detail, nor is this appropriate since the details of the National Curriculum are not yet finalised. The point I wish to make in relation to Williams's educational 'essentials' is a political one. Williams supports the argument that the State in capitalist liberal democracies has as its primary aim the maintenance of the capitalist economy. The kind of institutions, curriculum, methods of teaching and organisation of the State education system, in this argument, are determined by this primary aim of the capitalist state. This is particularly the case with schools since this is the area of greatest state control. As Williams argued earlier the instrumental form of the state education system is based on traditional principles designed to foster industrial growth in the nineteenth century. There are signs that the British Government's National Curriculum for schools and its proposals for the reform of Higher Education are formulated along lines identical to those nineteenth century concerns for industrial and economic development. If successful these reforms would negate the advances made towards achieving Williams's educational 'essentials' by progressive and socialist educators, particularly in schools.

Williams's educational 'essentials' put forward in the LR have informed and provided the theoretical basis for several curriculum initiatives, e.g. Cultural Studies and Urban Studies which I will consider in detail in later chapters. However, these have been scattered and local initiatives and are now threatened by the introduction of a vocational-oriented National Curriculum. The strength of State control of the British school system means that Williams's proposals in the LR take the form of a plea for a

radical alternative curriculum; as Hargreaves has also observed these proposals appear 'utopian'. When we look at Williams's work on adult education and workers' education it becomes clear that he had little faith that his proposals for radical reform in schools would be taken seriously.

3.

At the end of the chapter in the LR under discussion Williams expresses his doubts about the success of progressive reform in state schools by turning to the question of post-school institutional reform. He argues for the introduction of a variety of institutions which would provide 'everyone with some form of continuing education'. These institutions must be of a kind acceptable to adolescents and young adults. He writes,

"... if the democratic training is given substance by their particular participation in the immediate government of the institution they attend, we could greatly diminish the already diminishing resistance to an education which for the majority is set in terms of the needs of children, and which, damningly, is seen as of little relevance to the adult living that lies ahead." (21)

Williams proceeds to argue that secondary education should act as a preparation for this phase of education. In this way,

"We might be expressing the shape of our own society, rather than reproducing the patterns of others." (22)

Williams's claim is quite clear; a necessary condition of a 'full democracy' is a fully educated citizenry. Williams extends his theory of democracy to include economic and industrial democracy, cultural democracy, educational democracy as well as, political democracy. A democratic education, for Williams, entails a radical change in institutions, in curriculum and in teaching methods. As he writes,

"Utopian thinking is that which supposes we shall get an educated and participatory democracy, industries and services with adequate human communications, and a common culture of high quality, by proclaiming the virtue of those things and leaving our training institutions as they are."
(23)

An 'educated and participatory democracy' is the means by which we can answer the question of,

"... whether we can grasp the real nature of our society, or whether we persist in social and educational patterns based on a limited ruling class, a middle professional class, a large operative class, cemented by forces that cannot be challenged and will not be changed." (24)

Although writing in the 1960's Williams strikes a contemporary note when he asserts that although inherited privileges and social barriers have and will continue to come down. The question remains of what will replace them? He poses the question in this way,

"It is only a question of whether we replace them by the free play of the market, or by a public education designed to express and create the values of an educated democracy and a common culture." (25)

In the 1990's the British Government appears to be opting for the market alternative (26) which equates the aims of education with the aims of a free-market capitalist economy. Williams's version of 'public education' recognises the need for a vocational and training element but retains as its central non-instrumental aim, the creation of a participatory democracy.

The 'Education and British Society' chapter in LR is not a systematic and detailed proposal for curriculum and institutional reform. We do not find details of, for example, a course in 'landscape and architecture'. Nor does he tell us how a 'fully democratic' school might be organised. We have to

look elsewhere for details of Williams's theory of democracy and for information of what he has in mind by the term 'educated democracy'. However, it is possible to discern the general egalitarian impulse of Williams's theory of education within a critical and oppositional perspective. What it is also possible to say about this chapter is that it is important as a provisional statement which, in later published and unpublished work, he alters and amends and provides necessary detail. In later work Williams applies this theoretical statement to Higher, Adult and Continuing Education and only in passing to schooling. A central theme of the chapter is how Williams equates education with democratic training, or, 'training for democracy'. A major task of this thesis is to reveal what, for Williams, the theory and practice of this 'training for democracy' consists in.

We can see the contemporary relevance of Williams ideas on education in this chapter of LR if we consider an article that Williams wrote for the journal Education in 1960. In this article he repeats many of the arguments of the LR but sets these arguments in a political and cultural context. There have been two changes, he argues, to which we have failed to adjust a century after they occurred. The first is a cultural revolution, the second is the extension of democracy. It is Williams's contention that the standard of the culture and the nature of the democracy are determined by the standards of the majority of our people, in terms of education and of how informed the people are, he writes,

"... the quality of our arts, from drama to building, depends on the actual standards of the majority of people." (27)

For Williams, the two movements of culture and democracy represent,

"... the greatest challenge to educators which we have ever faced." (28)

In a passage which has highly contemporary implications, Williams puts the challenge to education in this way,

" It is all too probable that our culture will become a speculative chaos, and our system of government little more than a mass auction, unless we are all given the relevant skills of discrimination and judgement together with an adequacy in the kinds of fact which these demand. (29)

Williams argues that quality of democracy depends on the acquisition of these necessary skills and information. The aims of education are nothing short of the achievement of a full cultural and political democracy based on the values outlined above. The point about the importance of the curriculum is revived when Williams reminds us that the study of society and political philosophy is noticeably absent from the school curriculum; this is as true in 1990 as it was when Williams was writing in 1960. He connects politics, teaching and democracy,

"The fact is, surely, that we are frightened of what we call "politics", which is only another way of saying that we have not yet found the teaching methods relevant to a democracy." (30)

Williams does not provide a detailed curriculum proposal in this chapter of the LR. In the next section of this chapter I will attempt to provide this detail through an analysis of his work on writing, language and imagination, in relation to education. This task has led to an important finding, the existence of an outline theory of learning in Williams's work. For this discovery I am indebted to Carolyn Steadman and her unpublished paper on Williams entitled, Writing, Teaching and Learning.

There is a sense in which Williams's later work on education and these associated discoveries in his work are more interesting than the chapter on education in LR. However, the chapter remains central to Williams's educational theory despite its provisional, general and somewhat muted tone. I will now move to the third section of this chapter.

Chapter 2.2 Language and Learning

The chapter on Education in the LR represents a generalised account of Williams's thinking on the relationship between history, education and society. This account lacks detail and specificity. In WS written in 1984, Williams offers a more detailed and specific account of this relationship. In WS, Williams develops his ideas on education through an analysis of the theory and practice of 'Cambridge English', a method of English teaching which, Williams claims, has dominated the teaching of English in schools, colleges and universities over the past fifty years. For Williams, 'Cambridge English', as an educational practice, has also exercised an ideological and political function.

In WS Williams concentrates mainly on the teaching of English. However, it is possible to reveal a theory of 'Writing, Teaching, and Learning' from the book. I am grateful to Carolyn Steadman of the University of Warwick for this revelation; Steadman presents this theory in an unpublished Conference paper (1). In this part of Chapter 2 I will consider Williams's thoughts on English teaching, and the concept of the 'imagination' in WS, through an analysis of Steadman's paper.

I will argue that the discussion on 'English Studies at Cambridge' in Ch.4, and the section 'The Tenses of Imagination' in Ch.5, represent a telling contribution to educational theory and provide further indications

of Williams's ideas on the curriculum. Similarly, these chapters in WS provide an important illustration of the connections Williams identifies between art, education and politics. It is important to note that these chapters in WS were written within a debate about the relation between the content and method of English teaching, questions to do with social and cultural values, and ideas about democracy and education. In the course of the discussion I will assess the significance of the claims made within the debate in the light of developments in education in the late 1980's.

Ch.4 of WS consists of three lectures, 'Cambridge English Past and Present', 'Beyond Cambridge English', Williams's retirement lectures, and, 'Crisis in English Studies' a Cambridge English Faculty lecture. The question that immediately arises in this discussion is, what are 'English Studies'? More specifically, what is 'Cambridge English'? The answers to these questions should provide evidence for the claims Williams makes for these concepts. I will not offer a detailed analysis of these works, Williams's style in WS is often impenetrable and written within a debate which is highly specialist and enclosed. A more productive and helpful way into Williams's ideas on teaching, learning and politics is, I will argue, to approach them through a discussion of Steadman's paper, and a new work by Brian Doyle, entitled, English and Englishness (2). It must be said at this point that it is Williams's work on these issues that will be addressed and not Steadman or Doyle's interpretation of them. Rather the approach through Steadman and Doyle's work is a strategy aimed at clarifying the ideas contained within a dense and difficult work.

Doyle traces the developments in the relation between, 'English', education and democracy. These developments include Williams's attempts to counterpose literary criticism to 'culture' and his vigorous defence of

'public education' against anti-democratic and elitist notions of education and creativity. 'English Studies', 'Cambridge English' and 'Englishness', as educational projects, possess a close inter-relation which requires clarification at this stage. Doyle's book is particularly useful for this purpose. He traces the educational elevation of 'English' from the late nineteenth century to the present day. The major points of discussion are centred on the Newbolt Report of 1921, the influence of Leavis from the 1930's, the 'Cambridge Crisis' of 1981, and renewed government interest in English in the late 1980's. Doyle is clearly heavily influenced by Williams's chapter on education in the LR, but moves this provisional work forward to include developments in English and education in the 1980's. The 'Education and British Society' chapter in the LR traces the historical development of the British education system. In his book Doyle concentrates more specifically on 'English Studies' but offers this as a paradigm case for the more general development of education during this period.

Doyle accepts Williams arguments in the LR with some qualifications as we shall see. Doyle is interested in advancing the idea of cultural democracy through education in general and English in particular. The concept of cultural democracy and the derived idea of social semiotics in teaching and learning are very close to Williams's terms, cultural materialism and historical semiotics. Doyle's book is also important as a development of Williams's work because it contains an extensive bibliography which includes examples of educational programmes theoretically derived from Williams's work. Many of Williams's major statements on education are general or theoretical and lacking in detail but have been used as starting points for more detailed work. Both Steadman and Doyle are examples of this. However, some of Williams's later work, particularly the unpublished

and newly published material, does provide applications of the theoretical and general statements. The first part of this chapter was concerned with outlining some of the major statements, this part of the chapter is concerned with providing some detail through an analysis of Williams's later work and the work of two writers heavily influenced by his educational writing. As Doyle points out in his book,

"Once again the work of Raymond Williams is exceptional. However, in recent years he has given little attention to teaching practices and institutional arrangements." (3)

I will take Doyle's terms of 'Englishness', 'English Studies' and 'Cambridge English' in turn before moving to consider Steadman's paper. The aim of these tasks is to gain a purchase and clearer understanding of Williams's educational thought as expressed, in highly specialised terms, in WS.

'Englishness'

For Doyle, 'Englishness' as a concept began to be promoted between 1880 and 1920 to resolve problems of national identity which arose as a result of developments in industry and society. The promoters of the idea of 'Englishness' were the makers of state cultural policy who were reacting to the 'disturbing' influences of rapid industrial and economic development.

The concept of 'Englishness' was constructed to act as a 'spiritualising' force that would serve to unify and simplify an increasingly divided and complex society. The Newbolt Report of 1921 set out with the aim of developing a strategy which would link state concerns with those of a more general movement in society. This government Report was fully supported by the newly formed English Association, a body set up to establish English as the central subject in the curricula of schools and universities. As Doyle argues, the discourse of the Report invokes a sense of 'Englishness' linked to a 'mythology of medieval organic ruralism' as against the reality of a class-ridden industrial society with a growing urban proletariat. Policy-makers were concerned with national unity and the 'condition' of the new urban working-class. The Report's is concerned with constructing a spiritual unity for the nation rather than the state. As Doyle argues,

"... the task of spiritualising a utilitarian state machine is no easy one."

(4)

Doyle claims the ideological aim of the Report is to categorise the state policy machine as a neutral servant to the spiritually unified nation. As he writes,

"In this way English, and especially English Literature, can be established, not as a strategy for political and cultural intervention, but as a transcendence of political operations." (5)

It is worth quoting the Report on this point,

"For if literature be, as we believe ... a fellowship which 'binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society, as it spreads over the whole earth, and over all time', then the nation of which a considerable portion rejects this means of grace, and despises this great spiritual influence, must assuredly be heading for disaster." (6)

At the centre of the Report's concerns is the 'antagonism and contempt for literature which is said to be found among the working classes, especially those belonging to organised labour movements'. A practised understanding and respect for English literature was to be the single most potent unifying force of the fractious industrial England. The appeal to the English nation rather than the state as the 'spiritualising force' above politics, provided the legitimation for a cultural policy intervention on behalf of the educational practice of English Literature. I will come to this last point in the discussion on English Studies.

An underlying theme of the Report is that 'culture' in pre-industrial time was produced by artists and the community. The separation of literature from life was a direct result of the processes of industrialisation. as Doyle writes,

"Literary art could then be presented as the only means of determining properly national cultural qualities within a divided society; a literary

art which was the province of the poet rather than the state or any ruling class or group. In fact it is the absence of any territorial invasion by the poet into contemporary culture, which authorizes certain interim measures overseen by the state on behalf of the nation." (7)

Through the influence of the English Association and the Newbolt Report English Departments began to be established in universities and became the subject around which the school curriculum was to be formed. English teachers became the new 'missionaries' of 'Englishness' and the 'organic' English culture. The initial concept of 'Englishness' of the early twentieth century was founded as a means for national cultural mobilization and renewal. National unity was seen as an essential prerequisite of both economic and political stability. As Doyle argues, this was always an ideological exercise but one doomed to failure. However, although the attempt at national renewal and unity could only paper over the cracks of a class-based industrial England, the initial aims and practices of 'Englishness' remain to the present day. Before looking at contemporary variants I will consider very briefly a further major conception of 'Englishness', that developed by F.R. Leavis.

Leavis, writing in the period between 1930 and 1970, felt the need to respond to industrialism, culture and the question of 'Englishness'. Leavis agreed with the findings of The Newbolt Report and its espousal of an organic and agrarian pre-industrial version of England and English values. Leavis's recommendations were not aimed at national renewal, he believed the processes of industrialism had wrought irretrievable damage, but at the sanctity of a set of values retained from the 'organic' pre-industrial

English society. These values could only be revealed through the practice of literary criticism. English Literature was the repository and embodiment of value. Through the process of literary criticism a body of texts could be identified as the Great Tradition, the beholder of English values, the possession of value lay in the hands of the critic and not the author. English, for Leavis, was the privileged subject, the only means by which the 'essential values' could be retained. Leavis was tremendously influential and whole new University English Departments were set up both as a result of the Newbolt Report and Leavis's theory of value.

Essentially Leavis was concerned to preserve a privileged, elite enclave as guardians of the culture against the alienating values of capitalist exchange. This philosophy of education achieved considerable support and was to a large extent responsible for the academic success of English as a discrete subject in the twentieth century. Although Leavis's influence has lessened it is still possible to detect remaining elements of his theory of value both in terms of English teaching and in the definition of the term 'Englishness'

The Newbolt Report and the intervention of Leavis were central influences on the development of English Studies and the concept of 'Englishness'. Leavis particularly developed his theory of value into a philosophy of education. There is also evidence to suppose that those responsible for the Newbolt Report also saw English as a paradigm case for a wider theory of education. Doyle, taking a lead from Raymond Williams also accepts this position.

The last relevant feature of Doyle's account I will consider is his claim that the influence of 'Englishness' has continued into the 1980's, but with more complex ideological force. The use of 'Englishness' as a symbol for national mobilization and unity remains but with very different cultural and ideological targets. The revised 'Englishness' of the New Right does not invoke the values of a unified and organic, pre-industrial past but the contemporary values of market forces and the 'harsh realities of capitalist exchange'. As Doyle writes,

"Whereas in the 1920's the Newbolt Committee unsuccessfully proposed English as an instrument of state cultural policy, now it is the government which is elaborating a new cultural policy of its own within which it is seen as the role of education including English, to propogate an 'enterprise culture' ... Within the framework of enterprise cultural policy it is the clear purpose of education to reconstruct consciousness of self as prospective worker for the national and inter-national capitalist economy and to sustain conservative patriarchal family life, and indeed to resign the 'unenterprising' to worklessness." (8)

The 'harsh reality' Doyle mentions is the general political acceptance that market forces should be allowed to mould the content of educational provision. Of course, this is far from the whole story and Doyle outlines oppositional practices to the dominant version of Englishness and the associated ideology of education, I will consider these shortly.

One of the tasks involved in developing oppositional programmes, according to Doyle, is to challenge the discipline's underlying concept of 'Englishness'. A central perspective of this challenge should be to highlight the perceived 'mismatch' between English and 'the state of contemporary knowledge and modes of cultural organisation'. Doyle adds,

"... the inescapable influence of the enterprise cultural policy is itself contributing to wide realization that 'English' has a contingent rather than a necessary relation to 'English Literature', and indeed to 'Englishness'."

(11)

The 'Englishness' that the now dominant New Right have constructed and offer as a basis for their educational programmes is, according to Doyle, 'Anglo-centric, 'masculine' and 'individualistic'. The themes of the New Right were summarised by the contributors of the Black Papers in the late 1960's and early 1970's. The ideas contained within these papers had a significant influence on public debate and on public policy. As Doyle points out, the authors of the Black Papers argued that a university could not be a democracy and that academic study should be reserved for those endowed with special gifts. The texts of English Studies are presented by the authors as upholding the finest academic and cultural values'. The English Language and its Literature is seen as the 'national cultural heritage' of which teachers are the curators; firstly, teachers of English and then History, Geography, etc. That this concept of 'Englishness' is at variance with the actual reality of contemporary Britain is fairly obvious when we consider the multi-cultural and class-based nature of British

education and society, and its de-centred position in international politics.

In this section of the chapter I have examined how Doyle has identified the concept of 'Englishness' as the basis for various attempts to promote a unified and spiritualising national ideology through the educational practice of English Studies. The Newbolt Report, the work of Leavis and the New Right have all in their different ways used the concept as the centre of their programmes. Doyle argues that the attempt to unite the 'nation' in this way are doomed to failure because of the conflicts and tensions which lie at the heart of the English society and politics. He offers a programme of 'cultural democracy' through education as an alternative to previous and existing practices, I will return to this shortly. Raymond Williams offers a similar analysis in WS and Doyle admits Williams's decisive influence on his thinking. We can see this and its practical applications more clearly if we consider the second feature of Doyle's analysis, English Studies.

English Studies

In this section I will look more closely at the way in which English Studies have developed and consider their ideological purpose through examining some of Doyle's ideas. I will also outline Williams's ideas on

English Studies in WS and show how these have influenced Doyle's work with its more detailed and contemporary tone.

I have tried to show how an ideological account of 'Englishness' underpins English Studies claimed, by Leavis, Williams and Doyle as the subject around which the University and school curriculum have been built. It follows that this account of 'Englishness' is the central organising principle for educational provision in England. The concept of 'Englishness' has been reconstructed by the British Government of the 1980's, not as a value or unifying moral force above politics, but to represent a political formation and culture based on a particular reading of history. 'Englishness' is now a term shed of its imperialist and masculine past in order to support an enterprise culture. We can see this through looking at the development of English Studies up until the contemporary ascendancy of New Right ideology.

Williams traces this development in WS as cultural and political history. In English and Englishness, Doyle repeats this exercise in a more accessible style. English Studies began to be institutionalised within English Departments in universities between 1880 and 1920. By the 1930s the subject had become an established feature of universities. These developments represent a radical departure from earlier times. The rise of English Studies, as outlined above, was for different reasons, a response to rapid industrial and urban development.

The early debates about English Studies centred on whether Language or Literature should form the core of the subject. This was quickly settled in favour of Literature, and for very particular reasons. Doyle writes,

"... there was a clear movement towards replacing 'English Language and Literature' and the 'English Subjects' with the simple all-embracing term 'English', and this went with the assumption of a new focus. English was essentially seen as concerned with the contents of 'great works' and as the medium for transmitting a 'broader culture', which meant establishing a dominant role for literature." (10)

This 'new focus', disseminated by the influential English Association, saw English literary works as a vehicle for morality. Doyle explains,

"... the ultimate source of value in literature as in society was moral authority. The force of this moral authority becomes clearer when the discussions with the Association touching specifically upon the pedagogic uses of literature and indeed language are considered. Here the double emphasis upon the need to arrest cultural degeneration and preserve the national heritage was distinctly in evidence." (11)

As with Williams's in WS, Doyle moves his analysis of English from a concern with value and morals to questions of cultural degeneration and national, and by extension political, policy. Williams's influence on Doyle is particularly strong at this stage as he not only takes up Williams's themes and concerns but also his method. We can see this in Doyle's attempts to widen his analysis of English to include political and cultural concerns. English Studies in the early part of the twentieth century were

concerned with questions of national identity, concerns which carried a national emphasis, Doyle writes,

"... a number of educationalists, politicians, philosophers, and political theorists searched for new and more efficient ways of building and disseminating a national sense of ancestry, tradition, and universal 'free' citizenship." (12)

The sense of national identity Doyle refers to represented a 'new way' between revolutionary socialism, so active at this time, and, 'vulgar statism'; indeed, this search for a renewed national identity was, as Doyle points out, an attempt to immunise Britain from these political alternatives. The 'new way', or social and political philosophy, can be seen as an attempt at a synthesis between 'collectivism' and older ideas of 'individualism'. Philosophers such as T.H. Green and Bernard Bosanquet, Liberals like William Harcourt, and the Fabian socialists are all cited by Doyle as prominent in these debates. Doyle writes again,

"The new philosophy of society moved beyond any simple vision of the state as a set of administrative institutions towards a vision of it as an almost venerable ideal form; a form which claimed to be able to dissolve political struggle in the larger flow of the national way of life, in the name of common culture and common economic interests." (13)

Under this ideal vision of social harmony was a more practical programme. Administrative layers were to be built at the 'sensitive ideological' point of intersection between the official state and the mass of the people.

Doyle adds,

"It is ... at this very point that the movement to advance the status of 'English' in education must be situated if its particular history as a cultural and administrative form is to be understood." (14)

The newly invented discipline of 'English Studies' must be seen as part of a wider establishment of cultural institutions set up to mobilize the nation. English Studies became the repository of the national conscience with the task of shaping the popular imagination to resist the uncontrollable forces capitalism had unleashed. Doyle sums up the role of English at this early stage of its inception in the 1930's,

"English can thus be seen as an institutionalized set of academic and schooling practices which function to process, evaluate, and transmit works esteemed as having 'cultural value', and - by the same token -to determine which forms of discourse are to count simply as 'ordinary' language and popular fiction. Nevertheless, they fail to note that such educational practices in turn form a part of a broader historical process of the social channelling of fictions." (15)

I will come to the claims of the last sentence in this quotation shortly. The social and political role of English, as a central educational practice, is crucial, Doyle again,

"The overall social importance of fiction making is based upon its ability to engage in symbolic trans-formations, such as .. anxiety into joy, dissonance into harmony. ... fictions affirm that social order is possible. Thus, a fundamental use value of fictions is their capacity for creating community and reconciliation." (16)

The relation between fiction making, English Studies and political and social legitimization is at the centre of Doyle's and Williams's arguments for the essential political function of education, with English Studies as a paradigm case. In this section of the chapter I have attempted to trace the beginnings of English Studies as the major arts discipline, as a response to industrial and political change in Britain. The period between 1930 and 1960 represents the ascendancy of English, firstly, as a unifying force in a complex and changing society, and secondly, when the first was perceived to have failed, to provide a 'civilising' force intended for the benefit of an educated elite. The period from 1960 to the present day represents a period in English Studies of much greater theoretical and political conflict, illustrated by the 'Cambridge Crisis' of 1981. However, the central claim of Williams and Doyle remains, that of English Studies as a paradigm case of education, as a process of political legitimation and control. I will now proceed to examine the 'Cambridge Crisis' and the competing arguments and theories with which it is associated.

The Cambridge English 'Crisis'

In WS Raymond Williams writes,

" ... there was not, however, because in any fully worked out sense there never had been, ... a 'Cambridge English': a distinctive and coherent course and method of study." (17)

This presents a difficulty because the 'Cambridge English Crisis' in 1981 developed into national proportions as we shall see. Williams accepted the definition of a crisis in English at Cambridge but formulated this crisis in a manner which denied the existence of any such thing as 'Cambridge English'. Williams saw the development of English since the 1920's, when the English Tripos was introduced, as a 'paradigm' in the Kuhnian sense. That is, 'a working definition of a perceived field of knowledge'. In this way English at Cambridge was an 'object of knowledge' based on fundamental hypotheses and methods of investigation. This sense of Literature as a paradigm limits Cambridge English to the position of a disputed field of enquiry rather than a definitive and settled course of study; it is this which precipitated the crisis. The dominant paradigm at Cambridge was that introduced by Richards (18) in the 1920's and later adapted by Leavis in

the 1940's and after. The dominant paradigm was Literary Criticism, a close reading of selected texts that had the intention of producing a trained reader. The selected texts were not given but legitimised by the method; the 'canon' of English Literature was developed in this way. This is only a very crude definition, there is not space for more detail, but the dominant paradigm came under increased pressure in the post-war period from theorists who fought to shift and replace the dominant paradigm. These theorists at Cambridge included Williams himself, Frank Kermode, Colin McCabe, George Steiner and Graham Hough. This conflict reverberated into schools and put the privileged position of English Literature under extreme pressure from new subjects, e.g., Media and Film Studies, the study of Popular Culture and Cultural Studies. Indeed, the subject of English Literature came under pressure as a discrete area of study.

Williams was of the opinion that there had not been a consensus about English at Cambridge since Leavis's ascendancy in the period immediately after the Second World War. What form did the Cambridge Crisis take? What form did the thinking which challenged the dominant paradigm take? What implications did the crisis have for education generally? For answers to these questions I will return to Doyle's analysis of English Studies.

Williams points out that Leavis's influence disappeared with his retirement and this subjected Cambridge English to pressures which were at once academic and political and had implications for the education system as a whole. Doyle describes the period between the late 1960's and 1981 in the English Faculty at Cambridge as one of 'genial ecumenicalism' or 'new pluralism'. The dominant paradigm of literary criticism was felt to be no longer able to speak to contemporary social and political experience. The

liberal humanism of literary criticism was also coming under severe pressure from this experience. Marxism, structuralism, feminism and psychoanalysis were methods of enquiry which resisted the dominant paradigm and insisted on greater cultural democracy. George Steiner put the concerns of the opposition to liberal humanism in his 'after Auschwitz' thesis, he writes,

"... what man has wrought on man ... has affected the writers's primary material - the sum and potential of human behaviour - and it presses on the brain with a new darkness. We know that some of the men who devised and administered Auschwitz had been trained to read Shakespeare and Goethe, and continued to do so." (19)

For Steiner this puts into question the whole literary and humanist culture. Doyle puts the problem in this way,

"... it is no longer possible for English Studies to rely upon its traditional values, given current awareness of a history dominated by privation, sectarianism and nationalism" (20)

As Doyle points out by 1980 it was possible to study modern linguistics, structuralism, semiotics, marxist theory, post structuralism, the sociology of literature, literary theory and cultural studies at a number of polytechnics and universities. Colin McCabe was appointed as Professor of

English at the University of Strathclyde with special responsibility for film and television studies. This appears unremarkable but for the fact that until 1981 McCabe was working as a lecturer in English at the University of Cambridge. McCabe was effectively dismissed (failed to be offered a tenured Post) by his employers at Cambridge not because of his teaching style, but because of his association with intellectual forces which were seen as alien to the task of 'upholding the canon of English Literature'. The crisis received unprecedented coverage in the British press and media for six months.

In a related development a working party consisting of Raymond Williams, John Holloway and Graham Hough proposed, in 1972, a new paper for the English Tripos on 'Literary Theory: selected topics'. This paper would cover symbol and myth, the language of literature, and literature and marxism. Objections were raised within the English Faculty that such topics were inappropriate for a course leading to an English degree. George Watson, a member of the Faculty, said at the time, 'no doubt a university is the place to study discredited intellectual systems; but we risk derision if we propose them to the exclusion of others'(21). His views were repeated almost word for word in 1981. Williams upheld that no consensus in the English Faculty at Cambridge now existed; a conflict-ridden pluralism was precariously maintained until 1981.

Raymond Williams was at the centre of these developments as the Professor of Drama at Cambridge and a member of key committees. Both Williams and Frank Kermode lost the arguments during the crisis and their seats on the committees.

The importance of the Cambridge Crisis in educational and political terms lies in the fact that the effective dismissal of McCabe (an almost unprecedented event) represented a direct attack on the new pluralism in the English Faculty at Cambridge. In the wider context of political and social movements to the Right the reactionary opposition to pluralism felt confident in its attack. The political undertones are clear; the return to the older conception of English Studies, based on the critical analysis of selected texts, was also seen as a return to an English Studies based on a mono-cultural, imperialist, class-based and masculine 'Englishness'.

This has been a simplified summary of a complex issue. I will now try to bring the threads of the arguments together while making some contemporary educational points. These include Doyle's prescriptive account of the future of English Studies which is heavily influenced by Williams's work in WS.

The history of English Studies in the twentieth century, particularly at Cambridge University, had a political and cultural resonance outside the University. It would be absurd, of course, to attribute to Cambridge English or even the developments in English Studies, the achievement of altering the cultural and political consciousness of a nation. However, it is possible to present a claim for English Studies as part of an intellectual and political argument which reflected hard political developments in the society. As Doyle writes,

"The politics of English Studies were revealed in a confrontation between a fundamentally right-wing educational philosophy and a countervailing defence of the need for a plurality of emphasis." (22)

This confrontation was also occurring in schools in the form of a conflict between democratic learning and teaching opportunities and the political decision to restore more traditional forms of curriculum and pedagogy. The importance of this conflict in a discussion of Raymond Williams's philosophy of education is that Williams, both in terms of his academic work and in his personal intervention in the dispute, has been an influential figure at its centre. The relation between education and democracy is at the centre of Williams's philosophy of education, as is an attempt to develop a 'clearly formulated politics of education'.

Williams claims, along with Doyle, that English can no longer claim to possess a symbolic function which can energise a cohesive national identity. Similarly, in a rapidly changing cultural and political environment it can no longer claim to be the representational focus for an essential Englishness. As Doyle writes, within a commercial and international capitalist culture ,

"There is no longer a major cultural role for the old English within a trans-national network of quantified and repetitive cultural production."

(23)

The 'great works' of literature can no longer be regarded as a privileged cultural domain under the pressure of an attempt to reintegrate fiction making with other social practices. The 1960's and 1970's saw the attempt in schools to relate English teaching to cultural practices, e.g. film, music, advertising, popular culture. This attempt to re-write the subject was democratic in intention, as much with pedagogic style as content. The new National Curriculum is designed to return English to its former high cultural position. For the Kingman Committee the works of English Literature constitute 'the powerful and splendid history of the best that has been thought and said in our language'. The Committee's Report contains the following extract,

"In the 1960's and 1970's there was a desire to bring into the classroom urgent concerns about the relations between language, literature, politics and social conditions. But it has been argued that the result was that English lessons became in some schools no more than the setting for vigorous moral and social discussion, which too often assumed that language was a clear window on the social world ... Too rigid a concern with what is 'relevant' to the lives of young people seems to us to pose the danger of impoverishing not only the young people, but the culture itself, which has to be revitalised by each generation." (24)

The model of English promoted by the Kingmen Committee repeats many of the arguments of the Newbolt Report of the 1920's and supports the reactionary side of the debate at Cambridge. Against this has been the cultural democracy model, taken from Williams's work, which insists on dual learning

process between teacher and student, and a negotiated content based on a variety of fictions and forms of cultural production. The reactionary model favoured by the Kingman Committee and the British Government of the late 1980's forms part of an attempt to re-write the modern school curriculum in line with the capitalist enterprise. The political right now claim that the curriculum is out of step with consumer needs and the demands of the economy. Doyle believes this tactic of state policy is radical in that it is driven by an explicit conception of the role of education in promoting cultural change. The new cultural policy sees the role of education, including English, as propagating an enterprise culture.

Against this dominant reactionary State policy, Doyle, citing Williams, argues for 'cultural democracy' as what English should be 'for'. This amounts to a claim for the aims of education as cultural democracy rather than 'education for enterprise' to serve the 'national interest' of the capitalist state. Recent state initiatives in education have revealed, as Williams has continually claimed, that cultural values are constructed in public spheres beyond the influence of, for example, English Literature. Teachers of English now have to look elsewhere for a centre for their subject other than a privileged group of authors and texts. Doyle's model, and this follows directly from Williams is, 'the insistent interrogation of the theoretical, political, and cultural bases of social meaning and value'. English Studies will need to reconstitute itself in terms of discourses on communication, including centrally language and culture. These are social forces rather than settled bodies of knowledge or skills and thereby open to argument and contestation. For Doyle, this method has greater democratic possibilities than either the State model or the pluralist approaches of the Cambridge English school in the 1970's.

In this section of the chapter I have tried to show how developments in English Studies in England since the 1930's have followed political and cultural forces outside education. I have also tried to show, through this discussion, how politics and education have become inextricably connected. The case study of Cambridge English was used as an illustration of this connection. I have used the arguments of Doyle as representing the views of Raymond Williams in WS on English, the relation between education, culture and politics, and as offering suggestions for the future of English which parallel Williams's own thinking. This method of unravelling Williams more obscure and difficult prose style has been particularly helpful in this case. I will now move to an analysis of Carolyn Steadman's paper which engages directly with WS and specifies in more detail the relations between writing, fiction, teaching and learning presented above.

As with Doyle's book on English Studies, Steadman's paper represents a very convenient way through which to penetrate Williams's dense and protracted style. Steadman's paper is useful in other important respects. In her paper, Writing, Teaching and Learning and in other works (1), Steadman offers further insights into Williams's philosophy of education, particularly with regard to forms of democratic learning, the 'status' of children and other learners, the relation between gender and learning, and writing and the processes of cognition. Steadman finds sympathy with the main thrust of Williams thinking on writing, language and learning, but offers suggestions and amendments and identifies certain omissions. In her paper Steadman writes on a topic to which, she claims, Williams's fails to give sufficient attention; that is, the ways in which children learn through the structures of language and the processes of writing. This may have been a deliberate omission on the part of Williams whose main interest lay in the education of adults, particularly working-class adults.

As I have indicated Steadman's paper has particular relevance with its insights, taken from Williams's work, on the relation between democracy and education. I will argue that Steadman's ideas in the paper provide real possibilities for a framework for a democratic curriculum. In this way Steadman draws heavily on Williams's work, but importantly, covers new areas of interest.

I will begin this analysis of Steadman's paper with a summary of her central concerns and then relate these to Williams's ideas in WS. I will then consider some curriculum proposals derived from some of Steadman's ideas. The main themes of the discussion will be the relation between language, writing and learning, the relation between imagination and cognition, and the political implications of both Steadman's and Williams's ideas considered here.

Steadman bases her paper on five theoretical and historical points which are, she argues, of 'direct and practical contemporary application'. These five points are,

"1. writing.

2. the relationship of written to spoken language.

3. the forms available to particular writers in particular social circumstances.

4. the theories of language held at particular times, and what those theories permit or prevent (or how those theories structure certain kinds of human relationship).

5. questions about the learning, or acquisition, or development of language, both spoken or written." (2)

Steadman remarks that these five points could be conventionally labelled educational questions. She is very reluctant to do this herself.

'Education' is a term Steadman recoils against. She writes of education,

" ... it's the word that I didn't put in my title in order not to put you off; it's the word that I have always avoided in everything I've written, on the principle that I want to be listened to without disdain and presupposition, not wanting to be seen with the children clinging to my skirts." (3)

It is difficult to grasp quite what Steadman is referring to here but her concern about the use of the term education has an important bearing on Williams's work. If we can identify the reasons for Steadman's concerns it is then possible to understand more fully why Williams applied most of his educational thought to adult learning. Steadman's avoidance of the term education rests on what she describes as the 'status of childhood - of children - and of other learners'. Steadman accepts Williams's historical description of the social uses that have been made of language theory but proposes that this description needs the evidence of individual human development. It is here that Steadman recognises a difficulty. This is where Steadman's account of the 'status' of children and other learners' enters the argument.

Carolyn Steadman teaches teachers at the University of Warwick. In the course of the paper she relates her experience of years of watching students work with children, and with implicit and explicit theories of

language. The social relationships the students make with their pupils is, in this argument, 'partly structured by these theories'. Steadman then makes the key point that children in these situations acquire not only written language, but understandings about form, 'what forms permit, what they prevent'. This imposition of a theorised 'form' on a child's (and other learners) acquisition of written language is made possible by the devalued or undervalued 'status' of the learner. This proposition by Steadman rests on the questions raised by the 'learning and acquisition of systems', and on the influence theories and forms have on the ways in which we live. Steadman provides illustration for her claims through analyses of the autobiographies of two working-class writers, John Pearman and Margaret McMillan (4). I will come to these presently.

Steadman argues that Williams's account of language pays insufficient attention to the processes of written language and the way in which language theories shape what is taught and learnt. The argument about language that Williams presents in ML, Steadman argues, is deficient on two counts. The first is that Williams fails to include an account of written language as 'a linguistic system in its own right', and secondly, his argument lacks the 'insights that an account of development and learning might provide'. This leads Steadman to consider the questions raised by the acquisition of systems and from this to conclude that written language is something learned in adulthood, not childhood. Before considering this, perhaps surprising claim, I will examine Steadman's thoughts on the relation between 'written language' and 'linguistic systems', and her account of 'development and learning' through an analysis of Steadman's two

'autobiographies' which act as penetrative lights through the dense theoretical fog of language theory.

John Pearman

John Pearman lived from 1819 - 1908, a working class man, and a member of the uniformed working class for most of his life. Pearman was a soldier, policeman and a radical. He was also a socialist, a republican, and a writer. In 1881-1883 he produced a 'working-class' autobiography, mostly in his policeman's notebook. Steadman believes Pearman, in his Memoir, raises the five questions or points I referred to earlier. She uses Pearman as an example to illustrate her ideas on learning and the acquisition of systems, and to substantiate her claim that written language is something learned in adulthood and not childhood. In terms of Steadman's engagement with Williams's work the example of Pearman raises questions about the relation between social and political experience and theory, and this to forms of writing. These questions, in Williams's own words, are about 'writing in society'.

Steadman refers to Williams thoughts in WS on the 'moment of composing' in written language. This is the question she wants to address through the writings of Pearman. This moment of composition, for Steadman, is the moment of cognition when a learner of a language system, in this case Pearman, brings his own 'lived experience' to bear on the form and

structure of writing. Steadman makes the claim that this 'cognitive leap' could only be achieved in written language. I will attempt to clarify these difficult ideas, and assess Steadman's claims by looking more closely at her example of Pearman.

Steadman writes of the historical moment in which Pearman was writing,

" The individual struggle of many 19th working people must have been to free themselves from the official hopelessness that every legitimised trajectory of thought presented them with. Just as I am pleased to know that John Pearman was not alone when he wrote, ... I am pleased to think that he freed himself from this particular crippling doctrine, in the end, towards the end of his notebook; and that he made this break in writing."

(5)

Pearman whilst physically alone when writing had available to him publications of a radical nature, e.g. The National Reformer and The Republican. However, he set out by himself to complete a highly original and individual piece of creative, political writing. In his Memoir he set out to challenge this 'official hopelessness', or, as Steadman writes, he attempted,

"... to confront a written history that showed the poor and lowly that they occupied a proper and divinely ordered place." (6)

Among the means of keeping the poor in their 'ordered place' Pearman cites the notion of original sin, the system of justice and judicial administration, and the system of land tenure and social relations. Pearman set out to confront these repressive systems in his writing. Pearman's method (he had no other models to follow) was historical, social and philosophical, he wrote,

"... when I look back for only the past two generations of my family what an amount of temptations we have to endure to avoid to look at if what our parsons callse sin to git a chance to live while our Queen and the Lords and Dukes fare of the best the poor children of this carrupt earth can get for them ... there is one Law for the poor and another for the rich ... "

(7)

We can see from this passage that Pearman wrote from speech. Both Williams and Steadman repeat Pearman's thoughts on the repressive nature of Britain's political and social system. At the end of his own life Williams wrote in the New Statesman (8) that his own childhood had come at the end of a millenia of 'more thoroughgoing and brutal exploitation' than anything we now know. This is the exploitation of the mind and spirit against which, according to Steadman, Pearman struggled in his writing. Writing against this exploitation and the 'crippling doctrine' Pearman, drawing on his personal and political experience, began to develop political understanding as his work moved out of narrative into analysis. What Pearman's writing allows, claims Steadman, is a 'window on the processes of cognition'. Pearman is able to begin to achieve this 'cognitive understanding' through

the process of applying his 'lived experience' to his writing. Steadman's claim that Pearman could only have achieved 'cognitive understanding' through writing requires clarification,

"... the point of analysing a document like that of John Pearman is that it allows the reader to follow the trajectory of a mind, to see an intellect engaged with theoretical problems that connect directly with lived experience." (9)

In and through his writing Pearman was able to make his own 'original intellectual leap of understanding'. Steadman, drawing on Williams, uses her analysis of Pearman's work to develop a theory of 'writing as a form of cognition'. It is clear that Steadman is making a case for privileging writing over speech. Here she uses Williams's discussion of Vygotsky's theory of language in ML. Vygotsky claimed that writing makes available to the user a particular form of abstraction otherwise unavailable. In his Memoir Pearman moved from an implicit theory of speech written down to writing as a linguistic system in its own right. Through the linguistic system Pearman is able to achieve a 'manipulation of meaning' in written words. In this way Pearman was able to write what is 'impossible to say'. The ability to manipulate ideas in writing is what Steadman refers to as 'the moment of cognitive breakthrough'. This moment, for Steadman, is when Pearman inserts his own lived experience into the history he was recording and analysing. Steadman writes,

"It seems to me that he achieved his moments of cognitive breakthrough where he was able - in writing - to insert his own experience into the history of the world as he knew it, to see himself both shaped by that history, and at the same time, by standing back from it and recording it, acting upon that history, and making it." (10)

This process in Pearman's writing which leads to a 'cognitive breakthrough', is clearly educational. The process, as Steadman identifies it, is a liberation from the structure of spoken language to a manipulation of language and ideas through the linguistic system. This discovery, according to Steadman, represents an advance from Raymond Williams diachronic account of language (diachronic: historical description of the social uses that have been made of language theory). In Williams's account of the history of language theory, it was spoken language and its translation into inner speech that 'allowed the course of individual human development to move from the biological to the socio-historical'. Steadman, while accepting Williams's account as providing a partial explanation of the relation between history, language and society, wants to privilege an account that can be taken from learners of a language system. In her work on Pearman (she has produced a literal translation of his Memoir) Steadman attempts to trace the 'moments' when Pearman makes the cognitive breakthrough, the movement away from narrative to interpretive writing. Steadman describes this 'moment' as engagement of theoretical problems with 'lived experience'. For example, Pearman was able to take the critique of land ownership and taxation available from the Land Reform League, and reformulated it to incorporate his own experience of actually witnessing

exploitation and appropriation of land and people by the British in India in the 1840's.

Pearman had become an enforced learner of the written system through his work as a policeman; the processes of his understanding of his own history, his political understanding, was achieved because he had become a learner of the written system. As Williams pointed out 'writing' feels like a lonely and isolated experience until the necessary connections are made. Steadman, through the use of Pearman's Memoir, accepts Williams's account of 'writing in society' but feels this fails to provide an insight into the individual linguistic and psychological processes that occur in definite historical circumstances. It is these individual educational processes, operating within specific systems, which allowed Pearman to move from narrative to analysis and to the manipulation of ideas in writing. This process was not conventionally educational in the sense of learning through a structured academic programme; this is an indication of Pearman's achievement. We can explore Steadman's claims for her theory of linguistic and psychological processes in the development of language theory if we consider her second case, that of Margaret McMillan. This should take us more directly to the questions of learning, schooling, education and childhood that were raised at the beginning of this section of the chapter.

Margaret McMillan

In the late 1890's McMillan developed a theory of childhood and socialism, Steadman claims, that was taken up lock-stock-and-barrel by the Independent Labour Party. This theory included elements on language development, physiology and neurology. McMillan's theory can also be interpreted as a particular philosophy of mind. It was also politically radical.

Steadman outlines McMillan's theory as follows;

"... you could take the children of the labouring poor - dirty, hungry and sometimes deformed children, children with conjunctivitis and rotten teeth, take them not away from home, but to a centre established in the middle of a slum, feed them, let them sleep, wash them and give them some simple medical treatment. Within a few weeks, you could restore them - heavier, taller, healthier restore beautiful children to their parents, who would then make a cognitive leap, would see that dirt and disease were not just in the way of things, but the result of the appalling conditions of their material life." (11)

Having seen their children reborn in this way these parents would develop a political understanding, see how capitalism had defrauded them, organise and demand its overthrow.

In the tradition of the French sociologist, Saint-Simon, McMillan popularised physiological and neurological theories of amelioration. We will see how these theories influenced her ideas on education. McMillan saw mind as the product of material factors. The poor in the 1890's were 'tired

and stunted' because they were starved of food and sensation. In this argument the nervous system was unable to build up memory, mind, literally, could not form. McMillan's theory allowed stupidity and apathy to be seen as the result of material deprivation. Steadman emphasises the political radicalism of McMillan's ideas. If conditions were improved and deprivation could be removed then that which is material (physical might be a more useful term) could be restored. Steadman goes on to say that this theory of human development and of mind allowed McMillan to identify the children of the labouring poor as people like herself, deprived but not objects of pity and distanced inhumanity. This theory of the mind as material provided McMillan with an understanding of human potential which led her to adopt a relationship of equality with her subjects.

Steadman uses McMillan's philosophy of mind to assist in substantiating her own ideas on the conventional relationship between teacher and taught. Earlier in this section of the chapter I referred to Steadman's concerns about the 'status' of the child and 'other learners' in relation to the teacher. In her argument the child, in the conventional relationship between teacher and taught, is regarded as having low status compared with the teacher. Steadman wishes to reject this notion of children as symbols of low status. She is led from this position to adopt the view that that the term 'education' has become associated with this unequal relationship between teacher and taught. A relationship which, she adds, is profoundly undemocratic. To illustrate her argument Steadman uses the example of language theory. Both Pearman and McMillan are invoked as sources of a radical restructuring of the relationship between and teacher and taught. We saw earlier how Steadman witnessed the conventional relationship at work in schools at first hand in her role as teacher trainer; the way in which

'social relationships are partly structured by ... theory'. In the context of the discussion on Pearman's work Steadman draws an analogy between children and the natives of conquered lands,

"children ... were in the same kind of subordinate relationship to the observer as was any South Sea Islander giving an account of tense formation in Tagalog to the explorer-anthropologist of the early nineteenth century."
(12)

The 'observer' Steadman refers to here is the collector of linguistic information at the end of the nineteenth century in Britain. Steadman uses these examples to give weight to her claim that the low/high status relationship between teacher and taught continues to govern our thinking about 'education' in general and language theory in particular. Steadman argues for a relationship of equality between teacher and taught that recognise human potential. This is much like Raymond Williams's view of the relationship in 'An Open Letter to WEA Tutors', he writes of the experience of being a WEA tutor in an adult class,

"If you go in as a tutor you must go in as an equal, trying to share in an activity and to spread activity, in a common effort." (13)

Steadman then is encouraged by McMillan's account of language development in nineteenth century urban England. However, she believes aspects of this

account lead McMillan into real difficulties. This leads Steadman to turn to Williams's materialist account of the history of language development which, she believes, appears to tell a 'true historical story'. The difficulties Steadman has with McMillan centre on the latter's application of neurological physiology to the understanding of language. Steadman writes,

"McMillan described language as a matter of production, as the actual result of material formation, that is, 'the form of the mouth and the larynx'." (14)

For McMillan language had two components, speech and the content of speech. The production of speech was a physical exercise involving co-ordination of muscles and nerves. Poor breathing and other disorders would interfere with the way in which speech was produced. The content of speech, for McMillan, was acquired solely by imitation and thought itself was described as,

"... the ultimate operation of organs, as muscle and blood moved within the intergrated physiological system of the body." (15)

This led McMillan to condemn (her only condemnation) the way in which working class parents raised their children. This criticism was centred on the question of language, around what she called,

"... the strange aural condition of Deptford five-year-olds." (16)

This 'strange aural condition' that McMillan witnessed was silence, an absence of verbal communication. Working class children, in this argument, experienced both physical and sensory deprivation thereby arresting any possible development in their acquisition of language.

Steadman believes McMillan's acceptance of the determining influence of neurological physiology on children's acquisition of language led her into a trap, and perhaps, to her eventual abandonment of socialism in the 1920's. The theory of language she worked with prevented an understanding of language as, in Williams's terms, 'generative' or 'constitutive', and led to the possible conclusion of hopelessness about working-class childhood. In Steadman's opinion McMillan's particular materialist theory of language development led her to the conclusion that language development is a matter of reception and reproduction rather than a process where the child plays an active and constitutive role in the use language.

Steadman accepts Williams's account of the historical development of language and how it has been constructed and theorised within the last two hundred years. For Williams, language is fundamentally a social process; its development is determined by social relationships. Language is a dialectic where individual and social histories interact to produce revised meanings, changed consciousness. Williams writes in KW on language,

"... it is ... subject to change as well as to continuity - if the millions of people in whom it is active are to see it as active: not a tradition to be learned, nor a consensus to be accepted, nor a set of meanings which, because it is our language, has a natural authority; but as a shaping and reshaping, in real circumstances and from profoundly different and important points of view: a vocabulary to use, to find our own ways in, to change as we find it necessary to change it, as we go on making our language and history." (17)

Steadman argues that it is in writing rather than speech where we find 'our own ways in' to the language and where it is possible to make the 'cognitive leap' of political understanding she attributes to Pearman and to a lesser extent McMillan. This 'cognitive leap' is more likely to be made in adulthood rather than childhood because of the way in which the education of the child is structured and theorised. An adult, through writing, is able to bring individual 'lived experience' to the process of writing as Steadman indicates with her examples of Pearman and McMillan. The 'cognitive leap' is achieved through the 'entry of the learner into the socio-historical' in the process of writing. To put it as Williams did in WS, of 'the entry into the place where you are no longer alone as you write'; this is actually, 'writing in society'.

Steadman suggests that evidence is required to substantiate her own and Williams's claim for writing. She writes,

"The logic of the account suggests that we need the evidence of learners in childhood and other stages of development, in order to see the actual workings of the history that has been described, which is why I have told you about John Pearman and Margaret McMillan: to suggest that the history will be seen at work in the unconsidered places of this culture, in schools and classrooms, and among children and other learners of linguistic systems." (18)

For this evidence to be forthcoming thinking about teaching and learning is required to become more egalitarian with consideration given to the status of the learner. Both Williams and Steadman claim that education as presently constituted is anti-educational with 'entry into the system' denied.

In her paper Steadman attempts to advance Williams's theory of language to include a theory of individual development, and an account of written language and learning. In this way Steadman has made a contribution to the development of Williams's educational thought. Steadman's ideas on education remain in some important ways different from Williams. Her thoughts on the education of children are child-centred with a reduced role for the teacher. Williams encourages this approach with adults but tends to favour a knowledge-led method for children. It remains to be said that Williams's ideas as to what constitutes knowledge would be radically different to that taught in schools in the late twentieth century. I will provide more detail on this in later chapters.

In the last two parts of this chapter I have tried to present some of Williams's more obscure and opaque ideas on education through the work of two sympathetic but critical writers on education, Brian Doyle and Carolyn Steadman. Both, have in recent works, in the case of Steadman unpublished, engaged with Williams's work specifically in the area of education. These works have been useful in clarifying some of Williams's ideas on English Studies and language theory. Both Doyle and Steadman echo Williams's concern with the relation between education and democracy. Doyle's work in particular offers insights into contemporary developments in education. Lastly, both writers have as their starting point an egalitarian concept of education. It is to this starting point I will now turn.

Notes Part 1

1. Long Revolution, p.145-6.
2. D. Hargreaves, The Challenge for the Comprehensive School: Culture, Curriculum and Community, London, Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1982.
3. Long Revolution, p.147.
4. Ibid. p.147
5. Ibid. p.146.
6. The Nation, January 3, 1959.
7. Long Revolution, p.146.
8. Ibid. p.147.
9. Ibid. p.172.
10. Ibid. p.170.
11. Ibid. p.172.
12. Ibid. p.172.
13. Ibid. p.172.
14. Ibid. p.172-3.
15. Ibid. p.173.
16. Ibid. p.170.
17. Ibid. p.174.
18. Ibid. p.174-5.
19. Ibid. p.176.
20. Ibid. p.176.
21. Ibid. p.176.
22. Ibid. p.176.
23. Ibid. p.176.
24. Ibid. p.176.
25. Education Reform Act, 1988.
26. Education, March 4, 1960.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.

Notes Part 2

1. C. Steadman, 'Writing, Teaching and Learning', unpublished paper presented at the conference, In Memory of Raymond Williams, University of Warwick, April 1988.
2. B. Doyle, English and Englishness, London, Routledge, 1989.
3. Ibid. p.158.
4. Ibid. p.61.
5. Ibid. p.61.
6. Newbolt Report (223/252-3).
7. English and Englishness, p.63-4.
8. Ibid. p.137-8.
9. Ibid. p.139.
10. Ibid. p.35.
11. Ibid. p.35.
12. Ibid. p.18.
13. Ibid. p.20.
14. Ibid. p.20.
15. Ibid. p.9.
16. Ibid. p.8.
17. Williams, Writing in Society, p.190.
18. I.A. Richards, Principles of Literary Criticism, London, 1924.
19. G. Steiner, 'Humane Literacy' in G. Steiner et al, The Critical Movement, London, Faber, 1964, p.23.
20. English and Englishness, p.117.
21. Ibid. p.131.
22. Ibid. p.132.
23. Ibid. p.134.
24. The Kingman Committee, Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Teaching of English Language, London, HMSO, 1988.

Notes **Part 3**

1. Steadman has planned to produce an extended version of this paper for publication in 1991.
2. Steadman, Writing, Teaching and Learning, p.2-3.
3. Ibid. p.4.
4. J. Pearman, Memoir 1881-18883 and M. McMillan in selected articles in Clarion and Labour Leader, 1890's.
5. Writing, Teaching and Learning, p.9.
6. Ibid. p.6.
7. Ibid. p.6.
8. New Statesman, August, 1987.
9. Writing, Teaching and Learning, p.10.
10. Ibid. p.14.
11. Ibid. p.16-17.
12. Ibid. p.11.
13. Williams, An Open Letter to Students.
14. Writing, Teaching and Learning, p.18.
15. Ibid. p.18.
16. Ibid. p.19.
17. Williams, Keywords, p.24-5.
18. Writing, Teaching and Learning, p.20.

Introduction

In this chapter I will attempt to identify the major issues, theoretical and practical, which taken together form the basis of a political theory and a theory of political education in the work of Raymond Williams. These issues raise necessary questions of value and questions about the production of meanings and beliefs. A constant theme of the argument will be that there exists a determining connection between questions of value, political theory and political education.

The first section of the chapter will be in the form of a justification for the selection of these issues, to be followed by a summary of Williams's political theory. I will then look at the link to be found in Williams's work between politics, education and the imagination.

In the final section of the chapter I will present an outline of Williams's theory of political education and, also, point towards some omissions and contradictions in an attempt to develop further this central body of work on the relation between political theory, cultural theory and education. In the course of the discussion I will attempt to explain in detail what, for Williams, is cultural theory.

1.

Williams's theoretical position of cultural materialism is in essence a description of human existence as an indissoluble process. This is a broad claim but it can be said here that Williams developed his theory to correct a perceived imbalance in Marxist, structuralist and individualist accounts of the relation between material life (the socio-economic process) and cultural life (in which can be included language, art and education as cultural forms). Williams claims that this theory of indissolubility has a materialist foundation; the unified process of human history, including the processes of cultural production, is, in fact of a whole, a material process. Whereas 'structuralist' Marxists identify a determined hierarchy, Williams, invoking Marx as authority, rejects this 'classical' Marxist notion of determination and develops his own redefinition which takes as its central theme the proposition 'social being determines social consciousness' rather than the more traditional Marxist position of a mechanical determination from base to superstructure. The important point Williams wants to make here is that 'social being' is continually re-created through a process of dual determination; being and consciousness are, for Williams, equally responsible for the nature of 'social being'. This position of indissolubility, Williams claims, restores what was hitherto known as the superstructure a material character; traditionally Marxism has suffered from a lack of materialism rather than a surplus. If what has conventionally been contained within the superstructure, e.g., education, is now a material process, what does this mean? In Williams's terms it means that the cultural process (superstructure), is not strictly derived

from what has become known as the base, but contains its own determinants which are themselves material. For example, art, rather than mechanically derived from the mode of production and its socio-economic relations, possesses a material determination of its own; the process of art through the conditions of its production, in the process of its making, is a material process. To understand and value art it is necessary to trace these conditions which might, but not necessarily, lead back to the economic base. This is to say that consciousness can be the originator of social, economic and political change, against the 'classical' Marxist position indicated earlier; but it is nonetheless a consciousness determined by a process of interpenetration between social conditions and material life. More strongly change is achieved through the contradiction caused by the conflict between social consciousness and material life.

Before proceeding I want to indicate the contrasts Williams has in mind between 'social conditions and material life' and 'social consciousness and material life'. Williams, as does Marx, makes a distinction between material life (work, technology, the economic mode of production, commodity production and its distribution) and social interaction, social identity and social consciousness, the way in which social relations are formed and sustained, and the means by which collective and group thinking is determined. Unlike Marx, Williams does not advocate a relationship between material life and the social where everything social is directly determined by the material. Williams recognises the distinction but argues for a two-way process of determination between the two. For example, Marx would have said that the collective consciousness of the working-class (trade union consciousness), its values and attitudes, is directly determined by its position in the social relationships arising out of the capitalist mode

of production. For Marx, it cannot be the other way around. Williams, while in general support of Marx wishes to add that there are clear cases where social identity and consciousness develops free from the determinations of capitalist economics and technology, education is a possible case he has in mind. There is no question for Williams that the relation between material life, as Marx identifies it, and social consciousness is conflict-ridden, as I will try to show. It is interesting that both Marx and Williams talk about 'social' or 'collective' consciousness rather than individual consciousness. This is because both support the argument that forms of consciousness are produced by a process of interaction between material life and the inter-active communication between a community of individuals. I will consider the educational implications of this argument during the discussion.

Williams opposes the 'classical' Marxist position that all forms of consciousness are determined by the form of the economy. This, for Williams, is the error made by 'structuralist' Marxists who empty consciousness of any self-determination. While recognising the decisive effects of material life on ways of thinking and seeing Williams stops short of accepting that these effects are fully determined. This leads the way open for Williams to develop a theory of education which, although drawn from Marx, is freed from the crude determinations and limits of much so-called Marxist thinking on education.

Williams's position appears to hover in the space between idealist notions of change occurring through pristine consciousness, and the marxist notion of consciousness determined by the economic mode of production. However, as the discussion develops we can see that Williams claims a materialist

foundation for his argument and I will attempt to discover if this argument is justified.

Williams, drawing on Gramsci and Lukacs, insists on a 'totality' in the 'whole way of life' of a culture. Here, there is clearly an interpenetration of causality and determination with at the last instance a revised notion of the economic determinant. There is not space here to pursue this theoretical point fully but only to the point where it directly develops into a theory of political education. It is important to trace the comparison with Marx because, firstly, Williams claims to be a materialist, and, secondly, the comparison reveals a fundamental debate in Marxist theory regarding the role of education in achieving social and political change.

In what has become known as classical, and in a later version, 'structuralist' Marxism, education has been identified in capitalist society as an ideology situated in the superstructure and directly determined by the economic base. In other words, an ideology designed to promote and maintain capitalist interests. For Marxists of this kind education does not provide a fertile site for revolutionary struggle since changes need to take place in the economy before being reflected in the education system. This has led many Marxists to more or less ignore education as a force for the development of a revolutionary consciousness and instead define it as a source of ideological reproduction. (1)

This is where Williams's theory of indissolubility and totality becomes interesting and relevant. It is interesting since it offers not simply a

radical perspective on education but because it is a direct attempt to provide a post-structuralist alternative, in the form of a theory of culture, to orthodox marxist thinking. Williams rejects this conventional marxist theory of education because it opposes one of Marx's central arguments, that of our ability to make and remake our world in our own image. If men are, for Marx, the agents of historical change then notions of structural and objective forms governing human development, for example language, must either be challenged or re-presented in a less damaging form. This is the essence of Williams's argument, he accepts a loose and limited notion of structure while retaining the central principle of man as the agent for human, social and political change. (This presents some theoretical difficulties and problems that centre on questions of the nature of contradiction, the dialectic and the idea of 'lived experience' which I will attempt to resolve later in the chapter).

This, as the 'essence' of Williams's, position requires some clarification. I have outlined Williams's account of materialism in Ch.1 and will not repeat it here. However, by way of clarification it might be helpful to apply Williams's ideas on structural determination and human agency to education. Conventional Marxist educational theory categorises state education in liberal capitalist democracies as an ideological form of social and economic control. Williams, while in general agreement with this view, rejects the conventional Marxist claim that education in these societies necessarily takes this form. For Williams, certain structures in capitalist societies, e.g. the economy, the political state, the military, police and the legal system, maintain capitalist social relations through their various activities. He is extremely reluctant to categorise education in this way, although he does not wish to

deny the political form of the relation between the aims of the state and the aims of the education system. Williams agrees with conventional Marxists that these structures, including education, are material, i.e directly derived from the economic mode of production. Structures, for these Marxists, are semi-autonomous and cannot be removed or significantly reformed by human agency. In other words, curriculum initiatives, radical or progressive teaching methods, and organisational developments cannot alter the fundamental role of education in capitalist societies. The structure remains intact and its basic function unchanged. For these Marxists, revolutionary political and economic change must precede changes in the ideological superstructure where they situate education.

Williams cannot accept this analysis. He accepts the existence of these structures but wishes to include a positive role for human agency in the equation. Philosophers of education, teachers, curriculum planners can, for Williams, through the practical application of their ideas effect radical and progressive change in education. I will provide some examples of these ideas and practical proposals in later chapters. Williams's theory of cultural materialism accepts the existence of structural determination in capitalist societies but rejects the idea that the actions of human beings are wholly restricted by the form of these structures. In this argument education can have a determining effect on changing political and economic structures and forms of consciousness. This is the point. Williams agrees with the Marxists that revolutionary change is a necessary condition for the achievement of a socialist society. They agree on the aims but differ on the means; Williams prescribes a positive role for education in the achievement of revolutionary change.

With a revised account of structure and an insistent identification of human agency as the source of revolutionary change Williams is free to develop a theory of education with a notion of liberation at its core. Education is no longer seen as a simple case of ideological reproduction but a site of struggle where real and new production can and does occur.

Fundamental to Williams's theory of cultural materialism is the concept of indissolubility. This latter term has strong implications for Williams's political theory and marks it off from traditional Marxism. Education is a central feature of this political theory and to it is attributed a more enabling role in the process of political change than in the Marxist theory of education outlined above. For Williams, politics, education, social and personal life and the economy are indissoluble features of a process of 'totality'. Culture, including education, is central to this process. An example of what Williams has in mind here is the feminist contention that the 'personal is the political'. The 'personal' in this sense refers to the processes of life such as the patriarchal family, sexuality, and gender roles which contain a political dimension. These areas of life are, for Williams, as much a part of the political process as formal politics, or, for example, trade union activity. This is because the personal and cultural areas of life mirror the relationships of power and exploitation characteristic of formal political and economic life. The argument continues that changes in the nature of the relationships in personal and cultural life will entail similar changes in political and economic spheres. In contrast Marxists believe that change in the personal and cultural areas of life will only occur after changes in the way in which the economy is organised.

In the view of the Marxists above only the working class, in advanced capitalist societies, can achieve revolutionary change by acting on crises in the economic mode of production. This view appears to differ fundamentally from Williams's notion of indissolubility and totality. Williams states in a number of contexts that he is sympathetic to Marxism and to the primary role of the working class in achieving political change. Why has he sought to redefine the original Marxist formulation in this way? Firstly, we can say that Williams rejects the mechanical, scientific or structurally determined view of human development. Does it follow from this that Williams must reject the associated view of the working class as the sole agent of ultimate revolutionary change? Or, put less dogmatically, must Williams reject the view that without a decisive contribution from a fully conscious working class revolutionary movement, change cannot take place? This has important implications for education. Marx claimed an authentic working class education can only be provided by the working class themselves. We will see how far Williams agrees with this claim.

The best way to answer these questions is to consider what alternative political theory results from Williams's wider theoretical position. The first thing to say about Williams's political theory is that he is a committed socialist who supports a particular version of socialism and view about the possibilities of revolutionary change. Williams opposes the de-humanising, alienating and exploitative nature of capitalism. In the CC Williams expresses this opposition,

"I have been arguing that capitalism, as a mode of production is the basic process of most of what we know as the history of the country and the city.

Its abstracted economic drives, its fundamental priorities in social relations, its criteria of growth and of profit and loss, have over several centuries altered our country and erected our kinds of city. In its final forms of imperialism it has altered our world." (2)

and again,

"It is then often difficult, past this continued process which contains the substance of so much of our lives, to recognise, adequately, the specific character of the capitalist mode of production, which is not the use of machines or technology of improvement, but their minority ownership. Indeed as the persistent concentration of ownership, first of the land, then of all major means of production, was built into a system and a state, with many kinds of political and cultural mediation, it was easy for the perception to diminish though the form was increasing." (3)

Here Williams's method of complex sentence construction involving a series of qualifying clauses is clearly apparent. So are the materialist features of his political theory. In this passage he does not refer to politics, in the form of parties or individuals, as shaping and altering 'our' world, but a system or structure, capitalism. It is the mode of production, impersonal and autonomous, that achieves the alteration. Williams's political theory recognises this fact of the material process in developing an account of the political. Williams makes a further point about the determined nature of capitalism,

"It is that the total character of what we know as modern social life has been similarly determined." (4)

Williams then makes this point,

"Seeing the history in this way, I am then convinced that resistance to capitalism is the decisive form of the necessary human defence." (5)

He also offers a pointer to the character of this defence,

"These experiences are never exclusive, since within the pressures and limits people make other settlements and attachments and try to live by other values. But the central drive is still there." (6)

Here Williams is referring to both the opportunity of resistance and the deep and formidable opposition. Identifying the features and processes of capitalism Williams sets out to develop a critical analysis of the method of its operation to offer a perspective for change. I intend to develop here the particular features of capitalism that relate to ideology, consciousness and the production of meanings and values.

The classical Marxist position is that all the operations and structures of repression are directly derived from the economic mode and have their most

violent effect on the working class as the most exploited. This is fairly straightforward and Williams would agree with this but rejects the view that this is a mechanical operation which will inevitably bring about revolutionary change. Williams, using Marxist terminology, sets out to develop a socialist political theory that rejects the 'inevitable' thesis. Williams addresses his political theory to the question of why a socialist consciousness has not been fully developed within the working class.

Williams's socialist theory is based on a re-definition of what Marx called the 'productive forces', the function of cultural production, and the role of emergent social forces in a programme for socialist change. The first point to make about the character of productive forces is that they have direct implications for the resolution of problems centring on cultural production and emergent social forces. Williams agrees with Marx that there are primary productive forces,

"What we then have to say is that these forces of production are really very basic indeed; they are the production of food, the production of shelter, and the production of the means of food and shelter an extended range which is still related to the absolute necessary condition of sustaining life." (7)

Williams argues that there has been a slide away from Marx's original position by later marxists in their analysis of late capitalist economies,

"... as if everything which occurred in contemporary industry or agriculture were forces of production self-evidently related to primary need, as opposed, for example, to writing novels or painting pictures." (8)

Using the car industry to illustrate his point, Williams continues,

"There is no sense in which the car industry is primary production for the maintenance of human life in the same sense as the production of food or shelter or building materials." (9)

Williams believes Marx viewed the economy as more directly related to satisfying basic human needs unlike advanced capitalism,

"By the time you have got to the point when an EMI factory producing discs is industrial production, whereas somebody elsewhere writing music or making an instrument is at most on the outskirts of production, the whole classification of activities has become very difficult." (10)

The point Williams is making here is that once you get outside of the production of the primary forces then,

"... you are into an area which is to my mind indisputably political and cultural in a broader sense, in that the pattern of investment and output is so clearly determined by the nature of the whole social order." (11)

In using the term 'nature of the social order' Williams is clearly making a point about the values and choices associated with particular economic forces, a point to which I will return. Williams agrees with Marx's assertion that there exist hidden causal relations in the structure of capitalism where there is 'determination in the last instance by the economy', he writes,

"I see no difficulty at all in setting and where necessary revising a relative hierarchy of different kinds of production as suppliers of social needs and therefore as available historical causes." (12)

and again,

"I am very willing to concede these questions of hierarchy and effect. But I would not be willing to say that at the top of the hierarchy is productive industry, then comes political institutions or means of mass communication, and below them the cultural activities of philosophers or novelists." (13)

Here we begin to get to the heart of Williams's materialism; he accepts causal relations derived from material forces but stops short at the point where human intentions or decisions are excluded as elements of causation. More strongly, Williams argues that the basic organisation of the material forces is a cultural choice invoking questions of value, He writes,

"In this sense, the hierarchy of production is itself determined within a cultural order which is by no means separable as an independent sphere in which people wonder about the ultimate concerns of life ... At every point where determinations of need are being fought out, the cultural order is crucially involved." (14)

Referring directly to contemporary capitalism Williams states,

"What is still described in capitalist terms as essential production actually means profitable commodity production in the narrow sense; everything else is then superstructural to it in a kind of caricature of over-simplified Marxism." (15)

Williams's concepts of 'indissolubility' and 'totality' are introduced by him as an alternative to the mechanical determinism of the base/superstructure model. Unlike many Marxists, Williams is willing to accept that superstructural elements, e.g. education, literature, art, communications, can determine the nature of the mode of production. The

industrial priorities of capitalism are, for Williams, questions of value; they are the result of cultural choices. It follows from this that education, as a cultural mode, can influence the material process in the way in which it reflects or opposes cultural choices. The concepts of 'totality' and 'indissolubility' allow Williams the theoretical freedom to make the causal connections between education, politics, economics and culture. None of these areas are autonomous but are inter-dependent within the total process. This inter-dependency of cultural forces (education, art, etc.) with the economy is what provides culture with its (partial) material character.

This summary, necessarily brief, of Williams's re-consideration of the formulation and function of the productive forces in Marxist theory has been undertaken in order to clarify his cultural theory and to provide a basis for a theory of politics. For classical Marxists politics or civil life are bourgeois forms of re-production, it is only the economic structures in contradiction and struggle which can create the conditions for revolutionary change. Williams rejects this view and is thereby free to develop a theory of cultural and political change which can have a revolutionary effect on the economic base (redefined as a product of value-choice).

This political theory differs in method and aim from conventional Marxist political theory which identifies the proletariat as the sole agent of revolutionary change. Williams's political theory can be described as 'cultural revolution', a process of cultural and political struggle. Williams writes,

"Thus a cultural revolution, by contrast with other social programmes, is directed towards the appropriation of all the real forces of production, including especially the intellectual forces of knowledge and conscious decisions as the necessary means of revolutionizing the social relations (determination of the use of resources; distribution and organisation of work; distribution of products and services) which follow from variable forms of control of and access to all the productive forces." (16)

and later,

"A Cultural Revolution is then always practically centred on the areas and processes of knowledge and decision, each ineffective without the other. In going beyond those changes in the relations of production which are practicable, especially at the distributive level, within persistent inequalities in control of and access to the underlying productive forces - cultural revolution - but then, in effect, any full revolution - works for those more general (and necessarily connected) changes which, in changing the whole mode of production, would be at once the processes and the condition of a general human emancipation." (17)

Education, in Williams' terms, is a 'process of knowledge and decision' which must work for the 'more general..changes' that are the condition of 'human emancipation'. The 'general changes' refer to changes in the economic mode of production, exchange and distribution from capitalist to

socialist forms and arrangements.

In the quotation above Williams is making the claim that the cultural revolution is one form of revolutionary change; he is not claiming that the cultural revolution replaces the revolution derived exclusively from economic contradictions. So the cultural revolution is not an all-encompassing theory of change but represents an alternative to ideological accounts of superstructural rigidity. The problem Williams now comes up against as a socialist theorist with materialist affiliations is how the cultural revolution, seemingly stripped of class allegiance, can provide a theory of collective action which is a pre-condition of any socialist political theory? The answer to this question is partly tied up with the earlier question of the existence of alternative values and choices. However, Williams offers a more concrete answer in PMC. This answer is related to changes in the forces of production leading to a re-definition of work, Williams writes,

"What this really involves, as a central task of the revolution, in its necessary alteration of the nature of the productive forces, is a practical re-definition of the nature of work." (18)

If this alteration of the processes of work lead, as they must, to a new type of society based on a different set of values and beliefs, it is the nature of class, always derived from socio-economic and industrial

patterns, that has to be considered and defined within the theory of the cultural revolution, he continues,

"We then have to consider, finally, the relation between these definitions and perspectives of the cultural revolution and the most general received definitions and perspectives of revolutionary socialism." (19)

In PMC in the chapter 'Beyond Actually Existing Socialism' Williams attempts this task and the outcome determines his theory of political action. In a discussion of the radical importance of new social classes based on occupation who have privileged access to new forms of communication and information, and processes of mediation, Williams argues that radical as these new social forces are they are almost always enlisted into new forms of appropriation through incorporation. He writes,

"This is why, though necessary on the basis of rigorous new analysis, socialists committed to the idea of cultural revolution have still to find common cause - and by learning as much as teaching - with those who are most subject to appropriation, who alone have fully objective interests in its ending." (20)

Williams qualifies this,

"Yet one of the advantages of the Cultural Revolution, as it reaches beyond the immediate area of property relations, is that it identifies wide groups who are subject to the appropriation of knowledge and effective decision but who are structurally different from the old and new working class."

(21)

These 'wide groups' Williams identifies, for example, the 'outstanding case of women',

"The Cultural Revolution, as distinct from incentives and reforms to permit their inclusion in the plan, will be deeply sited among women or it will not, in practice, occur at all." (22)

Williams's theory of the cultural revolution, in opposition to the learned resignation of conventional Marxist reflection theory, restores to socialist theory the idea of possibility. Its theory of action is sited in the effective association of potential majorities beyond specific and limited loyalties. The cultural revolution will be achieved by these potential majorities through organisation and activity but also through the 'material force of the idea' which is 'the production and practice of possibility'. Here Williams is restoring Marx's notion of human agency to the achievement of change as against mechanical materialism. We have seen how Williams identifies women as central to the process of the cultural revolution, other potential majorities include, workers in communications and education, consciously committed groups based on cultural and ethnic

difference, committed intellectuals conscious of the process of mediation. By mediation is meant the way in which reality becomes distorted through the processes of communication and information. Williams writes,

"... the Cultural Revolution insists, first, that what a society needs, before all, to produce, is as many as possible conscious individuals, capable of all necessary association." (23)

As we shall see in the next section of this chapter education plays a central role in the production of consciousness. We have seen here how, against conventional Marxism, Williams has developed an enabling theory of action for revolutionary change which recognises the positive role of newly conscious social forces without losing the primary commitment to class affiliation, he writes,

"Certainly one cannot look realistically anywhere else but to the industrial working class for a socialist transformation of our societies today." (24)

The force of the cultural revolution is felt most in the ways in which it articulates the possibility of alternatives; in values and meanings, in courses of action, in theoretical and concrete ways. Moreover, the cultural revolution is a theory of action situated in the very areas of contradictory experience, including education, where capitalist ideology is

at its most vulnerable. One of the central forces of the cultural revolution is a re-defined education which, rather than an agent for the reproduction of capitalist values and meanings, becomes an area for the development of a revolutionary change in consciousness. The cultural revolution is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the full-scale overthrow of capitalism, a task that cannot be completed without the full conscious force of the working class in reversing the existing relations of production.

We have seen how Williams's theory of Cultural Materialism is a particular description of history and historical change. His theory of Cultural Revolution is a programme for action with clear aims of achieving revolutionary political, cultural and, ultimately, economic change. It is also a political theory of action that recognises the working class as the ultimate agents of revolutionary change. However, unlike reflection theory Williams allocates an enabling practical role to groups and individuals consigned by marxists to the superstructure. These groups and individuals include; women, where they are discriminated against; ethnic and racial minorities; groups based on sexuality or sexual preference; anti-nuclear campaigners; workers in information and communications; and others. These groups have become known as issue-based political factions as opposed to class-based political parties and organisations. It is Williams's intention to attempt a convergence of issue and class-based politics.

Education, Williams insists, has a positive, enabling, although partial role in the revolutionary process. he writes,

"The content of education, as a rule, is the actual content of our actual social relations, and will only change as the part of a wider change."

(25)

Here Williams is alluding to his assertion that theories of education must be contained within a wider political theory; education and politics are, in this argument, inextricably linked.

2.

So far, the discussion in this chapter has been rather prosaic. This has much to do with Williams's style and to the topic under discussion. In the final section of the chapter I hope to strike a more enlivening note, through a discussion of Williams's political philosophy in relation to education. The chapter in CS, entitled, 'Mill on Bentham and Coleridge' and Richard Holmes's book, Coleridge (26) will provide the references for this, possibly, more animated discussion.

Williams's political theory is critical of conservatism, liberalism and their philosophical foundations of idealism and individualism.. He is in the tradition of European systematic thinkers such as Hegel, Schiller and Marx. Unlike these European thinkers Williams has written extensively on education. The philosopher-poet, Coleridge, is another systematic thinker who has included a theory of education within his overall framework, although Williams and Coleridge do not appear, at first sight, to have much in common. However, Coleridge responded philosophically to the rise of industrialism, as did Mill and Marx, by developing a theory of culture.

In Mill and Coleridge Williams recognises writers who address the questions, both politically and philosophically, with which he is concerned. These questions include, the nature of experience, the contrast between civilisation and culture, the nature of democracy, the nature of the human faculties, philosophy of mind, the aims of education and the aims of a civilisation. There is clearly not the space here to confront all of these epic problems in detail, but a summary will help to clarify the

earlier discussion on Williams's ideas on 'totality' and 'indissolubility'. This task should also help clarify the ways in which, for Williams, education, politics and democracy are related; at the centre of the discussion is Williams's concept of culture. This discussion should also provide an illustration of Williams's theories of cultural revolution and cultural materialism. The two references cited above are also immensely valuable in developing Williams's ideas on the imagination and the way in which these ideas fit into his views on culture and education.

If Williams agrees with the choice of the questions which Mill and Coleridge raise and finds himself in general agreement on the answers to some of these questions, there are major areas of disagreement; I will attempt to look at both the points of agreement and the areas of objection.

In CS Williams argues that both Mill and Coleridge provide an intellectual response to industrial society and its social and political consequences. Mill's reaction to Bentham is to add a 'human' enlargement to Bentham's dogma of value residing in utility. Williams refers to Mill's adaption of Bentham as 'humanized utilitarianism'. Mill partially accepted Bentham's principle of utility but thought this applied only to the 'merely business part of the social arrangements'. Mill wished to adapt the principle to include the interests of the rising working-class and to reconcile democracy with individual liberty. The outcome of Mill's 'enlarged system of action' has, according to Williams, formed the basis of the main line of English social thinking. Holmes writes, in Coleridge, that this debate which Williams articulates between Bentham, Mill and Coleridge has important contemporary implications in the way in which governments emphasise purely utilitarian considerations ('merely business') in making

policy, or give weight to 'human' or 'enlarged' priorities. In other words, Holmes argues that the debate is central to discourses in political philosophy.

According to Williams, Mill was led to revise Benthamite utilitarianism for two reasons; firstly, he wanted to protect the individual against the possible 'tyranny' of the 'will of the majority' in the age of the Industrial Revolution, the Reform Bill of 1832, and the rise of the democratic state, and, secondly, because he believed Bentham's political philosophy did nothing for the 'spiritual needs of society'. It is for the second of these two reasons, Williams observes, that Mill turns to Coleridge for inspiration. The major discussion in this chapter in CS follows the second of these two reasons, the 'spiritual' dimension, and largely takes for granted the political good of the democratic state and increased democracy. In terms of democracy Williams supports a 'complete' democracy that he chooses not to outline, while both Mill and Coleridge favour a limited democratic organisation of society that will protect freedom of thought and make a contribution towards the 'philosophy of human culture'. It is an expression of Williams's 'humanism' rather than his materialism that he offers support to Mill and particularly Coleridge in their defence of the 'philosophy of human culture' against the 'philistinism' of liberal capitalism.

We have to read more widely in Williams's work to interpret what he means by a 'complete' democracy. In KW he supports a socialist meaning of democracy as 'popular power' rather than a liberal version of 'representative' democracy with certain conditions such as free speech. Williams contends that in modern times these two conceptions of democracy

have come to 'confront each other as enemies'. We can see more graphically what Williams has in mind here when he characterises the opposition as that between bourgeois or capitalist democracy and a more complete form of democracy which is extended to include all areas of human activity including culture and the economy. Here we find Williams equating democracy with equality. He writes,

"If the predominant criteria are elections and free speech, other criteria are seen as secondary or are rejected; an attempt to exercise popular power in the popular interest, for example by a General Strike, is described as anti-democratic, since democracy has already been assured by other means; to claim economic equality (q.v.) as the essence of democracy is seen as leading to 'chaos' or totalitarian democracy or government by trade unions." (27)

This thumbnail sketch about Williams's ideas of democracy is added to this discussion with the aim of clarity in mind. Although supporting a kind of socialist democracy covering all areas of human activity Williams is keen to point out that although the term democracy has had its meaning forged by history, 'the range of contemporary sense is its confused and still active record'. It is worthwhile to note at this stage that Williams would have been against a written Bill of Rights where this excluded the terms of economic equality.

An example both of Williams's view that the concept of democracy has been distorted and of his own idea of a fundamental democracy can be found in an

article in the CND journal Sanity written in 1965. Here Williams outlines how arguments for the retention and use of nuclear weapons have been used as a defence for a version of democracy,

"But the fact of the bomb is that it imposes, by its very character, the most centralized and arbitrary kind of politics in the modern world. The decisions about war and peace, even in the two world wars of the century, have been made in the democratic societies, by some kind of parliamentary process, and because of their time-scale have been subject to some kind of parliamentary and public challenge and discussion. The necessary timing of nuclear war allows no such process. At extreme points of crisis, decisions have to be made in a matter of hours or minutes ..." (28)

Members of the American Congress have expressed their concern in 1990 about the lack of accountability in Presidential decision-making, particularly with regard to 'decisions about war and peace'. For Williams, the existence of nuclear weapons has been used to support increased centralisation in decision-making. Williams does not wish to see democracy limited to parliamentary processes or formalised structures and institutions. Writing in the same edition of Sanity Williams argues,

"The key to our future, I firmly believe, is the extension of politics beyond the routines of parliamentary process, as CND, more than any other movement has already shown to be possible. Not all our campaigns will be of that size or character, but what we have to do, in open practice, is to

define politics differently, in every kind of institution and demonstration, so that we can go on changing consciousness (our own included) in ways that are intrinsically of a participating and therefore democratic kind." (29)

To return to the main discussion, all three writers mentioned above use the term culture as the space within which the spiritual, aesthetic or social dimensions of human activity can be developed in contrast to an, even reformed, industrial 'civilisation'. The distinction between culture and civilisation is a constant theme in the chapter on Mill and Coleridge in CS and is perhaps best expressed in this passage from Coleridge's Constitution of Church and State,

"The permanency of the nation ... and its progressiveness and personal freedom ... depend on a continuing and progressive civilization. But civilization is itself a mixed good, if not far more a corrupting influence, the hectic of disease, not the bloom of health, and a nation so distinguished more fitly to be called a varnished than a polished people, where this civilization is not grounded in cultivation, in the harmonious development of those qualities and faculties that characterize our humanity." (30)

'Those qualities and faculties that characterize our humanity' is the key clause here. A civilization that is not grounded in this essential condition is in some way alienated. It is how Mill, Coleridge and Williams,

all in agreement as to the essential alienating form of industrial capitalism, formulate their theory of culture ('those qualities and faculties that characterise our humanity') which determines their theory of politics. It is important just to note at this stage that education features strongly in the political thought of all three writers as I will try to show later. The concept of culture, so central to Williams's whole project, is seen by both Mill and Coleridge as the area of human experience within which the 'essential' nature of man can be developed. The three writers come to different conclusions as to the meaning of culture but all three accept that it is the most vital and liberating area of experience.

Mill believed culture was the way to enlarge the Utilitarian tradition which he thought lacked principle and spiritual awareness, being based, as he thought it was, on economic and political expediency. Mill accepted the extension of democracy but was concerned about the threat to individual liberty from the newly established democratic state. He was led to this position not by the extension of democracy but by Bentham's philosophy of laissez-faire commercialism. The democratic state's aims, according to Mill, were instrumental, commercial and devoid of spiritual meaning. This is Mill grounding his political philosophy in a social context. With these concerns about the spiritual worth of Utilitarianism Mill turned to Coleridge's ideas on culture.

Coleridge expressed his criticisms of Utilitarian thought by putting these questions,

"Has the national welfare, have the weal and happiness of the people, advanced with the increase of the circumstantial prosperity? Is the increasing number of wealthy individuals that which ought to be understood by the wealth of the nation?" (31)

Or again,

"It is this accursed practice of ever considering only what seems expedient for the occasion, disjoined from all principle or enlarged systems of action, of never listening to the true and unerring impulses of our better nature, which has led the cold-hearted men to the study of political economy, which has turned our Parliament into a real committee of public safety." (32)

Mill is attracted to Coleridge as a representative of the 'Germano-Coleridgean' school who, Mill believed, developed a philosophy of society and history which was a contribution towards a philosophy of 'human culture'. If Mill saw the emphasis on culture as the way to enlarge the Utilitarian tradition, Coleridge posited civilisation ('the ordinary progress of society') against culture or cultivation (the harmonious development of those qualities and faculties that characterise our humanity'). Coleridge found that this condition of culture was threatened under the impact of change and with the disintegrating processes of industrialism. Culture, for Coleridge, was an absolute, an agreed centre for defence against the encroachment of civilization. Like the German

philosophers Mill refers to, Coleridge defined his ideas on culture in terms of social conditions. There is little doubt that Coleridge believed in the pursuit of perfection and that this could be achieved by altering social conditions through institutional change. In this sense culture was not an individual process but a condition on which a whole society depended. One institution that could be changed with the aim of altering social conditions was public education, a view, as we shall see, that was shared by Raymond Williams who also included education within a theory of culture.

Coleridge's belief that human perfectibility could be achieved through institutional change led him to a political theory which differed from Mill's and, later, Williams's. Coleridge proposed the endowment of a class (he called this the Clerisy, or national Church) within the State, dedicated to the preservation and extension of culture or cultivation. The endowed class would judge and monitor social conditions. For Williams, this meant that the term culture had now been introduced into English thinking in terms independent of the progress of society. Coleridge provided details of how his endowed class would operate in practice, including budget details, powers etc. What Williams finds important in this aspect of Coleridge's thinking is its principle, i.e. the principle of the enlarged system of action. Mill thought that the idea of culture, embodied in a social institution, was adequately provided for by extension of the national system of education. Mill writes,

"The same causes ... have naturally led the same class of thinkers to do what their predecessors never could have done, for the philosophy of human

culture. For the tendency of their speculations compelled them to see in the character of the national education existing in any political society at once the principal cause of its permanence as a society, and the chief source of its progressiveness: the former by the extent to which that education operated as a system of restraining discipline; the latter by the degree in which it called forth and invigorated the active faculties." (33)

Mill believed the enlargement of the utilitarian tradition would satisfy Coleridge's condition for a cultivated society. This enlargement would act as a 'humanizing' check with education acting as a guide and guardian of the 'national character' which is how Mill saw Coleridge's philosophy of human culture. Coleridge himself came to different conclusions as Williams points out, although a theory of education was retained.

Coleridge, like Williams, centres our attention on the relations between personal instance and social institution. Coleridge's use of 'personal instance' is very close to Williams's use of experience. There is in both writers a kind of affirmation of the 'personal instance', or as Williams prefers it, 'ordinary experience'. Mill's final acceptance of a revised Utilitarianism leads him to an eventual separation between ordinary experience and the social and political world.

This acceptance is based on a recoil from a solely rational organisation of effort and a belief that the desire for social reform is ultimately inadequate. This, fairly common, view is derived from an assumption that 'human nature' is non-rational and therefore the search for perfectability is ill-conceived. There is not space here to develop this argument and the

theoretical foundation upon which it stands. It may be best summed up in this passage by Mill,

"In this frame of mind it occurred to me to put the question directly to myself: 'Suppose that all your objects in life were realised; that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to, could be completely effected at this very instant: would this be a great joy and happiness to you?' And an irresistible self-consciousness distinctly answered, 'No!' At this my heart sank within me; the whole foundation on which my life was constructed fell down" (34)

The 'great joy and happiness' Mill seeks, he concludes, is only to be found in,

"... sympathetic and imaginative pleasure ... which had no connection with struggle or imperfection ... " (35)

Mill finds his source of happiness and pleasure in the 'culture of the feelings'. The 'inward joy' Mill desires he finds in poetry. A conclusion which Williams points out has become a common and conventional way of regarding art. The personal refuge in poetry as 'the perennial source of happiness' does not mean that Mill rejects the impulse to democracy. However, it leads him to separate poetry (art) from the social and political, a separation which delimits art to an ideal sphere distinct from

the rational social and political world of struggle and imperfection. This way of regarding art, and particularly poetry, as Williams comments, contains an implied judgement of the rest of man's social and political activity. This has further implications for education as I will shortly try to show.

The position outlined above which Williams attributes to Mill is based on a particular philosophy of mind which denies the substance of feeling by substituting poetry for feeling. In this argument the mind is a 'machine for thinking' and feeling is at best subjective, or at worst, irrelevant. In this utilitarian philosophy of mind feeling and thought are seen as antitheses. The appreciation and practice of art are as Williams explains, 'treated as a saving clause in a bad treaty'.

Williams believes Coleridge offers a convincing alternative to Mill's 'humanized' Utilitarianism through his attachment to experience. Coleridge outlines this alternative and his thoughts on 'mind as machine' philosophy in a letter to Wordsworth,

"In short, the necessity of a general revolution in the modes of developing and disciplining the human mind by the substitution of life and intelligence ... for the philosophy of mechanism, which, in everything most worthy of the human intellect, strikes Death, and cheats itself by mistaking clear images for distinct conceptions and which idly demands conceptions where intuitions alone are possible or adequate to the majesty of truth. In short, facts elevated into theory, theory into laws, and laws into living intelligence and powers." (36)

Coleridge makes a distinction between 'substantial knowledge' and 'abstract knowledge'. 'Substantial knowledge' is that 'intuition of things which arises when we possess ourselves, as one with the whole'. 'Abstract knowledge' is the 'science of the mere understanding' which 'places nature in antithesis to the mind, as object to subject, thing to thought, death to life.' Williams argues that Coleridge wishes to remove the contrast between 'thinking' and 'feeling' by insisting on the unity of both. Thus 'that intuition of things which arises when we possess ourselves as one with the whole' is, for Coleridge, this unity. This is the way in which Coleridge affirms individual and social experience but within a unity with social condition as the source of 'that intuition of things' which is his 'substantial knowledge'. We might wish to describe Coleridge's 'substantial knowledge' as authentic knowledge. Rejecting Mill's duality of thought and feeling or experience and art Coleridge, according to Williams, offers something radically different from Mill's 'humanizing check', i.e. an alternative conception of man, however incomplete. Williams argues that Coleridge's conception of culture as the realm of experience, common to us all, contains within it a quality beyond reason, or even language. Williams also makes the point that Coleridge, as a Romantic thinker, originated the construction of culture in terms of the arts, rather than as a 'whole way of life'. However, Williams argues that this is only a partial conclusion because, for Coleridge, art was essentially a symbol for the kind of 'substantial knowledge' he saw as authentic.

Williams has taken from Coleridge the latter's concern with grounding his conception of man in experience. In this way Coleridge has developed a theory of culture which recognises the central importance of social conditions in shaping consciousness. Coleridge's alternative conception of

man can only be derived from a particular set of social conditions. In Coleridge these are unclear and his conception of man remains mystical. In Williams's case the social conditions are to be socialist. There is a further area where Coleridge's influence on Williams is felt, that is, on the necessity for a radical re-examination of the function of education. In Coleridge Holmes writes,

"The nature of that method, as applied to education, ... has borne fruit in a long line of writers on education, from Matthew Arnold to F.R. Leavis and Raymond Williams." (37)

Coleridge was passionately committed to the idea of a general education. Williams was committed to the idea of a democratic education; both have a similar aim, that of education in the pursuit of a new conception of man. In a consideration of Coleridge's influence on Williams's philosophy of education it is important to look briefly at both thinkers' basic philosophical concepts. I mentioned earlier in this chapter that Coleridge was a systematic thinker; in many respects Raymond Williams's attempt to create a multi-disciplinary area of enquiry in Cultural Studies, and in the way in which he works towards a synthesis between political theory and historical analysis, is in the form of an effort to create a theoretical and philosophical system in the manner of the European thinkers, e.g. Marx and Hegel. If there is a sense in which Coleridge and Williams are system-builders seeking to establish a structure of experience and knowledge, even though they come to different conclusions, there is also a substantive similarity in their use of the concepts which form the basis of

their philosophy of education; culture, method and the imagination. I will look very briefly at culture since it has been covered at length elsewhere, and will consider method and imagination more closely. I will then make some final remarks on how Williams's educational and political theory connect.

Coleridge's concept of culture had, as Holmes argues, an almost agricultural meaning; 'a process of sowing, nurturing, and gradual successive harvesting'. He did not believe in 'planting' a child's mind with anything until the child had reached the age where it was able to make decisions for itself. Typically, Coleridge used a natural metaphor to illustrate this. In a letter to the radical Thelwall, he wrote of his weed covered garden,

"I thought it unfair in me to prejudice the soil towards roses and strawberries." (38)

For Coleridge minds shared in the processes of nature and were open to natural growth and cultivation. He consistently attacked the eighteenth century notion of education as a kind of 'finishing process'. He drew a distinction between the 'civilised' and 'cultivated' mind and came to the conclusion that this distinction had never been so sharp than in England in his time. Unlike Williams, Coleridge did not begin from a political position. Coleridge saw education as a fundamental process of cultivating and drawing out qualities inherent in all young minds. All men, all children shared in this process of natural growth. Coleridge was fully

committed to education and believed that the revolutionary ideas of democracy and social justice could have no real meaning without a radical review of the aims of education.

Coleridge's ideas on education have influenced Williams's, I would argue, in a number of ways. One of these is the awareness that the class basis of education must be replaced by a more universal 'method of imaginative training and self-development'. In a passage that has interesting contemporary overtones Coleridge writes,

"... modern systems of education, ... can only lead to selfish views, debtor and creditor principles of virtue, and an inflated sense of merit... The imagination is the distinguishing characteristic of man as progressive being; and I repeat that it ought to be carefully guided and strengthened as the indispensable means and instrument of continued amelioration and refinement." (39)

Williams has rejected class-based and instrumental forms of education. Similarly, he was aware, as was Coleridge, that the processes of industrialisation threatened imaginative kinds of education. Unlike Coleridge Williams placed the responsibility for this threat directly in the hands of capitalists and their politicians rather than industrialism as such. Williams saw the debate and crisis in education identified by Coleridge and later Arnold and Leavis, as an effect of the rapid processes of a particular type of industrialism, i.e. capitalism.

Coleridge was writing at the time of the French Revolution with Hazlitt, Cobbett, Shelley and Godwin as his contemporaries. These latter writers placed their faith in the political revolution as the means by which the intellectual revolution could be brought about. The political revolutionary, the English Jacobin, in this argument, was to be the guardian of individual and collective rights. Coleridge eventually rejected the Jacobin model because he believed it was based on a fundamental misconception; that State power could transform the intellectual and 'inward nature of man': 'that all, or the greater part of, the happiness or misery, virtue or vice, of mankind, depends on forms of government' (40) . Coleridge believed that the revolution had to occur in the 'heart and mind' before it could take an authentic political form. In a letter to the political philosopher, Godwin, Coleridge writes,

"That general Illumination should precede Revolution, is a truth as obvious, as that the Vessel should be cleansed before we fill it with a pure Liqour. But the mode of diffusing it is not discoverable with equal facility ... The Author (Godwin) of an essay on political justice considers private societies as the sphere of real utility - that (each one illuminating those immediately beneath him) Truth by a gradual descent may at last reach the lowest order." (41)

For Coleridge, culture, with its continuous development, cannot be imposed according to some collective, national or economic purpose. This debate, as Holmes points out, has important contemporary implications in the light of revolutions occurring in Eastern Europe in the late 1980's. These

revolutions have overthrown imposed political orders. The original revolutionaries were unable to successfully diffuse 'Truth by a gradual descent .. to reach the lowest orders'. In many important respects the revolutions in 1989 in Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria have been cultural rather than political revolutions, although, eventually, they are bound to take the latter form. In Coleridge's terms the political education provided in these countries after the original revolution was imposed on the people against, what he would describe as their 'natural growth' or 'culture'. In T2000 and elsewhere Williams wrote at length on what he described as 'actually existing socialism' (that kind of socialism established in the Soviet Union and those countries just mentioned). Here he repeated Coleridge's claim that a political system cannot be imposed on a culture and succeed with the aim of changing cultural and political values. Williams's political theory of the 'long revolution' and his theory of culture is an attempt to meet the conditions of achieving the 'organic' society that both he and Coleridge believe 'characterises our humanity'.

It is important to note that although Coleridge came to reject the French Revolution he retained a democratic and libertarian impulse with his expressed concern for the exploited and oppressed. Coleridge contrasted the two ideals of method and imagination, not as binary opposites, but as forming a dynamic process, independent of any given curriculum. As Holmes, referring to Coleridge, writes,

"Education, in other words, is not essentially about the subjects taught. It is about the process of teaching, learning and cultivating the mind. It

is about the growth, nurture and harvest of a certain kind of awareness."

(42)

Raymond Williams places greater emphasis on the content of education than does Coleridge but there are strong echoes of Williams's thinking on education in this quotation. We can see this by taking a closer look at the 'two ideals' of Coleridge's 'true' education, method and imagination. Coleridge's method is something the mind has to achieve and which complements the training of the imagination. Williams's method, as a learning aid, does not represent a quality of the mind itself. However, the similarities are evident, Coleridge writes, the method,

"... becomes natural to the mind which has become accustomed to contemplate not things only, or for their own sake alone, but likewise and chiefly the relation of things, either their relation to each other, or to the state and apprehension of the hearers." (43)

One of the main principles of Raymond Williams's educational theory is that 'subjects' or 'discourses' cannot be studied in isolation but need to be dissolved within a multi-disciplinary, relational and integrated form of enquiry. In the this argument 'forms of knowledge' cannot stand in isolation as discrete entities. Stuart Hall, in a discussion of the LR, describes Williams multi-disciplinary approach as,

" .. on the impossibility of separating out the different lived systems and according one any prior determinacy (is) the theoretical basis of the radically interactionist conception of the social totality which the book advanced." (44)

Williams himself described this process in ML as the 'indissoluble elements of a continuous social-material process', and in the LR as the 'interaction of all practices on one another'. This is very close to Coleridge's relational method. It is not possible to know a thing until we bring it into relation either with other areas of knowledge or with the 'observer's' own experience. This last point is exactly Williams's position when he writes about the necessity for educational provision to meet students' own cultural experience. The similarities of the two writers' educational philosophy is again evident if we look at the way in which they privilege 'imagination' as the second of the two 'ideals' in education.

Coleridge's concept of the imagination is pervasive in his work. He repeatedly stated that the imagination is the highest faculty in man beyond reason and logic. For Coleridge, the world is perceived in imagination rather than as a 'mechanical' or rational construct. In the context of education, as in science and art, Coleridge attempted to organise his concept of imagination into a system. The imagination is a structure of all human minds which are open to growth and 'cultivation'. The training of the imagination can be successful only if applied through the method, which is the second of the two ideals of a 'true' education. Coleridge did not set out his system in a single work. However, we can see how it operates if we consider Coleridge's belief that eighteenth century philosophy dealt with

the world as a set of 'fixities and definites'. Eighteenth century poetry produced similes and comparisons rather than metaphors. Coleridge derided this kind of 'mechanical' thinking and turned to a naturalised concept of the imagination as the means by which 'we create and re-create the world. In order to re-create the imagination 'dissolves, diffuses and dissipates' in an effort to seek the 'eternal in the particular'. Citing Kant and Schelling as influences, Coleridge's idea of the imagination is an attempt to find what is true in other systems in an effort to reduce all knowledge into harmony. Coleridge's theory of education was designed to fully develop the imaginative structure of the human mind.

I will argue that Williams's theoretical concept of a 'structure of feeling', when applied to education, resembles Coleridge's idea of a methodical or systematic imagination even if the two writers come to different political conclusions. The source I will use is Williams's concept of a 'structure of feeling' is the chapter 'Tenses of Imagination' in WS. Williams's concept of a 'structure of feeling' is,

"... a particular response to the real shape of a social order: not so much as it can be documented ... but as it is in some way apprehended, without any prior separation of private or public or individual and social experience." (45)

'The real shape of a social order' is the key phrase. Williams continues,

"... as far as I can understand it, this process is not distillation or novel association; it is a formation, an active formation, that you \$feels\$ your way into, feel informing you, so that in general and in detail it is not very like the idea of imagination - 'imagine if...', 'imagine that...', - but seems more like a kind of recognition, a connection with something fully knowable but not yet known." (46)

As with Coleridge, Williams sets his concept of imagination in a 'base'. This 'base' for Williams is the social, economic and cultural formations in which people live. In this sense for Williams, again as with Coleridge, imagination is connected with the 'real', but, importantly, 'fully knowable but not yet known'. The imagination, in this argument, is the instrument by which something real, e.g. a social formation, a historical pattern or an underlying social structure, can be fully apprehended and finally articulated. The product of the imagination, working in this way, is a 'structure of feeling', something in existence but not observable. Can the imagination apprehend these 'structures of feeling' and produce things 'more real' than what is ordinarily observable? Also whether the imaginative process, working in this way, is a 'specific process for realizing - embodying in communicable form - what is already, at other levels, undoubtedly real'? The answer to both these questions, for Williams, is positive. The means by which the process can be realized is through education. On this conclusion Williams agrees with Coleridge. We can also identify a similarity with Williams's use of the 'real' and Coleridge's term 'true'. Both argue for the existence of a reality obscured beneath an 'unreal' or inauthentic appearance. If Coleridge and Williams agree on a reality/appearance distinction, they also agree on the means by

which the 'real' can be 'realized' and made communicable; a method of education which enables the imaginative process to work effectively on the 'base', the social, political and cultural contrasts within which people move. Williams, writing in 1984, claims that our imaginative powers, as he identifies them, are in need of urgent application, he writes,

"... there are... deeper forces at work, which perhaps only imagination, in its full processes, can touch and reach and recognise and embody. If we see this... between knowing in new ways the structures of feeling that have directed us and now hold us, and in finding in new ways the shape of an alternative, a future that can be genuinely imagined and hopefully lived."
(47)

Here Williams is referring to his claim that technological societies in the late twentieth century are becoming increasingly 'unknowable'. It is not simply that these societies have become so complex but that the processes of decision and information have become distant and removed, and therefore undemocratic. Imagination, education and democracy are the major themes of this section of the chapter and the way in which these themes relate to each other forms the basis of Williams's philosophy of education.

Williams's concept of imagination, which I have tried to outline here, is formulated within the future tense. It is not just coming to know a complex society more fully through an imaginative education, but is concerned with, as he writes,

"... finding in new ways the shape of an alternative, a future , that can be genuinely imagined and hopefully lived." (48)

In this chapter I have tried to outline Williams's cultural and political theory and to link these to his ideas on education. At the same time I have attempted to demonstrate how these areas of Williams's thought are necessarily related. The main feature I have wanted to stress is how Raymond Williams's philosophy of education is central to his political analysis and political theory. Closely aligned to this is Williams conception of what constitutes a socialist human being and a socialist society. A central aim of Williams's cultural, political and educational theory is an attempt to analyse what he claims is the 'inauthenticity' or 'unreality' of what counts for experience, knowledge and perception in capitalist liberal democracies in the late twentieth century. The aim of education Williams values is to reveal the 'reality' beneath the appearance of the societies he examines and the human condition they have produced. I will now turn to some examples of ideas in education heavily influenced by Williams's ideas on imagination and education which aim, as he wrote, to 'touch', 'reach', 'recognise' and 'embody' 'deeper forces at work' in the culture and society.

Notes

1. K. Harriss, Education and Knowledge, London, Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1979.
2. Williams, Culture and Society, p.302.
3. Ibid. p.294.
4. Ibid. p.294.
5. Ibid. p.302.
6. Ibid. p.303.
7. Ibid. p.353.
8. Ibid. p.353.
9. Ibid. p.353.
10. Ibid. p.353.
11. Ibid. p.354.
12. Ibid. p.355.
13. Ibid. p.355.
14. Ibid. p.356.
15. Ibid. p.356.
16. Williams, Problems in Materialism and Culture, p.257.
17. Ibid. p.257.
18. Ibid. p.269.
19. Ibid. p.270.
20. Ibid. p.271.
21. Ibid. p.272.
22. Ibid. p.272.
23. Ibid. p.268.
24. Ibid. p.321-2.
25. Williams, Culture and Society, p.298.
26. R. Holmes, Coleridge, Oxford, OUP, 1982.
27. Williams, Keywords, p.96.
28. Williams, 'The Bomb and Democracy', Sanity, April, 1965.
29. Williams, 'What is the Future of the Left', Sanity, April, 1965.
30. Coleridge, On Constitution of Church and State, 1837 edition.
31. Ibid. p.67.
32. Table Talk, recorded by T. Allsop; reproduced in Nonesuch Coleridge, p. 476-477.
33. 'Mill on Bentham and Coleridge' reproduced in Holmes, Coleridge, p.129-30.
34. J.S. Mill, Autobiography; reproduced in World Classics, p.125.
35. Ibid. p.113.
36. 'Coleridge: Letter to Wordsworth', 30 May, 1815; reproduced in Nonesuch Coleridge, p.661.
37. Holmes, Coleridge
38. Table Talk, ed. H. Morley, 1884, p.105.
39. The Complete Works of S.T. Coleridge, ed. W.G.T. Sledd (7 vols., 1884), p.368.
40. Essay on His Times, ed. D.V. Ernham (3 vols., 1978), vol.1 p.368.
41. Lectures 1795 on Politics and Religion, ed. L. Patten and P. Mann (1971) p.43.
42. Ibid. p.63.
43. The Friend, ed. B.E. Rooke (2 vols., 1969), Vol.1 p.451.
44. Raymond Williams, Critical Perspectives, ed. T. Eagleton, Polity, 1989, p.62.

45. Williams, Writing in Society, p.264.

46. Ibid. p.264-65.

47. Ibid. p.268.

48. Ibid. p.268.

Introduction

If Professor Gwyn Williams was correct when he defied any one to read The Long Revolution without 'going round the bend', perhaps we can better understand Raymond Williams's work if we try to get outside the difficult theoretical terms and the intense complexity of his writing style. In this chapter I will take the approach of 'translating' Williams's work into 'ordinary language', where possible, through an analysis of his major themes relating to education and politics.

In the first part of the chapter I will indicate and discuss the major concepts and themes in Raymond Williams's work on education and politics. I will use a variety of

sources including published talks, articles, lectures and extracts from his major works, together with the unpublished work discussed in earlier chapters. The second part will take the form of a discussion of Bhaskar's philosophical ideas on critical realism in relation to Williams's arguments on politics and education.

Raymond Williams believed strongly in the emancipatory powers of education particularly its role in achieving a 'common culture' or classless and socialist society. At the same time he was highly critical of what education has become in liberal capitalist societies. He felt education in these societies had become 'anti-educational', instrumental in its aims and socially and politically divisive in its methods. For Williams, the aim for an emancipatory education in these societies must begin with 'unlearning the inherent dominant mode'. In other words we must start to unlearn what our educators have taught us. In this assertion Williams takes his place in a tradition of educational thinkers as politically different as Locke and Noam Chomsky. In this context Locke wrote,

"Enlightenment is man's release from self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his understanding without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its cause lies not in lack of reason but in the lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. ... Have courage to you use your own reason! - That is the motto of enlightenment." (1)

In the context of Mrs Thatcher's third successive election victory near the end of his life, Williams affirmed this critical position when he wrote,

"At every level, including our own, this is a seriously under-educated society. The problems it faces are intractable with the kinds of information and argument now publicly available. There is no obvious way of measuring this most serious of all deficits. Some indications occur in the conditions of our newspapers, after a hundred years of general literacy, and in the character of parliamentary and electoral debates. The way is open for weak minds to renounce, in some despair, the whole project of public education." (2)

I have written in detail in the thesis about Williams's specific criticism of education in liberal-capitalist societies and I now want to begin to develop an account of his alternative. This alternative, as I pointed out in the Introduction, remains undeveloped and unsystematic. I will try to put his ideas into some sort of order. It is helpful, I think, if I begin this account by discussing the major concepts and themes in Williams's philosophy of education. I will relate these themes to William's political ideas; it is essential to keep in mind Williams's inter-disciplinary method whenever his ideas are under discussion. The major concepts in Williams's educational theory, I will argue, are 'solidarity', 'community', and 'ecology' These concepts also centrally inform Williams's political theory. Underpinning Williams's whole theoretical project is his theory of culture. In the context of this discussion a concept of culture is at

the very heart of his educational ideas. I will begin this discussion of these major concepts with a brief statement of how, for Williams, an awareness of culture should stand as an educational basic.

Williams argued that culture, as an educational basic, had been dissipated in the conventional distinction between high culture and popular culture. In this distinction high culture is referred to as the Arts, and popular culture as mass and low. Williams, insisting on the 'cultural significance of human consciousness', urged the reform of this conventional idea of culture to a more flexible meaning, and an insistence on community as a cultural form. (By 'cultural significance of human consciousness' Williams means the way in which his reformed notion of culture has been a prime determinant of values, beliefs and the construction of meaning). Williams sees culture as a continuing process within which individuals and groups define themselves, sometimes violently, as in revolutions, often unwittingly, as in styles of dress, music, architecture and so on.

Williams, along with others, was led to this reinterpretation of the idea of culture by the conditions of modern society and its questionable priorities. His insistence on the trade union movement and the collective organisations of the working class as cultural achievements antagonised more 'academic' and traditional critics. This is not to say that Williams rejects all intellectually-based cultural or literary achievements, but his position does leave him with the question of value. This is approached by selecting what has relevance for an authentic participatory democracy, and

what we feel should be passed on to future generations. This is a much more democratic notion of culture than that of an elite 'selected tradition' handed down.

Community-derived culture, the relation of culture to revolution and social disturbance, and the relation of culture to individual imagination, and inter-related with these the value of 'ordinary experience' in cultural construction and criticism are all central themes in Williams's theory of culture. This, so far generalised, democratic account of culture should, in this argument, form a basis for educational reform. In educational terms this idea of culture would be inter-disciplinary, cutting across traditional subjects boundaries as these come under tension from new lines of enquiry and discourse, e.g. cultural theory, structuralism, deconstruction, feminism and psychoanalysis. We can begin to specify Williams's claims for culture as an educational basic if we look more closely at the major themes of his educational and political analysis.

Solidarity

I will take the two concepts of solidarity and collectivity together because they address closely related issues in Williams's work. Williams describes solidarity as follows,

"In its definition of the common interest as true self-interest, in its finding of individual verification primarily in the community, the idea of solidarity is potentially the real basis of a society." (3)

The key clause in this quotation is 'the common interest as self-interest' as I will try to show. Essentially, Williams locates the 'common' or universal interest residing in working class values, for example, solidarity. For Williams, solidarity in the working class is differentiated, he offers two versions of solidarity within the working class; defensive and negative versions based on a seige mentality, the 'long seige' of the capitalist economy. This negative solidarity, Williams feels, has to be made positive and hence universal. He writes,

"... the negative elements thus produced will have to be converted into positives in a fully democratic society." (4)

The positive version of solidarity Williams often refers to as 'neighbourhood'. It is the values of 'neighbourhood' upon which he locates his universal notion of the general interest. This general interest is the 'fully participatory democracy' of common values which Williams believes education should aim to facilitate. The positive version of the working class ethic of solidarity offers a basis for the enhancement of the general interest. Williams admits that the idea of solidarity has been, necessarily, a primitive one dependent on identity of conditions and experience. Before looking at how Williams believes the idea of solidarity

can advance from this stage it would be useful to look at what Williams calls the 'achievements' of working class solidarity and culture. Williams describes these achievements in this way,

"We may now see what is properly meant by 'working-class culture'. It is not proletarian art, or council houses, or a particular use of languages; it is, rather, the basic collective idea, and the institutions, manners, habits of thought and intentions which proceed from this." (5)

Williams continues,

"The culture which it (the working-class) has produced, and which it is important to recognise, is the collective democratic institutions, whether in the trade unions, the cooperative movement or a political party. Working-class culture, in the stage through which it has been passing, is primarily social (in that it has created institutions) rather than individual (in particular intellectual or imaginative work). When it has been considered in context, it can be seen as a very remarkable achievement." (6)

These passages illustrate Williams's particular definition of culture as not just intellectual or imaginative work but extended to include a 'whole way of life'. He also distinguishes working-class culture from

'bourgeois' culture. This distinction, he argues, is 'between alternative ideas of the nature of social relationships'. He defines the 'bourgeois' social perspective as,

"... an idea of society as a neutral area within which each individual is free to pursue his own development and his own advantage as a natural right ... the exertion of social power is thought necessary only in so far it will protect individuals in this basic right to set their own course." (7)

Williams contrasts the individualist idea with the ideas and values of the working-class achievements, ideas and values which have been called communism, socialism or cooperation. He writes,

"... communism, socialism or cooperation, regards society as neither neutral nor as protective, but as the positive means for all kinds of development, including individual development. Development and advantage are not individually but commonly interpreted ... Improvement is sought, not in the opportunity to escape from one's class, or to make a career, but in the general and controlled advance of all. The human fund is regarded as in all respects common, and freedom of access to it as a right constituted by one's humanity; yet such access, in whatever kind, is common or it is nothing, not the individual, but the whole society, will move on." (8)

'Commonly interpreted', 'general and common advance', 'the human fund', these phrases indicate Williams's claim that working class values, being social rather than individual, provide the basis for a universal or general interest beyond class distinctions; this is Williams's idea for a 'common culture'. Williams does not suggest that all working-class people possess or even support working-class ideas or values. He means that the essential ideas embodied in working-class organisations and institutions are the result of a collective mode or structure.

I will presently consider how Williams develops these ideas into a theory of education but it is first necessary to further examine how his concept of solidarity forms the basis for a 'common culture' beyond class divisions. We saw earlier how Williams identified the necessity for the working-class to move beyond negative ideas of solidarity if the positive aspects are to be converted into a fully democratic society, (Williams emphasises throughout his discussion in CS that the working-class institutions offer the best examples of democratic practice). The key words in this context are democracy and industry and the use of both turn on the complexities evident in contemporary industrial capitalism.

I have referred elsewhere in this thesis to Williams view that modern industrial societies have become 'unknowable' due to their complexity. This complexity has been the result of rapid processes in industrial development. These processes have had the effect of fragmenting the culture and diluting the democratic process. This fragmentation has been essentially divisive in social and cultural terms but, as we shall see, this is not necessarily the

case. Williams notes the effect of a particular form of industrial development,

"... any predictable civilisation will depend on a wide variety of highly specialised skills, which will involve, over definite parts of the culture, a fragmentation of experience. The attachment of privilege to certain kinds of skill has been traditionally clear, and this will be very difficult to unlearn, to the degree that it is necessary if substantial community of condition is to be assured." (9)

While accepting the necessity for differentiation of experience and increased specialisation in technological societies Williams rejects the privileged, anti-democratic and divisive effects of capitalist industrial development. What Williams refers to as the crisis of capitalism, that is, its inability to resolve questions of technological development, the extent of democracy, and a community of experience can only be solved through,

"... the compatibility of increasing specialisation within a genuinely common culture - is only soluble in a context of genuine community and by the full democratic process." (10)

The solution, Williams argues, is to be found in his concept of solidarity. He writes,

"At root, the feeling of solidarity is the only conceivable element of stabilisation in so difficult an organisation." (11)

This 'organisation' is the complex nature of modern industrial society. There is little doubt that Williams's concept of solidarity, based as it is on the democratic and collective ethos of the organised working-class institutions, represents a form of socialism. If Williams identifies a negative or defensive aspect of solidarity he also recognises a second difficulty,

"The second difficulty, in the development of the idea of solidarity, is related to the first: in that it is again a question of achieving diversity without creating separation. Solidarity, as a feeling, is obviously subject to rigidities, which can be dangerous in a period of change." (12)

Williams points out that the growth of consciousness is uneven and always individual. He writes,

"An emphasis of solidarity which, by intention or by accident, stifles or weakens such growth may, evidently, bring a deep common harm." (13)

Williams argues that working-class, socialist institutions both in Britain and in certain socialist states have made a serious error in not valuing diversity, even dissidence, within a 'common loyalty'. He points out,

"Yet it is difficult to feel that, even in the English working-class movement, with its long democratic tradition, this need has been clearly and practically recognised." (14)

Williams's concept of solidarity is closely associated with the working-class values of mutuality, cooperation and collectivity. He wishes to extend this version to include a role for individual variation, even dissidence. The concept is derived from Williams's political thought which I will examine later in this chapter. I will now look at how Williams's notion of solidarity can be seen as a basic concept for a theory of education.

Williams wishes to stress that the labour movement have valued education as a necessary part of their project, he writes in CS,

"The record of the working-class movement in its attitudes to education, to learning and to art is on the whole a good record ... such a record will do more than stand comparison with that of the class by which the working-class has been actively and explicitly opposed." (15)

This record must be seen within a context of divided society where education has been provided for the 'masses' by a minority, class-based interest. Williams comments on this,

"... the fact is that working-class people cannot feel that this is their community in anything like the sense in which it is felt above them. Nor will education in their responsibilities to a community thus conceived convince them." (16)

Williams is here referring to what he describes as the idea of 'service' which is offered to the working-class as a reason for commitment to a divided social and political order. A second interpretation of 'solidarity' offered to the working-class in terms of education is what Williams refers to as the 'ladder principle'. Williams argues that the ladder is a perfect metaphor for the bourgeois idea of society because, while it offers the opportunity to climb, the ladder is a device which can only be used individually, 'you go up the ladder alone'. Williams rejects the 'ladder principle' for two reasons,

"My own view is that the ladder version of society is objectionable in two related respects; first, that it weakens the principle of common betterment, which ought to be an absolute value; second, that it sweetens the poison of hierarchy, in particular by offering the hierarchy of merit as a thing different in kind from the hierarchy of money or of birth."
(17)

Williams believes the 'ladder principle' as applied to education has had a divisive effect upon the working-class. The 'bright' child who has gone from state school to Oxford or Cambridge values the experience but does not see why it should be interpreted as a ladder. Williams comments,

"For the ladder, with all its extra-educational implications, is merely an image of a particular version of society; if he rejects the version, he will reject the image. Take the ladder image away, and interest is returned to what is, for him, its proper object: to the making of a common educational provision; to the work for equity in material distribution; to the process of shaping a tradition, a community of experience, which is always a selective organisation of past and present, and which he has been given particular opportunities to understand." (18)

The 'he' of which Williams writes is the 'bright' child who has successfully climbed the educational 'ladder'. As Williams states the ladder 'will never do' for it is the product of a divided society and 'will fall with it'. Williams is interested in a less divisive and more egalitarian system of education which is derived from his version of solidarity.

Williams argues that the dominant system of education needs to be resisted,

"... I know that there is a profoundly necessary job to do in relation to the processes of the cultural hegemony itself. I believe that the system of

meanings and values which a capitalist society has generated has to be defeated in general and in detail by the most sustained kinds of intellectual and educational work." (19)

I will complete this discussion of solidarity and education by looking at what Williams outlines as the beginnings of an education for solidarity. Robin Blackburn wrote in the 'Introduction' to Journey of Hope that Williams always insisted on the need for the labour and democratic movement to promote and nourish its own educational practice as well as to press for reform in the dominant provision. In earlier chapters we have seen how the values of solidarity have been pursued in parts of Adult Education, including the Workers's Educational Association and Trade Union Education. Williams provides his prescription for education based on the values of solidarity, collectivity and cooperation (socialist values) in an article in New Socialist entitled, 'Ideas and the Labour Movement'. In this article Williams reaches the conclusion that, apart from pressing for reforms of public education, working-class collective organisations and political parties need to develop their own educational institutions designed to meet their own needs. For, as he writes,

"It is a delusion to suppose that the existing order will provide these."
(20)

Williams is critical of the labour movement for not developing its educational organisations more adequately. Williams argues that it was a recognised part of the business of the labour movement to build educational and cultural movements to meet the aspirations of working people. Williams writes,

"From adult classes to theatre groups, and from labour colleges to newspapers, magazines and bookclubs, these parts of the movement were seen as integral to its success. Some survive, some new ones have been added. But it is fair to say that, in proportion to the resources of a now much more powerful movement, there has been since 1945 a quite extraordinary neglect of such enterprises." (21)

Williams claims that expanded public cultural and educational systems have been offered as an excuse for this neglect. But he argues that it is not true that everyone has their chance under the expanded systems. He argues,

"Education is still deeply distorted by the effects of class and privilege, not only in its selection of those who can take full advantage of it, but just as fundamentally in the kind of education which is then offered. A good, bright learner today still has the quick route to the habits of mind, the prejudices and rationalisations, the selective interpretations, and the balance of certain kinds of knowledge with certain kinds of ignorance, which form so much of current education." (22)

Williams continues in this vein when he criticises working class institutions for their complacency in the face of increased public education. He writes,

"... it is seen as success to learn what you are being taught (which even at primary levels may or may not be true and at advanced levels is rather unlikely to be true)." (23)

Here Williams is making the point that increased access is not in the absolute collective interests of the working class because the content of public education runs counter to the values associated with the labour movement. Williams suggests the labour movement needs to introduce two innovations which will begin to address the problems of their institutions, developed in a pre-modern culture, before increased communications, etc. Firstly, he recommends 'places of serious research, learning and teaching' based on the values and aspirations of the labour movement. Secondly, he recommends the setting up of socialist groups based on professional associations who have genuine and autonomous links with the working-class and its political and industrial organisations. The purpose of these recommendations is to develop forms of knowledge, enquiry and organisation that can inform the work of the wider movement. Williams develops this theme in an article entitled, Socialists and Coalitionists,

"The long neglect of fundamental research and political education has produced an uneven but unmistakable mixture of half-formed policies and

half-convincing protests. Much of the most essential detailed work is being done on or outside the edges of the party - in the peace movement, in the women's movement, in the ecology organisations - and all these bear especially on the politics of the future to which Labour must direct itself from the depths of defeat." (24)

As long ago as 1952, in an article entitled The Teaching of Public Expression, Williams insisted that workers often know quite well what they want to say but have been ill-equipped to say it, he writes,

"Does one impose on a social class that is growing in power the syllabus of an older culture; or does one seek means of releasing and enriching the life experience which the rising class brings with it." (25)

Williams is implying here that the curriculum of the 'older culture' fails the 'rising class' through failing to equate the necessary skills with the appropriate content. This argument is within the context of a debate in adult education but the criticism retains its force against school-based education.

In this discussion of Williams's concept of solidarity I have tried to demonstrate his claim that a social purpose and social value should be reflected in both the content and the organisation of education. The values that Williams supports are those he believes reside in the working-class ethic of solidarity. This ethic is also to be found in other values associated with working-class, i.e. brotherhood and neighbourhood. Williams believes that these working-class values provide the basis for the whole of society, the particular interest of the working-class, in terms of its values, then becomes the universal or general interest of a classless and unified society. This society that Williams envisages is without question a form of socialist society. His theory of education could be described as 'education for socialism'; there is no doubt that Williams believed his ideas on education ought to be put into practice by and for the organised working-class institutions. He believed strongly that public education (as he referred to the State education system) had other purposes and interests.

Continuing the discussion on solidarity Williams writes,

"The most powerful embodiment and clarification of the image of the brotherhood of man has been in the labour movement and in the thinking leading to socialism ... socialism has been the main attempt to define such an order. A serious difficulty arises at this stage ... while socialism's long term version of human society is brotherhood, its short term version is of a very deep conflict ... The image of human brotherhood is still there, and only there, but it has been so darkened by the real process of attempting to create it out of societies so powerfully organised in other terms that it has been radically confused." (26)

The aim of Williams's whole theoretical project has been to clarify this confusion driven by the belief that the 'image of human brotherhood' is embodied 'only' in the labour movement. In an unpublished lecture, unfortunately undated, Williams summed up his argument of what he schematically describes as Popular Education v. Mass Persuasion,

"Popular education, in any worthwhile sense, begins from a conception of human beings which, while recognising differences of intelligence, of speed in learning, and of the desire to learn ... insists that no man can judge for another man, that every man has a right to the facts and skills on which real judgement is based, and that, in this sense, all education depends on the acknowledgement of an ultimate human equality." (27)

This is, in essence, the substance of Williams's philosophy of education, 'all education depends on the acknowledgement of an ultimate human equality'. This philosophy of education encompasses political and economic

theory; its inspiration lies in the democratic achievements of the institutions of the organised working class, based themselves, as Williams explains, on the ethic of solidarity, mutual responsibility and community.

CHAPTER 4.2 Community

Williams's concept of community is exceptionally complex even within the complexity of his own writing. Community remains a central theme in all Williams's writing, and is particularly central to his work on education. Reference to community can be found in many places in Williams's extensive output. Since his death in 1988 several selections of his previously published work have been re-produced which have included reference to community; a number of these include interesting commentaries on Williams's ideas on community, not always sympathetic. The concept of 'community' has usually been received on the political left, as we shall see, with less than seriousness, the categories of social and economic class have generally found more favour. On the political right the concept of 'community' has been used as a term to denote the existence of a 'national' consciousness above class or cultural identity. In KW Williams charts these different interpretations of the term community and traces how the meaning of the word has been changed over time. Williams's particular use of the term has cultural, political and educational importance as I will try to show.

The sources I will use for Williams's thoughts on community will include articles, lectures and some of the new sources mentioned above. Two general observations can be made at the beginning; when Williams writes of communities in a positive sense he is referring to working-class communities

and the existence or possibilities for socialist consciousness; he equates working-class communities with the ethic of solidarity, brotherhood and mutual responsibility; when writing about community Williams is concerned with questions of social and cultural identity. I will attempt to show how these themes are intricately bound up with education.

There can be no doubt that Williams's sympathetic interpretation of the idea of community is part of his political and cultural theory. I will begin this part of the chapter with an outline of Williams's position on cultural politics as this relates to community. I will then move to an analysis of the term community before finishing with a consideration of the term's relevance to Williams's theory for education.

A consistent theme in Williams's work is how key concepts like democracy and community have been 'appropriated' and as a result have lost their original, radical meaning. Williams provides an example of this with the Miners' Strike of 1984. In the context of a discussion with Edward Said, Williams traces the way in which the term community was used by both sides in the dispute, he writes,

"So that you get in the miners's strike the two uses; that the miners said they were defending their community, and they meant the places they lived, and the Coal Board and Thatcher were saying that this was damaging the community, by which they meant the existing national social order of which this was a subordinate part, which if it was genuinely a member of the community could be expected to adapt to the prevailing norms." (1)

He continues,

"... the moment the notion of community is appropriated for a version which is going to be dominant, and to which variations are going to be subordinate, then the same value has turned in an opposite direction." (2)

Williams is quite clear which sense of community he wishes to defend,

"... if you track the word 'community' through my work, you would find, on the one hand, that you are opposing a notion of community to a notion of competitive individualism, and then you are finding that the idea of community is being appropriated by precisely the people who say that we have a national community which sets boundaries to the way people think and feel and, moreover, which sets certain responsibilities." (3)

It is precisely these divisions of class, domination and subordination within a culture which, Williams believes, 'prevent the assumption of a common culture as a thing which now exists'. Another example Williams uses to illustrate his claim that key political and cultural terms have been appropriated to present the illusion of unity within a diverse, often divided culture, is that of democracy. This links in well with his opposition to competitive individualism. Williams claims that the system of representative democracy was historically introduced in Britain by the

emergent bourgeoisie as a compromise with the more radical demands of popular democracy by the labour and trade union movement (4). A fully popular democracy implies a 'unity of community in those represented'. So long as there exist radical conflicts of interests as in class divided cultures, clearly no such unity exists. Williams outlines an alternative to 'representative democracy' which involves proportional representation and the principle of recall of delegates. The point he is emphasising here is that notions of representation and consensus are illusory given the conditions of conflict and division in the culture.

The dominant ideological use of community is 'centrally functional' to capitalism, as Frances Mulhearn has pointed out (5). This ideological use includes a prominent place for values of nationality and patriotism. Williams often notes that the terms 'service' and 'nationalism' are posited as forms of community overlaid on a conflict-ridden and divided culture.

Williams was quite specific as to what he meant by 'communities' in the sense of collectivities possessing the values of solidarity and 'mutual responsibility' which provide the basis for a socialist ethic. In 1982 Raymond Williams gave an address in honour of Robert Tressell, author of The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists, in which he describes the form of these communities,

"... there are certain kinds of labour process which need a certain kind of close, even closed, community. ... the mining areas, whether the coal-mining areas or the quarries; or the tailoring sweatshops; or the shipyards or the docks; places where you are simultaneously a working man or woman, a

member of a working-class family in the simple, descriptive sense, but also a member of a working-class community, often almost wholly a working-class community like a mining village or dockside urban district or a shipbuilding area or textile town." (6)

Williams further examines these communities,

"Moreover, these communities exist in a particular part of the country, Welsh or Geordie or Cockney or Clydeside, and because of this the whole spectrum of social relations comes at once in an integrated form. You only have to step outside in the street to be in a working-class community, and then within that very intense, often one-track community, the problem of class, which would in more mixed communities be subject to much more complex interpretation, arrives with what is also your identity as the people of that place and the people of that region, for you belong, simultaneously over the whole range." (7)

Williams contrasts these close-knit examples with more mixed communities,

"Get to a mixed community, get to where people are living next door to each other but are not necessarily in the same kind of work, get to where there are radical differences of social situation and position right inside the community, and you will have a different basic sense of what a community is." (8)

The point Williams wishes to make in relation to these two conceptually as well as actually different types of communities, is that whereas the 'intense, one-track' working-class community delivers class-consciousness the mixed community actually obstructs and confuses it. The first form of class-consciousness and the intense sense of community encouraged was very specific about its aims, as Williams writes in a lecture to a Plaid Cymru Summer School in 1977,

"... a much more collective community ... which cast its institutions in collective forms and which did propose to change society radically but to change it in a very particular direction; to attempt to establish from these received and new notions of mutuality and brotherhood, a total society which was possible ... " (9)

In the previous section on solidarity I discussed Williams's argument that the values of these 'intense' working-class communities provide the basis of a universal or general interest. The task of the collective institutions of the working-class is to move on from the specific interest to a political movement which would make the specific into the general, or in Williams words,

"... a higher political movement which should be the establishment of higher relations of this kind and which would be the total relations of a society ... " (10)

Traditionally, this has been the aim of the labour movement both nationally and inter-nationally. However, as Williams explains, fundamental and systematic historical changes have occurred, most of all in the mode of economic production, which have diluted the collective identity, and therefore the degree of class-consciousness, of these 'intense' communities. This has important consequences for Williams's political thought and, indeed, prefigures a deep conflict in socialist political theory. This conflict is centred on the increased political importance of new social movements on the political left over the 'old', class-based labour movement. These new social movements include the women's movement, ecology groups, the peace movement, and ethnic and black organisations. Although the aims of the new social movements and the old labour movement may be similar in that both espouse socialism or egalitarianism, the conflict has very deep underlying theoretical and strategical implications. These concern the emergence of late-capitalist or post-industrial society, the political distinction between civil society and the state, and arguments about political strategies deriving from these developments. In terms of a discussion of Williams's ideas on community, questions of value also arise.

The new social movements began to come to prominence in the 1960's and were clearly different from political parties in that they derived their support and power from the mobilisation of mass movements. These groups were made up of groups of individuals, from a diversity of communities and social classes, who understood themselves to have a common interest and identity, for at least some part of their social existence. These groups are then very different from the working-class communities Raymond Williams describes above. The increased political and cultural influence of these

groups also threatens the conventional Marxist emphasis on class as the essential means of creating political consciousness and bringing about political change. Essentially supporters of political strategies associated with the new social movements argue that the emergence of capitalist post-industrial society has led to the effective demise of the labour movement as the necessary agent of political change. This argument hinges on the the breakup of typically working-class industrial communities based, for example, on mining, shipbuilding and steel. These are the very communities that Williams believes have laid the foundation for a set of universal values and a general interest. The argument continues that the breakup of these traditional labour communities, for example, the northern mining communities after the 1984 Miners's Strike, has led to a lessening of the political influence of the trade unions and a diminution of their base in the Labour Party.

Francis Mulhearn, writing in the context of a tribute to Williams, writes of the traditional organised working-class movement,

"The working-class is revolutionary ... As the exploited class, it is caught in a systematic clash with capitalism, which cannot generally and permanently satisfy its needs. (This) combination of interest, power and creative capacity distinguishes the working-class from every other social and political force in capitalist society, and qualifies it as the indispensable agency of socialism." (11)

Mulhearn continues,

"What has to be said is that 'our major positive resource' can never be other than the working-class, and that if it cannot regenerate itself, no outside intervention can do so. If that resource, in some calamitous historical eventuality, be dispersed or neutralised, then socialism really will be reduced to a sectarian utopia beyond the reach of even the most inspired and combative social movement." (12)

Mulhearn highlights a problem in Williams's position vis-a-vis the new social movements. Williams's describes these movements as 'our major positive resource'. By this he means the most likely agent for achieving socialism. Williams expresses these thoughts in his last major theoretical work, T2000 (13). Throughout the rest of his work Williams takes pains to affirm the organised working-class as the indispensable agent for revolutionary change to a socialist order based on the values of solidarity, cooperation and mutual responsibility; this is central to all Williams's thinking on politics and culture. This seeming contradiction in Williams's work remains unresolved but we can begin to understand how he arrived at this position by examining the distinction he makes between the social and the political, or put another way, between state and civil society.

Williams believed that the Labour Party and the trade union leadership have become incorporated within the capitalist state system, or marginalised by the newly confident and aggressive capitalist politics. These developments led Williams to look outside the formal political institutions for points of possible socialist growth; this search was to lead him to his theory of cultural materialism and cultural politics. Williams was to find these

points in civil society or, as he describes it, in the culture. The state/culture distinction represents a partial rejection of the conventional notion of politics. For Williams, politics in late-capitalist society, has become 'the capitalist interplay of interests' which is the end, for him, of politics in the sense in which he first understood it,

" ... the sense of what any of this liberation is for, the sense of what the struggle would be able to attain, the sense of what that human life would be, other than merely Utopian rhetoric, which is the object of all the preoccupied conflict and struggle and argument." (14)

For Williams, politics in capitalist societies should be about 'conflict and struggle and argument' about 'what .. this liberation is for' and 'what that human life should be' and not about the 'capitalist interplay of interests'. Williams does not completely reject the use of Parliamentary and state politics to further the cause of socialism but believes the cause is best served through extra-parliamentary action (strikes, marches, protests, etc.) and cultural politics. A form of cultural politics, for Williams, is education.

The culture/political distinction also leads to a further problem for Williams since many of the aims of the new social groups, who can be said to be a part of a cultural rather than a political movement, are about individual wills, values and lifestyles. There is no problem with this

providing these reflect the values which Williams associates with the working-class communities he refers to above. When these groups fail to meet this condition then they also fail to provide the universal values which are the general interest. For example, if the women's movement affirms an ethic which includes only a part of the culture then it fails to meet Williams's necessary condition of the general interest. Similarly, if the aims of certain ethnic minorities do not include the values of common solidarity, brotherhood and mutual responsibility across the whole range of the culture then they too fail to meet the necessary condition. The point about the working-class is that it does range across the whole culture, including among its members women, ethnic minorities, members of the peace movement, ecologists and so on.

Williams tries to meet this apparent problem in his political thinking about the role of the old working-class organisations against the new social forces through his definition of community, of 'carrying the affirmatives of community through ... into a different kind of politics'. Firstly, he puts the rise of new forms of political and cultural consciousness and the breakup of older established working-class politics and communities in material terms. He writes,

"Something had happened which put certain of the basic elements of our social life beyond the reach of both direct experience and of simple affirmation, affirmation by extension." (15)

This 'something' is the 'fundamental and historical changes, above all in the mode of production but carrying with them virtually every other kind of institutional change'. Technological change has caused the decline of the traditional industries and their communities, and has also led to institutional changes, including the centralising of economic and political decision-making through, for example, the diminution of the powers of local government. The breakup of the established communities and the complexity of modern society makes this society difficult to comprehend. The older kinds of rural communities and militant working-class communities were more able to understand the workings of a society through direct experience. What Williams argues is that the arrival of the new mixed and more complex communities means that 'our common life' is not accessible by means of direct observation and experience. He gives, as an example, the modern system of ownership which cannot be observed, but has to be 'consciously discovered'. These new communities, both local and national, have altered the older means of developing militant working-class consciousness through direct experience of a classic capitalist/ worker or Marxist interpretation of social and economic relations. In its place is the beginnings of a capitalist post-industrial society which has obscured the characteristics and functions of the old, but has given rise to the development of new social and political affiliations and groups. The political militancy of these groups is expressed in the culture rather than in the state.

Williams recognises that there is a contemporary need for socialists to pursue a new 'truly prospective politics'; a 'politics' that carries the 'affirmatives of community' within it. What form will this 'prospective' and 'liberating' politics take that marks it off from older, more classical modes of struggle and conflict, but which contains within it that

'affirmation of community' essential to Williams? He finds the signs of a beginnings of this new politics in the 'revival of community and nationalist thinking' of the 1980's. The new politics then are very specifically national. Williams is led to say that this new politics has to be more than simply national or how is it to be distinguished from the bourgeois appeal to nationalism as 'service' to the 'national community', which is the capitalist state. He answers by linking renewed nationalist identities with the 'affirmations of community' which are by implication the working class and socialist values of solidarity and cooperation. He links the two in this way,

"I live in Cambridge among young radical students who would not recognise many of the analyses that are made about the condition of a dependent or deprived nation within Britain or any other of the deprived nations and regions of Europe. Yet they start from very similar but less negotiable feelings: feelings of social distance, of alienation, of political frustration and powerlessness. But the steps that they can then take, they find extremely difficult. It seems to me what is happening ... is the possibility in nationalist politics of making new affirmatives through necessarily confronting all the forms of negation, not to identify these as enemies but to see them as the whole complex of forces that at first sight we are against but that are parts of what has meanwhile happened to a whole historical phase which in fact also includes us." (16)

This is a typically obscure passage but nevertheless it is clear that Williams's idea of the 'new politics' involves a revised nationalism as a vehicle for the political expression of the universalised values, he writes,

"what ... almost alone is being contributed from the new nationalist movements, is a reconnection inside the struggle, including the negations, but also the sense of an objective which has the possibility of affirmation." (17)

Williams believes that this potential movement is still at the periphery of politics but is alone in attempting to develop the 'new kind of affirmative and liberating politics'. The new nationalist movements Williams identifies are those in Wales and Scotland in the United Kingdom, but it is also possible to apply the theory to Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Yugoslavia and elsewhere. There is no question that Williams believes nationalism in these cases can be the agent for socialism. It is an interesting hypothesis but is perhaps based on wishful thinking rather than developed theory. It must be noted that Williams made these observations late in his life and was unable to develop them fully. However, they do form a serious contribution to thinking about contemporary politics and culture. Williams's earlier thinking on culture and politics must remain as his major contribution to the subject. We will see the educational application of this in the next chapter.

In this discussion of Williams's concept of community I have attempted to show how Williams uses the concept as a paradigm case for his social theory and political philosophy. He uses the concept to delineate a set of values upon which he believes socialism could be constructed. The term also provides Williams with a conceptual tool for charting the cultural, political and economic developments of capitalism in the late twentieth century. He shows how the term community has been appropriated by capitalist politicians as a unifying idea which he variously describes as 'service' and 'nationalism'; the latter term is habitually invoked in times of war and civil or social unrest. It is clear the sense of community Williams is most keen to promote as a cornerstone of his political philosophy. We can see this in a further observation on the Miners's Strike of 1984, he noted,

"What the miners, like most of us, mean by their communities is the places where they have lived and want to go on living, where generations not only of economic but of social effort and human care have been invested, and which generations will inherit. Without that kind of strong whole attachment, there can be no community." (18)

This is a politics of place and attachment which stresses the values of a threatened community, Williams continues,

"... from the inner-cities to the abandoned mining villages, real men and women know that they are facing an alien order of paper and money, which seems

all too powerful. It is to the lasting honour of the miners, and the women, and the old people, and all the others in the defiant communities, that they stood up against it, and challenged its power." (19)

Williams recognises that these communities will alter fundamentally and become more differentiated and identifies the new versions of politics, including cultural politics and the development of new social forces, that will replace the older forms of resistance. However, he wishes to preserve the ethic of solidarity, cooperation, mutual responsibility and community in the face of a hostile competitive individualism. Although these new social forces must mean a fundamental redefinition of the socialist project, Williams makes the point that the working-class have never been the generalised mass typified by many socialist thinkers. He makes the point that the working-class has always exhibited difference and diversity; their interests and political concerns cut across those of these new social forces. This leads Williams back to his original belief that the working-class continue to form a potential revolutionary proletariat, whose future forms of political organisation and action could provide the means to a democratic socialist society.

Williams believes that education provides a way in which these values could be maintained. If the values engendered and learnt in the traditional working-class communities are endangered by the dissolution of these communities, education could provide the means by which these values are encouraged and transmitted. However, if this is public education it has to be seen in a context of a conflict-ridden and divided culture and society as Williams sees it. In essence Raymond Williams considers

education under two connected concepts; experience and teaching. Experience is educational in the way in which it develops kinds of consciousness; for example, we shall see in the last part of this chapter how Williams identifies the experience of the 1984 Miners' Strike as a fundamental educational experience. We can see this in the way in which the miners and their communities during the strike became aware of and developed positions, during the strike, on ecological issues. We have seen in this part of the chapter how the cultural experience of the working-class, derived from their economic position, encouraged the development of values of mutuality and solidarity, and a commitment to democracy; for Williams, this is a kind of political education into political consciousness from experience.

However, Williams argues that, invaluable though this political and educational experience is, it is inadequate without teaching. He writes,

"socialism ... is to do with understanding social relations, understanding the system. If experience alone will not teach, then experience and teaching will teach." (20)

Why will experience alone not teach? Williams agrees with Robert Tressell that it is a mistake to think that people within a class are more unselfish, more noble than they are. In the novel The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist, Owen, the fully conscious socialist worker, is beaten up as he tries to 'take the message to the people'. Williams compares this to the reception the nineteenth-century Russian populists received when they told the peasants

they were poor and ignorant and that they had come to educate them. As Williams observes, they were lucky to escape the villages alive. The novel includes two chapters, 'The Oblong' and 'The Great Oration' which Williams describes as teaching chapters. These two chapters, consisting of long speeches detailing socialist positions and arguments, are continually interrupted while the general scene reproduces, for Williams, 'that consciousness which is resistant to sustained serious talk'. Tressell then attempts to develop a discourse in which opposing positions do not fully cancel each other out.; for Williams again, this attempt reveals a teaching method but also a problem of teaching. The point is, to teach the 'understanding of social relations and the understanding of the system' against the resistance of sections of the very class which have most to gain in the long term, through this teaching. Williams writes of Tressell's teaching method,

"Great care is taken to show something very different from the easy ideas of bringing the truth, bringing the message, and being gratefully received by the suffering masses." (21)

The 'problems of teaching' Williams refers to hinge on the resistance to this revelatory and explanatory method which actually exposes, and in many cases, negates, whole lives. Williams sees this problem of teaching as in a major way responsible for the lack of a fully developed general socialist consciousness among the working-class. Williams invokes Cobbett who wrote, 'I despise a poor man who is contented'. Williams puts this sentiment in his own words,

"He (Cobbett) says, in effect: to be poor and contented is below the quality of a man. To be deprived and cheated and yet still to be contented is below the quality of a man. It is to lack self-respect." (22)

The 'problem of teaching' Williams identifies in Tressell's forms of discourse is, to him, an aspect of a wider more general problem. He outlines two major changes over the past century that we have failed to adjust to,

"The first is a profound cultural revolution, which makes it increasingly clear that the quality of our arts, from drama to building, depends on the actual standards of the majority of our people. The second is the extension of democracy, which is putting the power of decision, in an increasingly complex world, into ordinary hands." (23)

These two changes,

"... represent the greatest challenge to educators which we have ever faced" (24)

Williams proceeds in this article to outline the 'glaring deficiencies' in the current secondary provision and concludes that in a society committed to democracy these 'deficiencies' are incredible. Without the relevant knowledge, discrimination and judgement democracy can never be more than a

'lottery' and our culture a 'speculative chaos'. According to Williams, a reason why educators fail to meet this challenge is that they are frightened of what we call 'politics'. Williams puts the problem this way,

"The fact is, surely, that we are frightened of what we call "politics", which is only another way of saying that we have not yet found the teaching methods relevant to a democracy". (25)

In the final chapter I will offer some examples of programmes of education which encompass 'teaching methods relevant to a democracy' and seek to solve the 'problem of teaching' Williams identifies. In this part of the chapter I have attempted to assess Williams's ideas on community, the second of his three basic concepts, I will now turn to the third of Williams's these basic concepts which taken together contribute to an account of his philosophy of education.

Chapter 4:3 Ecology

Raymond Williams's social and political philosophy has included an emphasis on ecology from his work as a young man, CS, to his more mature writing. It is important to state from the beginning that Williams's ideas on ecology inform his very particular version of socialism. There is also a philosophical basis for his ecological thinking based on a materialist theory of man and nature. History features strongly in all Williams's social and political thought and his ideas on ecology are no exception. In several of his works Williams traces the development of capitalism through the mid-eighteenth century to the late twentieth century model of an international capitalist order. Williams is highly critical of the way these capitalist societies have treated the physical world. Unlike many on the left he is also critical of versions of marxism for their position on the relation between man and nature. Unusually, Williams also goes back to pre-industrial societies in his historical account of the development of ecological thinking . A consistent theme of Williams's argument is the relation of democracy to socialism and ecology.

I will take each of these themes in turn with the aim of developing a coherent account of Williams's theory of ecology. As I mentioned earlier there are a number of sources where Williams either refers to ecology or offers a more detailed discussion of it (1). I will concentrate on those which are most relevant to education. These sources are mostly articles and

lectures written in the last ten years of Williams's life, although, I repeat, ecology has been a consistent theme of his work throughout his life. A major work which contains many of Williams's mature ideas on ecology and socialism is T2000 and this will provide the basis for much of the discussion.

The educational implications of Williams's thoughts on ecology are fundamental. These include the possibility of combining economics and social science into a single science; the nature of the relation between the human and natural sciences; the nature of the relation between ecology and democracy; the educational potential of the ecological debate; and interestingly, the educational implications of such experiences as the 1984 Miners' Strike with particular reference to ecology. I will examine these ideas after developing an account of Williams's theory of ecology to which I will now turn.

Ecology and Philosophy

As Williams himself wrote ecological socialism is 'bit of a mouthful'. In order to clarify the thinking behind running the two ideas together he looks at the way in which the different bodies of ideas have developed. In Socialism and Ecology, an SERA pamphlet written in 1982 (2), Williams traces the invention of the concept of ecology to the German biologist, Haeckel. In the 1860's, according to Williams, Haeckel had a strong influence on the thinking of the socialist movement around the turn of the

century; he claims Haeckel's influence on Lenin was enormous. Williams weighs Haeckel's particular influence on socialist thinking,

"His work was influential because it was a materialist account of the natural world and among other things a physiological account of the soul."

(3)

Williams believes Haeckel's ecological theories provoked great debates within socialist thinking on the relation between socialism and religion and other ethical systems. Regretfully, for Williams, this relation between ecology and a problem within socialism is not given, although the kind of issues the early debate now represents have been and remain important.

In an essay in NLR in 1978 Williams discusses the materialist philosophy of Sebastiano Timpanaro, the Italian philosopher. This discussion is a useful way into the philosophical issues Williams's theory of the relation between ecology and socialism raises. In the essay Williams prefaces his discussion by asserting that knowledge of the material world is subject to a continual process of revision. Such knowledge is provisional, falsifiable and its categories are renewable. For Williams, this means that there can be no one 'materialism' as a single doctrine. Materialism is not a fixed explanatory philosophy or science which can then be associated with a political position; Marxism was founded precisely to reject such rigidities.

Williams's materialism, drawing on Marx, rejects the passivity of nature or the material world. The corollary of the material world as passive is the realm of humanity as active. Williams rejects both of these ideological

categories, insisting on a rejection of the 'false universal of nature and man'.

Williams's believes the 'passive' and 'active' opposition is ideological through the way in which it promotes,

"... the now vaulting ambition of epistemology to become the universal science." (5)

The emphasis on epistemology within the scientific community, in the late twentieth century, is, for Williams, accompanied by the reduction of the physical world to human activity. Taken to its extreme this results in an ideological claim for the mastery of man over nature, or as it is usually put, the 'conquest' by man of nature. This ideological error is repeated by marxists, empiricists and idealists alike. This philosophical/ideological position has had profound consequences on the physical and material world; e.g., environmental damage, including acid rain, lead poisoning, deforestation, depletion of the ozone layer and global warming. Williams's further point, as I will try to show, is that the man/nature opposition is essentially anti-democratic.

Williams opposes Timpanaro's linking of the struggle for communism with the 'stuggle against nature'. Williams argues that nature is intrinsic to human beings and rejects the externality of nature and the desire to master it. He acknowledges a system of priorities,

"Of the physical over the biological level, and of the biological over the socio-economic and cultural level: both in the sense of chronological priority (the very long time which supervened before life appeared on earth, and between the origin of life and the origin of man), and in the sense of the conditioning which nature still exercises on man and will continue to exercise for the foreseeable future." (5)

Williams argues that there is 'an external situation' of nature which is beyond human control. These are the middle and far reaches of our physical environment; these are the 'conditions' for our existence and not material for conquest. He also argues that there are nearer reaches which inter-act with politics and human industry. The point is that these must be seen as conditions and not raw material for man's 'conquest of nature'. Williams's rejection of the man-nature separation leads him to the view that the physical world is constitutive of human beings. Williams gives examples here of sexual love, the love of children and the pleasures of the physical world. The nature of work should also be included in this list; although Williams is keen to affirm the gains of industrial society he is concerned that industry should reflect human priorities rather than capitalist ones of expansion and competition. This against the pessimism of Timpanaro's materialism which stresses such physical realities as illness and the processes of age and death. Williams's materialism emphasises the physical conditions and limits on human development as expressed in the politics of ecology.

In the essay Problems of Materialism, Williams writes,

"... after all the achievements .. there are major natural forces ... not only at the level of the physical universe and the solar system ... which are still beyond our control. Moreover, even within .. the project .. of sustaining full and free human life on our planet within foreseeable historical terms, that part of the 'conquest' which is represented by scientific knowledge now increasingly shows us the complexities and the often unwanted effects of that part of the 'conquest' which is physical appropriation and transformation." (6)

Williams argues that 'marxist' and capitalist societies have been guilty of 'triumphalism' vis-a-vis their relation to nature and the physical world. He writes,

"... it can now be clearly seen that this triumphalist version is, in an exceptionally close correspondence, the specific ideology of imperialism and capitalism, whose basic concepts - limitless and conquering expansion; reduction of the labour process to the appropriation and transformation of raw materials -it exactly repeats." (7)

The 'triumphalist version' to which Williams is referring is that adopted by the 'socialist' and marxist-inspired societies of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Williams believes that Marxism has been compromised by this use of materialism by Engels and others. While adhering to materialism, Williams rejects the 'conquest of nature' ideology and takes a position which accepts the 'conditions' of nature on man as 'constitutive'.

He also rejects the man/nature separation and instead adopts a position within which man and nature are irreducible. Williams asserts that man's physical existence and fulfilment are inseparable from a connected project of 'political and economic liberation'. In this assertion Williams begins to outline his synthesis of ecology and socialism. We can see how other social systems have failed to develop from an 'effective social perspective' with disastrous consequences if we turn to the actual history rather than prescriptions for an alternative.

'Forms of Human Intervention'

The principal source for Williams's systematic ideas on ecology are the pamphlet Socialism and Ecology and T2000. For Williams, the Industrial Revolution dramatised the human intervention in the natural world. He points out an error in that period which remains, that 'substantial interference with the natural environment began only with the industrial revolution'. The reckless human intervention of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth century accelerated a process that had begun centuries before. The point Williams wishes to make with this observation is that opposition to this intervention was usually based on a view of a 'natural order' which industrialism had despoiled and to which it was still possible to return. Williams quotes James Nasmyth, inventor of the steam hammer, who, writing in 1830, produced a classic account of environmental devastation,

"The grass had been parched and killed by the vapours of sulphureous acid thrown out by the chimneys; and every herbaceous object was of a ghastly grey - the emblem of vegetable death in its saddest aspect. Vulcan had driven out Ceres." (8)

Nasmyth's account, according to Williams, is typical of the thinking which centred on an idea of 'natural' being destroyed and replaced by the industrial intervention. This idealization of a pre-industrial 'natural order' pre-supposed that there had been no pre-industrial intervention in the natural environment. Williams argues that this kind of intervention goes back to neolithic times, in the form of, destruction of forests, methods of farming, over-grazing, etc. Of the tendency to idealize a pre-industrial 'natural order' Williams writes,

"We shall get nowhere in thinking about these problems if we think that it is only the distinctive forms of modern industrial production that represents the problem of living well and sensibly on the earth." (9)

Williams believes it is a false contrast to counter-pose industrial society against the pre-industrial order. The contrast of physical conditions evades the problem of social and economic conditions. For Williams, this is a kind of utopian ecological thinking. The central social and economic questions are those around which Williams wishes to base his own theory of ecology.

Although modern socialism, and to an extent capitalism, have addressed themselves to these questions their overall priority is for more not less industrial production, both for different reasons; capitalism for profit, socialism for the abolition of poverty. Questions of qualitative production have not been put by either side. Capitalism from its early years to its later period of imperialism monopolised the metaphors of conquest and mastery. Williams writes,

"... these attitudes of mastering and conquering had from the beginning been associated not just with mastering the earth, or natural substances, or making water do what you wanted, but with pushing other people around, with going wherever there were things which you wanted, and subjugating and conquering." (10)

Socialists, according to Williams, believed poverty had to be cured by increased production, at the cost of damaging the immediate environment, as well as by altering social and economic relations. Socialism took up the metaphors of mastery and conquest of nature in an attempt to make production the human priority. This, Williams believes, has meant that 'socialism in fact lost its own most important emphasis'. It failed to note that the advanced, wealthy countries had failed to eradicate poverty, produced new types of poverty and with it disorder and squalor. Williams puts his case in this way,

"The essential socialist case is that wealth and poverty, order and disorder, production and damage, are all parts of the same process." (11)

What the socialist case needs to reconsider is industrial production related to human need rather than simple quantitative improvement. He cites William Morris as a socialist concerned with this question. Paraphrasing Morris, Williams states the problem in this way,

"Have nothing in your shops but what you believe to be beautiful or know to be useful." (12)

Production for need and beauty needs to replace production as an end in itself, despite the damage this causes. This is the beginning of a socialist alternative which recognises the importance of production, ecology and the relation of these to democracy. This position is based on negotiation, choice and decision. This is Williams's distinctive contribution to thinking about ecology: that questions of what type of production and for what reasons must be tied to questions about the nature of democracy.

Williams argues that it is no longer the case in industrialised capitalist or socialist countries that there is any longer a choice in accepting ecological questions,

"... it is not really a matter of choice whether we can go on with certain existing patterns and conditions of production, with all their actual looting of the resources of the earth and with all their damage to life and health. Or even when they are not damaging, there is the certainty that many of the resources at their present levels are going to run out; the fact of real material limits to the existing mode of production and to the social conditions which it is also producing." (13)

The central socialist argument is that productive growth will not abolish poverty. What is important and necessary is the 'way in which priorities between different forms of production are decided'. Socialists can agree on the way production is organised and the way products are distributed. This process of decision is determined by the social and economic relations between people and classes. Williams provides the example of a Welsh mining community, but it could be a steel, dockyard or shipbuilding community anywhere in Britain. It is no good telling miners, he says, that they should come out of their harmful industries and go to something better. The process must be one of 'equitable negotiation'. Here Williams is referring to the de-centralised, fully participatory democracy which is essential to his form of socialism. This process of decision which settles 'different forms of production' will determine whether more production will eliminate poverty or will create new kinds of poverty and new kinds of destruction. There is also an international element to these questions of the relations between industrial production, ecology and democracy.

Williams argues that the way in which societies organise their production and its priorities, e.g. profit, determines the way in which people live

in their social relationships. This is true at a national level, but even more true at an international level. The world economy is organised and dominated by the highly advanced countries of the West. Third world countries live in a subordinate relationship to these countries. Williams points out that the shortage of strategically important resources, e.g. oil, determines the power relations between states. The problem of resources is crucial. Williams writes,

"... the continuation of existing patterns of unequal consumption of the earth's resources will lead us inevitably into various kinds of war, of different scales and extent." (14)

He continues,

"... the case for changing our present way of life has to be argued not only in terms of local damage or waste or pollution, but in terms of whether we are to have the possibility of peace and friendly relations, or the near certainty of destructive wars because we are not willing to change the inequalities of the present world economy." (15)

Williams makes the further point that 'foreigners' will be characterised as hostile enemies by 'powerful resources of modern communication', and public opinion mobilised to justify war in terms of 'peacekeeping'. The scarcity of resources for the production levels of the western countries, for

Williams, will lead to domination or war. The case for 'sensible industrialisation' in developed and less-developed countries is made in this way by Williams,

"The case ... has to be made from a position of genuinely shared experience and from a deep belief in human equality, rather than from the overt or, even more dangerous, covert prejudices of the developed northern societies." (16)

Williams believes that the issues involved in local, national and international politics are producing the first elements of an 'ecologically conscious socialism'. The analysis that might develop from this is the fusion of economics and ecology into a single science. Williams's analysis goes beyond concerns about 'acid rain', 'deforestation', etc., to a complete reformulation of the priorities of industrial and agricultural production. Fundamental changes in our social and economic institutions are a necessary condition for re-assessing the priority of human needs. In the final chapter on T2000, 'Resources of Hope', Williams includes the ecology movement as one which can contribute to new forms of socialist thinking about the above issues. Williams is convinced that only a revised socialism can provide a legitimate alternative to capitalist waste and damage, he writes,

"There is a ground for re-uniting the socialist and what is now the core ecological case. But socialism ... can take the argument much further. With

its commitment to a whole society ... it can steadily transform the whole nature of work and its relations to its physical world. ... a socialist economy can alter the calculations and relativities of production, service and trade, taking the care of its whole land and its whole people as the priority to which all economic decisions are in the first instance referred." (17)

Here is the unity of politics and economics that is at the centre of Williams's theory of ecology; this theory gained increased importance in Williams's work up to the 1980's. The phrase 'the first instance referred' indicates Williams's insistence that such decisions must be made only after the maximum public debate and decision. Fundamental institutional changes are required before this can be achieved. As Francis Mulhearn has written (the inverted commas indicate Williams's words),

"A 'substantial socialism' must therefore be a 'variable socialism', dispensing not only with 'all-purpose' assemblies and representatives but also with 'all-purpose' societies, discovering a flexibility of institutional reach adapted equally to inter-continental networks and to local communities." (18)

Ecology is seen as an indispensable part of socialist thought and planning; it is the study of finite resources and limitations and counter possibilities. In this argument ecology is a contributory factor towards

the 'socialist realm of freedom'. Williams offers more detail of what 'substantial socialism' might be and how it might be achieved in T2000. What is important in a work attending to Williams's educational thought, in this re-definition and alignment of socialism and ecology, is that the process has to include questions of consciousness and knowledge as well as organisation.

Williams's personal experience has led him to see workers' education as a paradigm for the raising of class-consciousness. This stayed with him throughout his life and the key concept that informs his ideas on this form of education is 'experience'. In the 1984 Miners' Strike, to which he continually refers, Williams believes the miners and their communities learnt about the issues discussed above through their experience of economic and political conflict. The ecological implications of the dispute, e.g., coal versus nuclear power, the condition of mining communities, the damage to self and the environment, the awareness of the 'consumer' about these questions, and so on. All these issues were outside the conventional confines of the dispute set between the Coal Board and the National Union of Mineworkers, yet were the basis for a profound educational experience for the miners.

Similarly, Williams believes the ecology 'movement' and the issues of ecology and the environment which the movement has addressed have been of incalculable educational benefit. It is typical of Williams that he attributes these forms of learning to events and agencies outside the formal education process. This has to do with distinctions between consciousness and knowledge but Williams does offer clues as to what might contribute to formal education about these issues of ecology and socialism.

A clear case is the integration of economics and social science to form a single science; there are signs that this is beginning to happen. The ecological organisations as political movements have produced alternative bodies of knowledge and could be said, along with the peace movement, the feminist movement, and the anti-racist groups, to constitute cultural movements for popular democracy. These are broad educational applications of Williams's work on ecology and socialism and in the final chapter I will look in detail at some practical examples.

Notes **Part 1**

1. J. Locke, 'What is Enlightenment?' in Kant on History, ed. L.W. Beck, New York, 1963, p.3.
2. N. Chomsky, Times Higher Educational Supplement (THES), February 3, 1989.
3. Williams, THES, January 1, 1988.
4. Williams, Culture and Society, p.332.
5. Ibid. p.332.
6. Ibid. p.327.
7. Ibid. p.327.
8. Ibid. p.325.
9. Ibid. p.326.
10. Ibid. p.333.
11. Ibid. p.333.
12. Ibid. p.333.
13. Ibid. p.334.
14. Ibid. p.334.
15. Ibid. p.334.
16. Ibid. p.328.
17. Ibid. p.330.
18. Ibid. p.331.
19. Ibid. p.332.
20. Williams, Resources of Hope, p.xxi.
21. Williams, 'Ideas and the labour Movement', New Society, Nov./Dec. 1981.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Williams, 'Socialists and Coalitionists' in Future of the Left, ed. J. Curran, London, Polity Press, 1988.
25. Williams, Highway, April, 1952.
26. Williams, Long Revolution, p.129.
27. Williams, This quotation is taken from a published lecture Williams gave in Belgium. I have been unable to trace details of publication but am indebted to Joy Williams for allowing me access to the manuscript.

Notes **Part 2**

1. Williams, 'Media, Margins and Modernity' in Politics of Modernism, London, Verso, 1989, p.194.
2. Ibid. p.194.
3. Ibid. p.194.
4. I am grateful to Alan O'Connor for this insight expressed in his book Raymond Williams: Writing, Politics and Culture, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989.
5. Raymond Williams: Critical Perspectives, ed. T. Eagleton, London, Polity, 1989. p.74.
6. Williams, The Robert Tressell Memorial Lecture, History Workshop, Issue 16, Autumn 1983, p.74.
7. Ibid. p.75.
8. Ibid. p.75.
9. Williams, in Resources of Hope, p.115.
10. Ibid. p.115.
11. Raymond Williams: Critical Perspectives, p.84.
12. Ibid. p.84.
13. Williams, Towards 2000
14. Williams, Resources of Hope, p.118.
15. Ibid. p.116.
16. Ibid. p.118.
17. Ibid. p.118.
18. Ibid. p.124.
19. Ibid. p.124.
20. Williams, The Robert Tressell Memorial Lecture, p.78.
21. Ibid. p.78.
22. Ibid. p.79.
23. Williams, 'Strictly Personal' in Education, March 4, 1960.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.

Notes **Part 3**

1. see Williams, Problems in Materialism and Culture, Politics and Letters, Towards 2000, Resources of Hope and What I Came to Say.
2. Williams, Resources of Hope.
3. Ibid. p.210.
4. Williams, Problems in Materialism and Culture. p.121.
5. Ibid. p.106.
6. Ibid. p.110.
7. Ibid. p.110.
8. Williams, Resources of Hope, p.211.
9. Ibid. p.212.
10. Ibid. p.214.
11. Ibid. p.215.
12. Ibid. p.216.
13. Ibid. p.221.
14. Ibid. p.224.
15. Ibid. p.225.
16. Ibid. p.225.
17. Williams, 'Hesitations Before Socialism' in Resources of Hope, p.292.
18. Williams, Critical Perspectives, p.76.

CHAPTER 5.1

Introduction

In the first part of this final chapter I will examine the theoretical basis of Cultural Studies, the area of discourse most decisively influenced by Raymond Williams's educational theory. Cultural Studies, as an innovatory educational paradigm, has enjoyed significant expansion in schools, colleges and universities since the 1960's. It is particularly strong in the area of Adult Education which is, perhaps, more open to innovation than areas dominated by the public examination system.

Cultural Studies is the last in a series of educational methods and programmes that have been influenced by Williams from the 1950's to the late 1980's. The first, as we saw in the Introduction, was in the 1950's in the form of teaching methods which challenged traditional Oxford University dominated methods in adult education of lecture and discussion in favour of more 'progressive' methods of active student participation. Williams was also in the forefront of innovations in content at this time, e.g. classes in Public Expression and Communications rather than more traditional classes in Literature and Literary Criticism which the University and the Department of Education expected and often demanded. All this can be seen as preparation for the more theoretically-developed Cultural Studies. This student and tutor led method remains central to Cultural Studies programmes, the culmination in practical and theoretical terms, of the influence of Williams's educational thinking.

Cultural Studies is inter-disciplinary drawing on literature, philosophy, sociology, media studies and geography. The questions that come to mind in an analysis of Cultural Studies are: what is Cultural Studies? What are its philosophical and theoretical bases? What are its educational aims? I will attempt to answer these questions in the course of this part of Chapter 5.

1. To find a satisfactory account of Cultural Studies it is necessary to examine different ideas about culture and from there to consider how these ideas have shaped this relatively new educational paradigm. There are at least two distinct strands of Cultural Studies providing different perspectives on the central founding idea of culture. Within these two strands are three methods of enquiry:

1. Textual Analysis
2. Social Analysis
3. Subjectivity and Identity

I will examine 1 and 2 in detail in the second part of this chapter while 3 must remain outside the scope of the discussion because it does not significantly inform Williams's work on culture. All these methods have different emphases and applications derived from one of the two strands of thinking in Cultural Studies.

The two strands of thinking in Cultural Studies can be described as firstly, 'culturalist' or, in some cases, 'humanist' (1), and, secondly, 'structuralist' or 'post-structuralist' (2). 'Culturalist' perspectives on Cultural Studies are derived from 1. and 2. above with an emphasis either on literary criticism or literary theory, although criticism and theory are collapsed within a wider theory of cultural production. The 'structuralist' strand of Cultural Studies tends to draw upon either economics or psychoanalysis as its decisive influences. I will develop these introductory remarks more fully in the discussion. It would be simplistic to depict these two main strands of Cultural Studies as British and Continental European but the distinction carries some force as I will try to show.

The founding texts of Cultural Studies in Britain are those of Richard Hoggart, E.P. Thompson and Williams. These writers produced their early formative work in the late 1950's and early 1960's but in ignorance of each others' work. This is interesting given the similarity of their ideas and in their use of almost identical concepts and methods. Williams based his early work on literary criticism and theory; Hoggart used literacy and literary values; while Thompson, although adopting a detailed historical perspective, remained within the same theoretical framework, particularly in his work on Williams Morris (3). All three writers introduced ideas on society and social development in their early work but as a method of analysis of literature and art.

For the purpose of this discussion I will concentrate on Williams's contribution as a founder of Cultural Studies. Williams's work in this area has been criticised for its 'culturalist' or 'humanist' perspective

(4). What does it mean for Williams's cultural theory to be classified in this way? The Cultural Critics by L. Jackson (5) goes some way towards answering these questions. Jackson's own position is derived from Althusser (6) and more latterly, Terry Eagleton (7) and supports the Cultural Studies paradigm of Stuart Hall and the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (8). Briefly, Jackson's criticism of Williams rests on the latter's alleged stress on art and literature as embodying objective human values. According to Jackson, Williams, as a socialist critic, fails to give sufficient attention to structural features of society, e.g. mode of production and economic factors, which are, for Jackson, the actual determinants of value. Following from this argument social or human values become class-dependent. The criticism levelled at Williams of 'culturalism' is that it is erroneously founded on the notion of 'experience'. In outline, this criticism is based on the view that theories of representation founded on the notion of 'experience' are subjective. For Jackson, this method of enquiry ignores the necessary and identifiable presence of ideological structures which he claims determine subjectivity. This argument of Jackson's is close of Althusser's view that all experience is illusory or ideological.

Before expanding on these general points I will, as a preliminary task, outline the origins and influences of Cultural Studies as a radically new educational paradigm; the method of Cultural Studies emphasises the importance of historical location in social, political or theoretical enquiry. The contemporary sense of culture, which has remained intact despite modifications, was first introduced by Matthew Arnold in the late nineteenth century (9). The idea of culture was developed by Arnold as a response to industrial society and began a debate which has continued to

the present day. This debate has centred on the relation between the individual, the intellectual, art and industrial society (particularly capitalism). Education has been a primary feature in this debate and in the social vision of the participants.

2. MATTHEW ARNOLD

Arnold defined culture as,

"... a pursuit of total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best of which has been thought and said in the world."

(10)

The sense of this definition is clear. Here is a statement which expresses a commitment to a set of values (as yet unspecified) i.e. culture, in opposition to relativist claims of cultural diversity as in some anthropological and philosophical arguments (11). Arnold is referring to 'the culture' rather than a plurality of cultures. Arnold's claim has contemporary echoes when one considers the arguments for and against multi-cultural education and the nature of the relation between class, race

and gender. Arnold's definition of culture rests on the assumption that there exists an ideal set of objective human values beyond those held by any one individual or group. Arnold, and later Leavis and Williams, retained the influence of this classical humanism in a clearly discernible way. That is to say, the way in which art or the artist (the cultured intellectual) embodies those ideal qualities necessary for living the 'good life'. Thus art, in this argument, is the ideal beyond any particular value an individual might hold. This is only part of the idea of culture but does suggest its antecedents and formative influences.

If the nineteenth century of culture emphasised the perfectibility of human nature exemplified by art it also had a further feature which distinguished it from other responses to the rise of industrial society in general and capitalism in particular (an example of these responses would be the Romantic Movement). This other feature of the idea of the relation between man and society also moved the concept of culture away from a preoccupation with art, the artist and the intellectual. This other feature was the concern to restore morality and social responsibility to the idea of culture; Arnold's conception of culture was concerned with a commitment of the social. The idea of romanticism with its associated notions of genius and creativity depicts the artist as the possessor of a superior vision of the world denied to the ordinary individual. Romanticism seeks to isolate the artist and the creative individual from the rest of society and by doing so makes the individual an abstraction from the social whole, hence its preoccupation with individualism. In an effort to restore morality and social responsibility to the role of art and its understanding Arnold began to widen the definition of culture.

Arnold was convinced that the concept of culture contained three aspects that were intimately connected. First, that it is a social idea; second, the notion of getting to know the 'best that has been thought and said'; and third, the need to turn radical and free-thinking ideas upon conventional thought and habits. For Arnold, education is the means by which the aims of his revised definition of culture can be achieved. Arnold is concerned to explain the relation between man, society and industrialism, and to produce an alternative vision of this relation through his idea of culture. Life in industrial societies could only be improved by returning to a set of values whose over-riding principle is the resolution of the problematic relation between the individual and the community in industrial society. This can only be achieved if individuals seek an ideal beyond or outside their individual selves. Culture is the vehicle for transforming the values and morals of industrial society into objective ideals of humanism; education is a central feature of this idea of culture and play a crucial role in achieving its aim. These ideals of objective human values can be said to embody an idea of human nature which lays beyond the self. In the words of Newton :

"There is a physical beauty and a moral; there is beauty of person, there is beauty of our moral being, which is natural virtue; and in like manner there is beauty, there is perfection of the intellect. There is an ideal perfection in these various subject-matter, towards which individual instances are seen to rise, and which are the standards for all instances whatever." (12)

This is very close to Arnold's account of culture as an ideal consisting of supra-personal values which the collective community should strive to attain. Arnold's theory of education contained a strong social and collective emphasis as opposed to narrow individual or utilitarian aims. What, precisely, are the 'human' values which Arnold is keen to objectify? The answer to this question has both a negative and a positive aspect. The negative aspect emphasises Arnold's critique of the 'mass' society of industrial capitalism and its effect on the quality of life of each individual. Life in these societies is narrow, one-dimensional and a-moral. Arnold believed that the impetus to change this tragic state of human affairs must come from a collective enterprise. At the centre of this enterprise lies the assertion that the collective or social is primary over the individual; only a solution to the social problem will resolve the individual problem.

The positive aspect of Arnold's objectification of human values is more difficult to identify. What can be said about Arnold's account of human values is that they are objectified as human perfectibility in terms of physical beauty, natural virtue, beauty of moral being and of the intellect. Arnold does not give a detailed account of these values but we can assume that they belong to an organic society whose emergence has been prevented by mass industrial society. Arnold argues that the role of education is to foster and develop these specifically human values; this leads to problems to do with education's function in society and whether education is actually part of the reproductive process of society, or, alternatively, an agent for social change. Arnold clearly believes the latter but does not pursue the point.

To conclude this discussion of Arnold as a founding influence on Cultural Theory it can be said that he introduced an idea of culture that began to assimilate art, literature and society within an all-encompassing theory. Arnold agreed with renaissance and romantic ideals about the existence of a set of objective values to which human beings should aspire. These values find their ideal expression in the art and the 'good life' of the artist and the intellectual, a life of creativity and reflection. Arnold advances the further claim that the artist and the intellectual can only achieve their ideal state within a fully integrated, organic community. Lastly, the question of culture, for Arnold, is objectified, that is to say there is one idea of culture which embodies universal human values. However, these values, which are not fully specified in Arnold's work, appeal to man's natural goodness, or in Trilling's words, 'the Socrates in every man's breast'.

Arnold's conception of culture was formulated to oppose theories of possessive individualism associated with the development of capitalism. This concept of culture, therefore, is non-pluralist and anti-relativist. The nineteenth century idea of culture as presented by Arnold represents a shift away from individualism and romantic contemplation to a direct concern with the 'other' and with society as the carrier or expression of universal human values. This concern for the 'collective' as formative of human values broke with the intellectual ethos of the day.

In the twentieth century two other British writers, F.R. Leavis and Raymond Williams, began with a concept of culture as the organising principle of their ideas on social, political and artistic development. Both insisted

on the inclusion of a theory of education at the centre of their concept of culture.

4. F. R. LEAVIS

Arnold developed his thinking on culture as a response to a recently arrived industrial, urban and mass society. Leavis made his most significant contribution to thinking about culture when important structural changes in the economy and society has become established. These structural changes gave rise to the notions of mass society and to conventional means found in art and literature. These developments in society, technology and science had, for Leavis, a disastrous effect on 'standards' and a levelling down in the quality of life and aesthetic taste. Leavis wrote :

"Now, if the worst effects of mass-production and standardisation were represented by Woolworths there would be no need to despair. But there are effects that touch the life of the community more seriously. When we consider, for instance, the process of mass-production and standardisation in the form represented by the press, it becomes obviously of sinister significance that they should be accompanied by a process of levelling down." (13)

In his distaste for industrial society Leavis made an appeal to a return to the 'organic' community of the past best represented by the idealised rural village. More specifically, Leavis believed that education had a central role to play in achieving a return to previous and idealised standards of life, aesthetics and behaviour. His 'revulsion' from the masses led Leavis

to believe in the necessity of a highly elitist education system; he acknowledged that only a very few could attain the required standards and tastes he passionately felt that society had abandoned. Leavis' notion of culture was of a similarly restricted kind. He decried film, television, radio and mass-circulation newspapers for appealing to the masses and consequently low 'standards' and fell back on literature or the 'Great Tradition' as the paradigm art form and arbiter of moral judgement. In a sense this restricts Leavis to the function of literary critic. However, since he used the wider term culture throughout his work, particularly in connection with education, as an organising concept for social analysis, his work has to be taken as a contribution to cultural analysis. Leavis admitted that he was an elitist and argued that Higher Education should be reserved for the 'cultural' few. Leavis remained an enigma unable to come to terms with structural changes in culture, science and technology in the middle part of the twentieth century.

In his earlier work Raymond Williams continued in the tradition of Leavis and Arnold introducing several new insights before addressing questions posed by Marxism and structuralism in his later work.

5. RAYMOND WILLIAMS

Williams responded to socio-economic and technological change in quite a different way from Leavis while at the same time holding to a concept of

culture with education at its centre. A contemporary of Leavis, Williams similarly attempted a synthesis of his thoughts on politics, society, art and education into a theory of culture. Williams's early work was written from within the problematic framed by Arnold and Leavis although he remained highly critical of both. In CS, the most influential of his early works, Williams developed his ideas on culture in its relation to social and political developments from the perspective of literary criticism; CS can be described as a work of literary theory. Unlike Arnold and Leavis, Williams attempted to come to terms with these fundamental, structural changes by including them within his theory of culture. In CS Williams developed a theory of literary production which accounted for social, even revolutionary, change. Williams took several established writers of the last two hundred years and subjected them to criticism from the perspective of their social context. Through this process Williams introduced his literary theory which involved judgement not of the text itself but of the conditions from which it was produced. These conditions of production were to include, the position of the author, the technical means of production (e.g. publication and distribution), and the social and political constraints on the work and its distribution (censorship would be a factor here).

Also included in the conditions of production would be the prevailing dominant ideology and its sources. With this theoretical framework Williams developed a theory of literary criticism and aesthetic value and judgement. With these extra-analytical tools Williams subjected the works to criticism and further began to develop a theory of culture based upon literary criticism. Even with new insights Williams's theory of culture remained firmly within the problematic of literary criticism and as such

failed to account for new and emergent social forces and forms of cultural production, e.g. mass-circulation newspapers, television, radio and video. In Williams's early work there is, as Jackson has suggested, a concern for intellectual and therefore 'human' values associated with art and the 'good life', a subjective account of the nature of culture that tends to elitism. Education is then identified as the means by which these values can be transplanted in the student body. Literature and literary criticism is a fundamental part of the educative process and its 'civilising' aims. Jackson is correct to point this out, however, it can be argued equally forcefully that Williams is only concerned with one aspect of cultural and ideological production.

In CS Williams argued that modern society must develop a 'common culture' or it will perish; either spiritually and intellectually with a loss of human values, or literally through the specific application of advanced technology. Williams defines 'common culture' in this way :

"The struggle with which that process constricts us now is, I believe, the struggle to create public meanings which are authentic forms; to create a society whose values are at once commonly created and critical, and where the discussions and exclusions of class may be replaced by the reality of common and equal membership. That, still, is the idea of a common culture, and it is increasingly, in developed societies, the determined practice of revolution." (14)

The revolution Williams refers to here is the 'long revolution' of the period from the establishment of capitalism as the dominant system of economic production to the present; Williams dates 1750 as the approximate date for the beginnings of capitalist ascendancy. The 'long revolution' is the process of political, social, economic and cultural change that has occurred in the above period of capitalist domination. This change included polarisation of socio-economic classes, the division of labour, urbanisation, increased political rights, increases in literacy levels and modes of communication, free and comprehensive secondary education, and the development of intellectual ideas, for example, collectivism, imperialism, and feminism.

Williams does not put a value on this process. It is, for him, a simple historical fact. However, this process of the 'long revolution' has contained within it a potentiality. By this we can take Williams to mean a form of socialism. This potentiality is unfulfilled because of the existence of dominant structures within the mode of production. These structures take economic, political and ideological forms. Education is seen as a dominant ideological structure. These structures can never fully repress the potentiality for change or the emergence of liberating forces. Capitalism and its allied processes of the division of labour and urbanisation contains within it the seeds of its own downfall; these would include the emergence of the organised working class, increased democratic forms and participation, feminism, forms of communication, and new cultural forms. These potentially liberating forces are incorporated into the dominant ideological mode unless their agents struggle to defend their interests. Williams's social theory contains a concept of struggle, a struggle for an egalitarian community; the sense of liberation has a

collective rather than an individual emphasis. It follows from this that Williams's philosophy of education contains a similar collective emphasis; the collective is prior to the individual. Williams refers to this vision of an egalitarian future arising from capitalist domination as the process of the emergence of a 'common culture'. The struggle for the 'common culture' is the struggle to 'create new public meanings which are authentic forms' within which 'values are commonly created'.

In the Cultural Critics Jackson argues that the class struggle is the sole means by which a socialist future can be achieved. This amounts to a political and social theory and there is little room for education as an agent for change unless it supports the idea of the class struggle in favour of the working class. Williams clearly rejects this position in a plea for 'public' not class authentic meanings and values to be 'commonly created'.

Jackson's criticism of Williams's theory of the 'common culture' is persuasive given the lack in Williams's work of an account of how the 'common culture' is to emerge; the plea for the creation of authentic 'public meanings' appears little more than wishful thinking as an appeal to the victory of essential human values over the alien values of capitalist society. In Williams's early work, in the concern to promote the idea of a 'common culture', there is a lack of a coherent political or educational theory. In this context, D. Hargreaves (15) commenting on the 'Education in British Society' chapter in the Long Revolution argues that this is a seminal piece of writing on education. However, Hargreaves observes that there is a naivety in Williams's approach in that he expects that his appeal for change in education will simply be accepted and implemented by

progressive thinkers. What can be said in defence of Williams's early work on culture is that it rests on a critical analysis of the cultural forms of the dominant ideological mode which seeks to trace the specific origins the forms and their conditions of production, rather than rest on a pure form of literary criticism. This is the progressive nature of Williams's contribution to thinking about culture and an advance on pure literary criticism and the work of Arnold and Leavis.

Williams attempted to answer some of these criticisms in his later work through an engagement with the theoretical concepts used by his Marxist critics. In these later works of the 1970's and 1980's Williams is more concerned with the complexity of culture as a tool for cultural analysis. His work in the 1950's and 1960's, essentially in CS and LR, centred on a moral critique of capitalism built around his formulation of the concept of culture. This critique omitted any analysis of the actual structures of capitalism that produce and maintain the society's political arrangements and institutions. In the 1970's and 1980's Williams shifted his concern from the role of the literary intellectual and the reconciliation of the working class and democracy in the process of social change, to a coming to terms with marxism. This led him to redefine his theory of culture, a redefinition which has influenced Cultural Studies. Before examining the practical example of Cultural Studies I will consider Williams's later work on culture in order to clarify the theoretical foundations of this example.

Williams's work in the 1970's and 1980's from CC to his most recent work, T.2000 sought to come to terms with Marxist Cultural Theory. The essay 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory' (16) is the definitive statement of this revised position. In this essay Williams moved away from

an idea of culture as a creative activity in society, whether of the individual or the collective, to a recognition that culture could form one of the instruments for the subordination of specific groups in society; Williams begins to introduce the concepts of 'power' and 'influence' in an analysis of British culture. However, he admits that this new enquiry directs him towards what he sees as a theoretical block: the conclusion that cultural institutions and ideological forms are simply means of social control and reproduction. This leads him to search for a position which is to be distinguished from his own account position and from structuralist marxism. This new position can be said to be a synthesis of his early ideas of culture as creative activity and of some aspects of Marxist Cultural Theory. This new position Williams describes as Cultural Materialism. Cultural Materialism has provided the theoretical basis for a version of Cultural Studies found in schools, colleges and university today (17).

Williams has a number of aims for this revised theory of culture:

1. to provide Culture with a material base against both idealist and reflective marxist accounts.
2. to develop an alternative to theories of ideology as illusion.
3. to stress the existence of contradictions and conflicts inherent in the capitalist social formation.
4. to explain the way in which these contradictions require constant

maintenance and control by means of hegemonic influence.

The concept of hegemony is central to the revised account of culture. The ruling capitalist class, Williams states, often maintain their dominance through direct, often physical, coercion. At other times its rule is expressed through hegemonic influence. Hegemony adds to the concept of ideology through its recognition of :

"... not only the conscious system of ideas and beliefs (ideology), but the whole lived social process as practically organised by specific and dominant meanings and values." (18)

Here Williams is making the point that hegemony is not simply a mechanical structure passively received but that for it to achieve its aims it must be a continued process of active regeneration. This might mean, for Williams, among other things, the power of television, advertising, popular newspapers, new technology and even education if its purpose is to maintain sets of beliefs and values associated with the ruling power.

In C Williams broadens his definition of culture to include new forms of communication, e.g. language use, television, newspapers, television and film. Here he defines the process of culture as 'cultural production' rather than as previously, 'creative activity' or 'artistic production'.

From this perspective Williams is then able to analyse how values and meanings are transmitted. Education would be included as a form of cultural production. However, he does not go as far as to examine economic structures in their relationship to cultural production, for which he has received further criticisms for neo-marxists like Jackson.

In C, written in 1981, Williams emphasises the importance of contemporary European thought on Cultural Theory, particularly the way it employs theories of language. In the book Williams stresses that he is writing within a contemporary convergence around the current definitions of culture. This convergence, or theoretical intervention, attempts to bring together two major ideas about culture. For Williams:

"Each position implied a broad method: in a) illustration and clarification of the 'informing' spirit as in national histories of styles of art and kinds of intellectual work which manifests in relations with other institutions and activities, the central interests and values of a people; in b) exploration on the known or discoverable character of a general social order to the specific forms taken by its cultural manifestations"

(19)

The two 'major ideas' can be described as a) idealist or liberal humanist, and b) the Marxist view of culture as the reflection of events in the economic and social order. Williams contends that most work in culture in

the twentieth century has been done from within these two positions. The first of these positions argues that cultural practices are constitutive of human experience and the social order, while the second position claims that it is the economic and social order which is constitutive of cultural production and thereby human consciousness. Williams attempts to merge these two positions into this theory of cultural materialism.

The application of this theory to the cultural practice of education is fundamental to Williams's version of Cultural Studies. Williams's new claim is that ideas are embedded in the social structure; the aim of his method of cultural materialism is to focus on and specify the relation between ideas and the social structures from which they are derived. He argues that the idealist of liberal humanist position is elitist and cannot affect the social order in the way in which its supporters claim. The idealist position of Arnold and Leavis amounts to no more than a claim for the 'informing spirit' (art) as the civilising element in mass, industrial society. The logic of this position is that only a select few can be the custodians of the culture. Both Arnold and Leavis argued for an elitist system of Higher Education as the protector of the culture. The neo-Marxist position, Williams argues, fails to make the relation between economic and social structures specific, nor does it provide an explanation of their operation (Marx himself was quite specific on these questions). Whereas Williams's new argument :

"... see culture as the signifying system through which necessarily (though among other means) a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored." (20)

The inference that social structures are constitutive of ideas as cultural production is clear. Williams then proceeds to attempt an explanation of this 'signifying system'. It is involved in all forms of social activity, including education. The reasoning here is that education is a cultural or signifying practice with its aims and purposes decisively constituted by social structures. e.g. class, relations of power and domination, and economic relations. However, this is only part of the story for this argument does not differ significantly from the marxist view Williams denies; it simply replaces ideology with 'signifying system'. Williams wishes to enlarge the marxist theory of ideology by arguing that his revised position has elements in common with b) above, he writes :

"... but differs from it in its insistence that 'cultural production' and 'cultural productivity' (in its most recognisable terms) are not simply derived from an otherwise constituted social order but are themselves major elements in its constitution. It then shares some elements with a), as it emphasises cultural practices as (though now among others) constitutive." (21)

In this argument education, as a cultural form, can be constitutive (it is interesting here that Williams chooses not to use the marxist category of determining) of social structures, and by extension the social order. By constitutive we can take Williams to mean originating and not merely reproducing existing forms. In Chapter I outlined Williams's ideas on imagination and this is of importance here for education as a site for original and constitutive modes of thinking. I will try to show shortly how Cultural Studies as an educational programme for social change fulfils this originating function.

Williams has extended his earlier definition of culture as artistic production or intellectual activity to include :

"...not only the traditional arts and forms of intellectual production but also the 'signifying practices' - from language through the arts and philosophy to journalism, and fashion and advertising." (22)

All these areas connect as parts of a whole signifying system. The task then remains to specify precisely what these relations are and how they operate in practice. In C, ML, CC, and KW Williams attempts to make these specificities and connections apparent. For the purpose of my argument I will concentrate on education and try to determine whether Cultural Studies is an area of relative autonomy or whether it can only ever be an example of reproduction as the mechanical marxists claim.

Firstly, what is a 'signifying practice' and how do these 'practices' combine to form a 'system'? In his book Ways of Seeing John Berger uses the case of 'publicity images' in capitalist society as an example of a 'signifying practice. Berger's example is also illustrates how a 'practice' can be part of a 'system'. Berger writes,

"Publicity adds up to a kind of philosophical system. It explains everything in its own terms. It interprets the world." (23)

This 'system', for Berger, is democracy. he argues that publicity turns consumption into a substitute for democracy by offering consumer freedom of choice in place of 'significant political choice'. Berger extends this argument by claiming that publicity also disguises undemocratic features of our own society, and by extension, the rest of the world. Berger continues,

"The contrast between publicity's interpretation of the world and the world's actual condition is a very stark one." (24)

Berger finds evidence for these claims in colour magazines where images of famine in Africa are juxtaposed with images of conspicuous consumption in the West. Berger makes the point that these counterposed images are produced by the same culture. He writes,

"Publicity exerts an enormous influence and is a political phenomenon of great importance." (25)

Freedom of choice, freedom of enterprise are the immediate visible 'signs' of the 'free world'. Berger explains the political significance of these signs,

"For many in Eastern Europe such images in the West sum up what they in the East lack. Publicity, it is thought, offers a free choice." (26)

Raymond Williams wishes to include 'signifying practices' such as advertising, fashion and media practices in general, within a system that includes political and philosophical ideals; this part of his inter-disciplinary method of which culture is a lynchpin. It is indicative of Williams's later interest in marxism that he uses concepts such as 'signifying practices' and 'system'.

In his engagement with marxist cultural theory Williams employs some new concepts and redefine some earlier ones. He introduces the concept of 'structures of feeling' to convey a sense of constant flux rather than fixed forms of 'world views' or ideologies. As Jackson writes :

"Structures of feeling emphasises the way in which meanings and values are actively lived and felt." (27)

An example of a 'structure of feeling' would be feminism which developed as a cultural movement before becoming a formally organised political force. Williams provides a further example of the 1930's political poets, Auden, Spender, and MacNeice, who although not writing in collaboration, produced work of a remarkably similar focus. However, 'structures of feeling' have a negative as well as a positive aspect. For example, feminists have described the negative aspect of their consciousness as the 'learned helplessness' produced by the experience of living within powerful patriarchal cultural structures.

Jackson also points to several recently formulated concepts Williams has introduced; 'effective dominant culture, and 'residual' and 'emergent' cultural elements. These concepts provide Williams with the methodological tools with which to analyse the relation between culture and society. The 'dominant culture' is the selective culture which is the 'tradition' and the 'significant' past. In Jackson's terms the selected culture,

"... seems to perpetuate the effective dominative culture, in a process of continual making and remaking. Through this selective tradition or culture our relationship with history, society and knowledge is defined. Williams argues that this process accompanies the process of education, the process of a much wider social training within institutions like the family, and

the practical definitions and organisations of work, as forms in the maintenance of hegemony in the society." (28)

An example of an emergent cultural element is the way in which cultural producers (educationists) are sensitive to new social forces and trends in the culture and anticipate 'breaks' in the cultural pattern of our society' these insights are expressed in their work. The emergent cultural elements are new meanings, values and practices which develop with the emergence of new social forces, for example, multi-cultural communities and feminism. Artists and intellectuals can express and anticipate these new patterns but they cannot initiate them, they are derived from social, economic structures and movements. Through this methodology Williams is able to more easily identify and analyse the different trends in society, lived culture and selective culture in the process of domination and subordination. Through this new method Williams is also able to move away from the earlier idea expressed in CS of a 'common culture' in the form of an idea.

The extended meaning of Williams's revised definition of culture and the manner in which it departs from creative or artistic activity is apparent in C,

"The work of the new convergence has been lost and most frequently done, either in general theory and in studies of 'ideology' or in its

distinctively new areas of interest in the 'media and 'popular culture ''.

(29)

What emerges from Williams's new position on culture in his later work is that the plea for a 'common culture' is dropped in favour of a close analysis of capitalist hegemonic and cultural production from a perspective of the two themes of 'domination' and 'subordination'. Through the employment of these themes Williams can introduce the notion of conflict in society, for example, class conflict, which the call for a 'common culture' necessarily omitted. The Cultural Studies theorists have applied Williams's later theoretical position as a educational programme with some additions of their own, notably in the area of political economy.

The framers of Cultural Studies emphasis that their work constitutes a programme of political education. Cultural Studies differs from other programmes of political education (30) which have individual autonomy as their primary aim. Cultural Studies contains a politically-committed, non-neutral and collective emphasis. Its sympathies lies with dominated and oppressed groups whether on class, race or gender lines. Cultural Studies recognises the existence of dominant structures in the capitalist system and seeks to expose these through developing authentic representations of their operation. Cultural Studies employs Williams's method and organising idea of 'lived' and 'dominant' culture, 'structures of feeling', and 'experience' to develop a theory of representation as an educational method.

In this section of Chapter 5 I have attempted to provide a summary of the theoretical basis of Cultural Studies, from the perspective of the work of one of its principal influences, Raymond Williams. I have also outlined how Williams developed the work on culture of Arnold and Leavis. There are other influences on Cultural Studies, e.g. Edward Said(31) , particularly with reference to an understanding of how imperialism and racism operate as cultural phenomena, and Marxist approaches which differ from Williams and Said in their emphasis on culture as ideology determined by social and economic structures. I have also touched on the main aims of culture Studies as a programme of political education. In this theoretical section I have referred to education only tangentially as one example of a cultural practice. In the following section I will concentrate on education as a cultural practice in detail through a presentation of Cultural Studies programmes.

Chapter 5.2

Introduction.

In this section of the chapter I will examine two examples of Cultural Studies programmes which derive their theoretical bases from the work of Raymond Williams and other writers sympathetic to his position; among the latter are Edward Said who has applied many of Williams's concepts and arguments to the issues of racism and imperialism, particularly with reference to Orientalism and the issue of Palestine. The programmes I will examine are the Diploma of Cultural Studies recently established at the University of London (1) and the work of the Centre for Urban Educational Studies based in London (2).

I have chosen these two examples since they derive their theoretical bases from Williams's theory of Culture and his related ideas on representation, experience, literary production, language and communications. In this discussion these concepts will be applied within an educational context.

These two examples of Cultural Studies programmes differ interestingly in that they are directed at two separate and distinct categories of students; the Diploma of Cultural Studies (DCS) has been established for adult London students, the Centre for Urban Educational Studies (CUES) has its base in London schools. Even with this important distinction the two programmes share more similarities than differences. For example, both programmes have been designed to take into account the multi-cultural and urban character of their students' catchment area. Moreover, both programmes possess one characteristic which unites them in terms of educational aims and which is derived from Williams's socialist political theory; I refer to the idea of

political commitment. The idea of a politically committed educational practice is highly controversial and risks criticism from politicians, parents, educators and commentators. Indoctrination, bias, and neutrality are issues that are habitually raised when attempts are made to 'introduce' politics into education. The justification for politically committed educational theory and practice argued by the framers of Cultural Studies programmes, and by Williams himself, is that education necessarily contains a political dimension.

This politically committed educational theory has two main themes. Firstly, that education cannot be neutral or value-free and is always connected to an idea about a 'truth' or an 'objective reality'; in this argument educational theories and their derived practice entail the presence, intended or unintended, of a political position. This assertion provides the basis for the further claim that forms of knowledge and knowledge acquisition, the curriculum and the various processes of education in

liberal capitalist democracies are forms of domination, e.g. on lines of class, race or gender; this is the thrust of the socialist critique of the unstated but ideological aims of education in these societies. Secondly, if domination is the intended or unintended aim of education in liberal democracies then the first priority of a socialist theory of education must be to develop a critical theory and practice designed to oppose the existing dominant practices. Backed by this theory of political education Williams's work and subsequently programmes of Cultural Studies are overtly politically committed.

I will describe the main constituents of these examples of programmes of political education so far only outlined. Also, in this section I will attempt to answer a number of questions. For example, in what ways can these programmes be said to be political? How can political commitment be defined? What is the substance of Williams's and Said's criticism of current educational practice? How is this criticism political? A further set of questions arise from the concepts employed by Williams and Said. What is the role played by theories of representation, literary studies, experience and historical understanding as bases for political education? Do these concepts provide an appropriate framework for a theory of political education?

CULTURAL STUDIES DIPLOMA, University of London.

I will consider the main elements of the DCS, its theoretical bases and in which ways the Diploma can be considered a programme of political education from a socialist perspective. The first thing to say about the course is that it emphasises the necessity for a multi-disciplinary approach in the application of the concept of culture. The course is of four years duration, The first year is organised around the three main patterns of thinking about culture mentioned in the previous chapter; Textual Analysis, Social Analysis and Subjectivity and Identity. The second year offers a modular approach to selected cultural debates in the form of, local, intra- and inter-national enquiries. The third year of the course sketches out the epistemological bases for the cultural debates of the second year before moving to a 'cultural moment' or case study. The final, Diploma year, is in the form of an in-depth special study, e.g. Working-Class Writing, Sub-Cultures, Cultural Politics. This is a bare outline of the Diploma course, I will now attempt to provide the detail.

As I indicated earlier Williams and Said have been the founding influences on the DCS. There are important differences between the work of Williams and that of Said despite their binding similarities. Williams displays a strong class dimension in his cultural analysis which is absent from Said's writing. Both write from marginalised cultures and ethnicities but in Said's work, as a Palestinian resident in the USA, there is more explicit attention paid to racism. It is interesting that neither writer has given explicit and sustained attention to gender in their principal work. This was to some extent been rectified by Williams in later years, Both Williams and Said are internationalists ; Williams in his analysis of western capitalism, while Said has preferred to focus on imperialism and Palestinian rights in an American and Third World context. Williams has

written in detail on education, Said hardly at all. Both writers draw upon what they regard as conventionally separated subject 'disciplines', e.g. literary theory, philosophy, history, geography, economics and, of course, politics. This is the sense in which their work can be described as integrated or multi-disciplinary as I will try to show.

I will now try to show precisely how Williams and Said's work has influenced and determined the form and content of the DCS course. As I indicated earlier the course is organised around the three main patterns of thinking about culture mentioned on the previous page and in the last chapter. Both Textual and Social Analysis draw heavily on the work of Williams and Said while the Identity and Subjectivity element reflects the concerns of the course planners to include contributions to thinking about culture derived from psychoanalysis and the attempt at synthesis of Marx and Freud (3). Years 2,3, and 4 of the course develop from the main ideas which link into other theoretical features of the course, e.g. the relation between theory, experience and social context. This relation interacts, as I will try to demonstrate with the three main patterns of thinking and taken together provide the form the course's methodology.

There are real problems here which arise from the integrated methodology of the course as noted by the planners.

"One of these is the relationship of social analysis to individual experience and social context. Another is its application to particular issues 'objects' and situations. A third is the range and complexity of

much of this work and the consequent difficulty of making use of it in educational contexts." (4)

I will consider to what extent these problems are addressed in the Diploma course particularly with regard to the educational application of the underlying theory. The most useful way to proceed is to tackle the main patterns of thinking about culture in turn and try to show how they are brought to bear on the complex relation between theory, experience and social context. However, I will omit the third pattern, Subjectivity and Identity, in the interests of brevity and because Williams's influence is far less marked than in the other two patterns. I will also attempt to show how the categories of theory, experience and social context are applied to concrete situations and objects. This method ought then to reveal the different emphases that are applied to the idea of culture, what the theoretical bases of these are and, to what extent the course represents a programme of political education. The first pattern of thinking about Culture employed by the framers of the CDS is, I will argue the primary organising feature of the course from which all others are derived.

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The course planners describe the content of this module in the following way;

"'Culture' as a more extensive and transformative term for 'art'. Case studies of a large range of cultural practices high/low art (e.g. Dickens, Mills and Boon and romantic fiction), print/visual forms (e.g. tabloid press and T.V. soap opera), different historical (e.g. the changed relationship between sport and T.V.) and geographical (e.g. Asian popular cinema) locations. Each selected study object to be understood as the product of associated practices, modes of circulation, and in relation to implied groups of 'consumers'." (5)

There are a number of implied theoretical positions here that require clarification but it can be clearly seen that this approach to cultural analysis is based on communication and literary theory. The question then arises as to the nature of this theory and the extent to which it is political?

Firstly, what does it mean to say of culture that it is a 'more transformative term for art'? Williams's influence on this pattern of thinking about culture is decisive; an interesting source for Williams's recent ideas on literary theory and culture is WS (6). In the chapter 'Crisis in English Studies' Williams examines the influence of English Literature as a paradigm art which embodies a theory of value; this is the critical rather than the prescriptive element of the DCS. In this chapter Williams compares several alternative approaches to the study of literature

and literary production which were outside the dominant paradigm of English Literature, among these are structuralism, deconstructionism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, and his own position which he describes as historical semiotics. In this discussion I will concentrate on Williams's critique of the Cambridge English (English Literature) paradigm and how this relates to the DCS model of Textual Analysis. Williams developed his formulation of Cultural Theory in opposition to what had become the dominant method of 'cultural analysis', i.e. Cambridge English.

It is necessary to state that the CDS course and Williams's theoretical foregrounding of it is designed for a particular student body; those entering a course of study in an institution of Higher Education. Moreover, the ideas from which the course is derived and the arguments which it has sought to oppose have also been developed in similar institutions. I mention this because it does provide some evidence that Higher Education can be a more fertile area for radical innovation in education than, for example, schools. I will examine this point in more detail when I look more closely at examples of Political Education in schools.

Cambridge English, Williams argues, has had a profound and far reaching effect on British culture in the past five decades through its influence as a dominant educational practice. Evidence for this argument is to be found in school curricula, examination syllabuses and courses in colleges and universities and, less tangibly, in the way in which English Literature has been used as a hegemonic structure. The latter claim is complex and I will elaborate on this point more fully in the course of the discussion. Briefly, the claim relates to the way in which the cultural practice of Cambridge English has influence and effects outside the occasion of its

inception, the institutional site. For example, political attitudes and moral values are reinforced and promoted by the teaching of a selected and reified set of literary works. Williams equates Cambridge English, a theory and practice of teaching developed by the English School at Cambridge University, with this set of canonical works of English Literature. English Literature, the 'English' prefix is illuminating, has become an 'object of study' or 'paradigmatic art form' through its promotion by the Cambridge English School, (CES). Williams proceeds to point out that F.R. Leavis, a founding and decisive influence of the CES from his work there in the middle of this century (7), described English Literature as the 'storehouse' of a particular set of 'recorded values'; this 'storehouse' is usually described as the 'canon' of English Literature.

To put it crudely this form of literary criticism defends a prescribed 'good life' in opposition to modernity (by this I mean the processes of industrialisation, urbanisation, and the development of 'mass' civilisation, democracy and literacy that have occurred since the middle of the 19th Century). The 'canon' itself amounts to no more than a few novels and poems by selected authors who support the virtues of the 'good life' that Leavis and his predecessors, Arnold and Richards (8), extol as the authentic mode of human existence.

It is now necessary to look more closely at the method of literary criticism as a tool of social and political analysis and why Williams believes it has become such a powerful, ideological educational influence. In this way it should become clearer precisely what values the Cambridge English School communicates and in which ways they can be said to be political.

The critical methods of the CES are inter-dependent with the values it upholds; there is a sense in which the values are contained in the method. I stated earlier that the social and political values of the CES are recorded and articulated in a small body of literary works. However, this is not so important a feature of their position as the critical method itself; more than anything it is the method that has been so influential, according to Williams, as an educational paradigm. The first thing to say about the critical method of Leavis, and earlier Richards, is that it affected a separation of literature and language. The CES, Williams argues, in a deliberate ideological act, chose to preclude philosophy and theory of language from their methodology because the method rested on an idea of 'creative imagination' possessed by certain individuals as readers. This ruled out any 'external' ideas about structure, theory and social context within their particular method of literary criticism. The exclusion of theory, philosophy and linguistics enabled the CES to preserve their idea of English Literature.

What then are the main elements of the critical method of so-called English Literature that allows it to be denoted as a distinct object of study or paradigm. Firstly, the method is applied to the printed text (the 'storehouse of recorded values') and is designed to identify 'imaginative works' which are then designated as the 'canonical' and 'artistic' texts of English Literature. The restricted set of printed texts accepted into the canon are exclusively English. This restriction is based upon the defence of an English culture deemed lost in the development of industrialism and 'mass' society in the 19th century; this culture is compatible with the lost 'organic community' of the English pastoral village which Leavis reified as the authentic mode of English life. The selection process of the

critical method gives to Cambridge English a nationalist value. The method has an ideological purpose; to establish an English national literature. Williams argues that this is to abstract English Literature from the literature and language of other cultures; the reason for this abstraction is to produce a political identity of 'Englishness' in artistic production. For Williams, this renders Leavis's method anti-theoretical since it relies on imagined ideas about identity culture. The reasons for wanting to promote this sense of identity or empathy with a version of English Literature are social and political in that the method seeks to promote an idea of an 'authentic' English past against the increased democratisation and extension of political rights which accompanied the 19th century process of industrialisation and urbanisation. Williams puts it this way,

"What has now happened, in very complex ways, was a redefinition of 'true English', partly behind the cover of the separation from philology. The English ruling class had long traced its real ancestry to the classical world and especially to Rome, as distinct from its actual physical ancestors. Culturally, and with many evident reasons, a comparable real ancestry was now defined." (9)

Williams takes this argument further,

"What has been traced, of course, was a genuine ancestry of thought and form with the linguistic connections assumed from the habits of the private schools. It is not so much this cultural connection that counts; it is the

long gap in the culture, history and language of these islands, across which this persuasive formulation simply jumps." (10)

For Williams, it made sense for the CES to move from Greek and Roman drama to Shakespeare and then to establish the eventual English moralists as Plato, Aristotle, Paul and Augustine since this reinforced the English ruling class view of the world. Rich though this tradition and defined history was, it contained a severe and centrally disabling limitation. Williams provides an example,

"'We should know the poets of our lands', but then not Taliesin or Dafydd ap Gwilym. 'Of our own people', but then not the author of Beowulf." (11)

The area of working-class writing is regarded by Williams as valuable but is not accepted within the canon. Working-class writing refers to both the writer and the subject matter. Examples of working-class writers would include John Pearman (see Ch.3), Robert Tressell, Sid Chaplin and an extensive list of writers of autobiographies (12). These writers have had difficulty getting published, despite the merit of their work. For Williams, it is important that this work gains recognition for the writers concerned because this would counter the elitist claim that working-class culture is debased and shallow. It is important this work is recognised for a further reason; the selected works of the canon omit any sustained attention to work. For those working-class writers mentioned work forms a highly significant and central part of their personal and social experience

and this is reflected in the narrative. 'English Literature' does not value work as a legitimate subject; personal identity and crisis, romance, the family, inheritance and money, traditional bourgeois values, have preoccupied the writers who have been admitted into the canon of 'English literature'. Williams makes this central point,

"Yet its own province, rich as it was in resources, was defined in ways that were bound to prejudice the culture and history of its own land and peoples," (13)

The promoters of the literary tradition placed themselves at a deliberate and ideological distance from their actual and differential literate culture. The educational influence of the English school, fully developed and established at Cambridge by the mid-20th century has been decisive, Williams claims, in schools, Higher Education and in general reading. Other theories, fiercely opposed to Leavis, were Marxism, structuralism and deconstructionism, all of which have contributed to the content of CS as I will presently try to show. Firstly, it is necessary to explain how Cambridge English has a political dimension beyond its defence of nationalist ideas; this dimension is introduced through the individualist methodology of the CES.

The somewhat extreme position of the CES and its principal supporters was that literary criticism should be identified as the central activity in all human judgement. If the canon of literature was to be the paradigmatic

'object of study' as the 'storehouse of recorded values', the activity of criticism was to be the method by which the individual could discover, rediscover, the central human values. Through the method of literary criticism the individual achieves the personal autonomy and knowledge necessary to become an authentic, discriminating and fully human being. In this context Williams writes of Leavis's forerunner, Richards,

".....the version of literature which he shared with others was in terms not only of a 'storehouse of recorded values' but of these as especially indicating 'when habitual narrowness of interests or confined bewilderment are replaced by an 'intricately wrought composure'. It could then be believed that analysis of the 'intricately wrought' was necessarily integrated with that clarification of response which was 'composure', which in turn, was at the centre of a theory of value." (14)

In this argument literature, in an accepted crisis of culture and belief, offered essential human values as the way to 'save' human beings.

'Intricately wrought composure' was the aim of criticism for the fully rational and autonomous individual. This is largely the substance of the theory of value Williams attributes to the CES, from which his criticism of English Literature springs. As he points out there are other dispositions fostered by literature than 'composure', these include belief, disbelief, disorder, conflict, etc., the diversity in literature was being disguised in the interests of an ideological absolute called literature criticism. The simple position of literary criticism favoured by Leavis and Richards was possible, Williams argues,

".....only, if the corresponding abstraction of the 'trained and discriminating reader' was moved and taught into place: the developed individual who had moved beyond all other conditions and experiences to this achieved and saving clarity and composure." (15)

This defence of English Literature and its defining theory of criticism is then extended to include the claim that literary criticism is the central activity in all human judgement. This exaggerated claim is refuted by Williams on several grounds, all of which have an educational basis. Firstly, there is a disabling contradiction with the idea that literary criticism is the central activity in all human judgement. Leavis admitted that only a few, highly educated people could achieve the level of education necessary to practise the developed skills of literary criticism. This elitist view is in direct conflict with the claim that literary criticism is the central activity of all human judgement.

Secondly, Williams argues that Leavis's claim for literary criticism as the method by which individuals can achieve personal autonomy within mass industrial society, with its anti-human system of values, is mis-conceived because the aim of personal autonomy is itself mistaken. This is in essence the main thrust of Williams's critique; Leavis's idea of Culture is in the last analysis founded on the view that individual autonomy or personal salvation can be achieved in abstraction from other human beings and general social conditions, provided that one has learnt the form and content of literary criticism. Williams's argument for a common culture together with the broader definition of culture to include contemporary, non-printed forms such as Television, Film and popular writing contains a

democratic emphasis and, a claim that, although each individual is undeniably unique, neither individual nor social autonomy can be achieved through personal salvation as Leavis claims.

By considering Williams's critique of the work of the CES and its supporting theory and practical educational influence it is possible to understand the context of the introduction and development of Cultural Studies as an educational practice opposed to literary criticism and its philosophical basis. The gain for CS programmes is to reflect Williams's views on the prior claims of the social over the individual in shaping human development, popular democracy, and the achievement and value of popular culture. The educational influence of these views is profound if we consider that Williams's aim for his formulation of culture is to discover and identify an 'otherwise observable reality' from that claimed by literary criticism and its adherents. The 'otherwise observable reality' method is that contained in the CS programmes which feature popular forms, an integration of philosophy, psychology, history, politics and economics, within which the idea of 'lived experience' plays a central role. CS in its intergrated method of study attempts to identify this 'reality' in all areas and forms of life in late capitalist society. CS contains the assumption that there exists an objective reality which the conventional separated forms of knowledge are ideologically constructed to obscure.

The Textual Analysis method of CS is almost wholly dependent on Williams for its theoretical basis. I have tried to show how his thought has influenced the programme and its central idea which defines culture as a 'transformative term for art'. Textual Analysis has its origins in a debate that took place in the CES about structuralism, semiotics and the 'Great

Tradition' method of English Literature during the 1970's. Textual Analysis refutes the claim that English or literature can be seen as a given body of work which contain a prescribed and absolute set of values. Unlike its predecessor, English Literature, Textual Analysis seeks to combine theories of language with the study of written and visual texts. In this revised definition of what constitutes English Studies a text could be described as a piece of film, a verbal recording, written prose or poetry, and, advertising and media pronouncements and comment. The icon of the text was not merely redefined, its historical, economic and political origins were now admissible evidence for its method of analysis. Popular forms, including sub-cultural material, youth cultural activity, and women's writing and criticism were now identified as texts within the broader definition. The framers of the CS programmes have redefined the text away from its conventional sense as a prescribed set of literary works of art containing a moral and value position into the text as a multi-media form (one of which remains literature as traditionally defined). The methods of analysis of CS include a theory of value and judgement that situates the text in a social and political context. This context includes features of a social formation such as philosophy, politics and economics; in this argument the text is identified as a determined feature of a culture.

The pattern of thinking about culture that I have been describing should be seen as a provisional theoretical position from which the other patterns are derived. The other main pattern of thinking about culture from the DCS, Social Analysis, aims to specify in very concrete and practical terms the general and critical theoretical position laid down by the method of Textual Analysis. If Textual Analysis sought to set the ground and define the area of study within its critical parameters, Social Analysis moves a

further step and involves a programme of political education. I now want to move to an analysis and description of this programme.

SOCIAL ANALYSIS

Social Analysis is an example of a Cultural Studies method designed to identify the main determinants of an 'objective social reality'. Literature is central to the method as the record, articulation and representation of the movement of hidden social forces and patterns of social causation which is the form of the 'objective reality'. The work of Williams is not simply central to the idea of Social Analysis but rather the Social Analysis method could not have been established without Williams's contribution. The work of Edward Said has also contributed to the form of Social Analysis by way of extending the central body of ideas. The principal source for Williams's influence on this Cultural Studies programme is The Country and the City (16). Said's works Travelling Theory (17) and Orientalism (18) have proved a considerable influence on Social Analysis but in the interests of clarity I will refer to them only briefly. I will argue that the CC provides persuasive evidence for Williams's theory and philosophy of education.

In this section I will provide evidence for these claims and try to clarify some of the key concepts and terms used by Williams and Said which have been taken up by the cultural and educational theorists responsible for designing the Social Analysis element of Cultural Studies programmes in colleges and universities.

In the CC Williams develops his ideas on education through an analysis of different writers and their works from a social and economic perspective. I will argue that the CC provides the clearest insight into Williams's philosophy of education. In the CC Williams presents his ideas on perception, truth, reality, knowledge and consciousness within the context of a debate about the central aims, purposes and effects of education on the individual and on society.

Before moving to a close analysis of Social Analysis through the CC I will briefly state what I consider to be the essential differences between Social Analysis and Textual Analysis. Textual Analysis, as I mentioned earlier, is a theory of literature and communication which attempts to identify the way in which ideas, often ideologies, are articulated in conventional literature in order to support a dominating set of meanings and values. We saw how Textual Analysis proceeded from this starting point to develop a theory of culture, based on communications, which seeks to transform and democratise conventional and ideological notions of art; in this argument art becomes culture and whole areas of neglected culture are re-claimed as significant, in some cases oppositional, theories of value and meaning. Working-class writing was offered as an example. Social Analysis goes beyond this provisional position to include a whole range of works in philosophy, political theory and economics. The range is extensive

and formidable. I will now attempt to unravel the complexities of Social Analysis, a rewarding task since this is, I would argue, Williams's most profound contribution to thinking about culture and the derivative areas of philosophy and education. The CC is also the single most important influence on the planners of the DCS course at London University.

For Williams, the active relation between the country and the city in Britain has been a process of a single thread of causation. Williams traces how the country and the city have been transformed since feudal times to the present when the relation must now be considered in international rather than national terms. This is a central point and I will try to support this claim in the course of the discussion. Williams accepts the conventional view that a form of Industrial Revolution occurred in Britain around 1750-1850 and an Agricultural Revolution a century earlier. In the CC Williams argues that the development of the country and the city since feudal times through the Industrial Revolution to the present has contained a persistent and decisive thread. The primary fibres of this thread have been, property, capital and the division of labour. Williams writes,

"It can be restated theoretically. The division and opposition of city and country, industry and agriculture, in their modern forms, are the critical culmination of the division and specialisation of labour which, although it did not begin with capitalism, was developed under it to an extraordinary degree." (19)

In this argument the history of the city and the country is the history of capitalism and the enduring features it inherited from the feudal system. These features include, exploitation of labour, poverty, inadequate public housing and health, forced repatriation and rent; it is these features and experienced conditions of capitalism and its necessary predecessor that have been the reality of the historical relation between the country and the city. Of course, this is not the whole story and Williams provides other evidence to support his arguments. However it is this persistent thread of the relation that is the form of Williams's necessary organising theoretical principle.

In the CC Williams identifies and illustrates this thread of history through the record and articulation of a range of writers from Virgil, the Country House poetry of Jonson and Carew, Austen and the Brontes, Dickens to Lawrence and, more contemporary expressions and representations from writers of imperialist experience, for example, Nwankwo, Achebe and Lamming (20).. Through the work of these writers Williams is able to focus on what he claims are differing, often opposed, representations of 'objective reality' in representations of the relation between the country and the city. For example, the Country House poets idealise the notion of 'pastoral' in opposition to the town or urban experience. Similarly, Jane Austen has a limited view of the pastoral or country experience because she fails to represent in her novels the experience of the majority of working people of the country and city outside the gates of the country house.

In the previous section of this chapter we saw how Leavis used particular writers to underpin his belief in the sanctity of the organic pastoral ideal. While revealing what he would regard as ideological representations

of reality, Williams also emphasises his own argument by referring to writers who articulate the 'real' and 'authentic' history of the relation between the country and the city, and the majority experience of its people. Essentially these are working-class rural and urban writers, for example, Hardy, Grassic Gibbon, Tressell and Somerville.(21)

This is the basis from which the Social Analysis method of Cultural Studies finds its ideas and substance. I will attempt to show in the discussion that the CC is not merely a work of literary criticism but one of Cultural Theory; that is, an attempt to discover the 'knowable', the 'objective reality' of the historical process that has determined our current perspective on the country and the city. It should then become clear how Cultural Theory should be seen as a methodology or paradigm which employs a fusion of history, literature, economics, philosophy and politics as its source material.

In the CC Williams utilises concepts and ideas used extensively by philosophers of education. For example, theories of perception, representation, truth and reality, forms of consciousness, a theory of communication, and imagination. I will try to show how these concepts and ideas connect to form the basis for a practical programme of political education. The fundamental philosophical position that Williams takes in the CC is, I will argue, materialist. This claim might further confuse philosophers of education unfamiliar with Williams's work, for the meaning I ascribe to materialism in this context is that associated with Marx and Engels rather than with materialist philosophy of, for example, Aristotle, Hobbes or Locke. Williams's philosophical position is not that of Marx and Engels in its entirety: cultural materialism does not fully accept the more

determinist features of historical or dialectical materialism but nonetheless leans heavily on Marx for its theoretical basis. Williams's philosophical position should be considered in the light of Marx's influence; that is to say that political and ideological forms, ideas and philosophy are determined by social-economic factors in history. This position provides a very different perspective to conventional ideas on e.g., perception, imagination and communication.

In the CC Williams argues that the history of the relation between the country and the city, in fact the process of the establishment and development of capitalist society, is a process of such extraordinary and increasing complexity that it has become impossible to 'know' the world or 'reality' in an essential or authentic sense. Williams's method in the CC is designed to unravel this complexity in order to reveal an authentic reality and its underlying causal processes and determinants. We shall presently discover to what extent Williams's method is successful. Firstly, what evidence does Williams provide for his claim that the world, the external reality, in other words individuals, communities and their social and physical circumstances, have become unknowable due to this increased complexity? He approaches this question through a description of the problem of the 'crisis of the knowable community'. Williams relates this crisis to novelists and the manner in which they address it. In ENDL he writes,

"We can see its obvious relation to the very increasing size and scale and complexity of communities: in the growth of towns and especially of cities and of a metropolis; in the increasing division and complexity of labour;

in the altered and critical relations between and within social classes. In these simple and general senses, any assumption of a knowable community - a whole community, wholly knowable - becomes harder to sustain. And we have to remember, with this, that there is a direct though very difficult relationship between the knowable community and the knowable person." (22)

later Williams adds,

"The problem of the knowable community, with its deep implications for the novelist, is then clearly a part of the social history of early 19th Century England and of the imaginative penetration and recoil which was the creative response. But what is knowable is not only a function of objects - of what there is to be known. It is also a function of subjects, of observers - of what is desired and needs to be known. A knowable community, that is to say, is a matter of consciousness as well as of evident fact. Indeed it is just this problem of knowing a community - of finding a position, a position convincingly experienced, from which community can begin to be known - that one of the major phases in the development of the novel must be related." (23)

For Williams, the problem of consciousness and an authentic 'knowing' is not simply that, a problem, but it is also a crisis, a crisis of society and of community,

"Now we have only to name this particular crisis - the crisis of the knowable community - to see how it is deeply related to the change through which these novelists were living." (24)

I will shortly name these writers. In the CC Williams hints at a method through which an authentic 'knowing' can be achieved in the face of this crisis of perception,

"Clearly the contrast of the country and the city is one of the major forms in which we become conscious of a central part of our experience and of the crisis of our society." (25)

We have a number of claims here. Firstly, that the processes of capitalism have rendered our common life unknowable thereby hindering perception both individually and collectively. Secondly, that this is not simply a problem but a crisis; it is a crisis because if we cannot 'know' the world and our history then we cannot change it or imagine an alternative. The third claim Williams makes is that an authentic 'knowing' and an 'objective reality' exist and are possible to perceive through an analysis of the historical relation of the country and the city, and an analysis of writers at different historical moments. Through this method Williams is able to compare ideological or inauthentic representations of reality with 'true', 'real' or 'objective' accounts.

In the CC Williams traces the history of this 'contrast' and the development and nature of the 'crisis' through the language in which these have been communicated by the writers of particular periods. Language and crisis are concepts central to Williams's analysis of the relation between the country and the city and the application of this relationship to political and socio-economic history. Both concepts have philosophical and educational foundations; language in terms of perception, knowledge and communication; 'crisis' in the way in which it can be developed into a significant educational paradigm. For Williams, the novel, through its particular language, attempts to represent a particular interpretation of 'reality'. He writes,

"Most novels are in some sense knowable communities. It is part of a traditional method - an underlying stance and approach - that the novelist offers to people and their relationships in essentially knowable and communicable ways." (26)

It is only through language that the knowable can be perceived and known. Of course, not all forms of language or its specific use approximate 'objective reality' or 'authentic knowledge'. Williams's theory of value can be identified in the novels and poems he selects as approximating 'objective reality'. These works contain a method of representation, through particular use of language, that serve as an alternative to conventional forms of literary representation. Before looking at examples of these works I will consider in more detail Williams's use of language and his idea of 'crisis'. These two categories are closely related in

Williams's thought and are both derived from Williams's identification of the historical relationship of the country and the city within the development of capitalism. Williams puts his central argument in this way,

"I have been arguing that capitalism, as a mode of production, is the basic process of what we know as the history of country and city. Its abstracted economic drives, its fundamental priorities in social relations, its criteria of growth and profit and loss, have over several centuries altered our country and created our kinds of city. In its final forms of imperialism it has altered our world." (27)

and in theoretical terms,

"It can be restated theoretically. The division and opposition of city and country, industry and agriculture, in their modern forms, are the critical culmination of the division and specialisation of labour which, though it did not begin with capitalism, was developed under it to an extraordinary and trans-forming degree." (28)

The 'crisis' then is the crisis of capitalism, its form is economic and political but is also a crisis of perception; the relation between what we see and what we know and what we believe in is unsettled. John Berger has argued that as capitalist society has become more complex in national and international terms our ability to perceive these complexities has become

inadequate as our means of perception have been altered. These have been altered by the increased use of the visual image over the written word. According to Berger these visual images mystify rather than clarify our experience, and they have very clear aims. Berger uses 'glamour' as an example of a visually created concept of capitalist society which produces attitudes and values, but also a contradiction. He writes,

" ... glamour cannot exist without personal envy being a common and widespread emotion. The industrial society which has moved to democracy and then stopped half way is the ideal society for generating such an emotion ... He (the individual) lives in the contradiction between what he is and what he would like to be. Either he becomes fully conscious of the contradiction and its causes and so joins the political struggle for a full democracy ... or else he lives ... subject to an envy which compounded with his sense of powerlessness, dissolves into recurrent day-dreams." (29)

In the CC Williams analyses the attempts by writers to respond to the crisis of perception. He offers his own view of the crisis through a selection of writers whom he considers have most understood the crisis; that is to say, have best articulated the crisis in language. Through this method Williams is able to present his theory of value. The essential point to grasp is that the writers Williams supports have successfully identified the crucial relationship between literature, language and the known and knowable community. As we will see these writers are in the main working-class, feminist or those writing as victims of imperialist domination.

I now want to look at Williams's most central terms in more detail and at the same time explain how these terms are seen by the planners of the DCS as vital educational issues. This should make it clear how Williams's theory of the relation of the country and the city is not just a critical analytical tool but a theory which contains a strong prescriptive element. The main source I have used so far in this section has been the CC and this will continue to be the case but I will also refer to The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence because of its strong educational perspective. ENDL is not a work that has been used extensively by the Cultural Studies planners but I will try to argue that the book demands to be included in any study of Williams's educational thought. The terms I will look at are Williams's idea of community, his theory of perception (which includes a theory of knowledge) and, the distinction he makes between 'custom' and 'education'. Williams's theory of language and his idea of cultural materialism inform these terms on which I will focus.

Consciousness and Community

Ideas of community are present in all Williams's thought on education. His formulation of community is constitutive of the general theory of political education I am trying to construct from Williams's general work. The term community has been used by contemporary educationists and politicians, both local and national, to describe a particular and distinctive type of educational provision; its defenders claim community education is in itself a philosophy of education (28). In KW Williams sets the use of the term against associated uses of society, nation and state. In tracing the historical usage of the terms Williams notes that community has become a more immediate term for society, state and nation. The term has been associated with socialism and communism through such descriptions as the French Commune but has also passed into sociology to express particular social relationships. Clearly, the emphasis the term community has come to express most forcefully is that of a close, direct and informal relationship. often local. Williams applies this emphasis,

"A (comparable) distinction is evident in midC20 uses of community. In some uses this has been given a polemical edge, as in 'community politics', which is distinct not only from 'national politics' but from formal 'local politics' and normally involves various kinds of direct action and direct local organisation, 'working directly with people', as which it is distinct

from 'service to the community', which has an older sense of voluntary work supplementary to official provision or paid service." (29)

Williams emphasises the complexity of the term and makes the following observation with regard to its current usage,

"Community can be the warmly persuasive word to describe an existing set of social relationships, or the warmly persuasive word to describe an alternative set of social relationships. What is most important, perhaps, is that unlike all other terms of social organisation (state, nation, society, etc.) it seems never to be used unfavourably, and never to be given an opposing or distinguishing term." (30)

Williams proceeds from this provisional clarificatory position to put his emphasis on the term community through an analysis of its use by different writers and their works. In the CC Williams further expresses the complexities of the term and its articulation but seeks to attribute to community a revised meaning different in kind from any of the uses set out in KW. Both the meaning and use of the term in CC are, for Williams, problematic and contentious, and therefore, as I will try to show, political. Williams argues that community is a matter of consciousness, of 'knowing' a community. He illustrates this claim by drawing a distinction between sense of community in the country and in the city. He writes,

"Thus it is often said, under the pressure of urban and metropolitan experience, as a direct and even conventional contrast, that a country community, most typically a village, is an epitome of direct relationships; of face-to-face contacts with which we can find and value the real substance of personal relationships." (31)

Williams admits that the differences in scale between country and city make the structure of the country community more visible. However, Williams qualifies this statement,

"But a knowable community, within country life as anywhere else, is still a matter of consciousness, and of continuing as well as everyday experience."
(32)

So for Williams, community is a matter of consciousness and of experience; a community can only be experienced authentically when it is fully known. Williams calls upon Dickens as a novelist who attempts to show people and their relationships in knowable, and importantly, communicable ways,

"The full extent of Dicken's genius can only then be fully realised when we see that for him, in the experience of the city, so much that was important, and even decisive, could not simply be known or simply communicated, but had, as I have said, to be revealed, to be forced into consciousness." (33)

'Forced into consciousness', this phrase has major implications for Williams's theory of education. For what it implies is that what we conventionally and instinctively know about our experience, our social relationships, and our communities is authentic, as Althusserian marxists would say, ideological. According to Williams, Dickens's method of writing allowed him to show that life in urban London in the nineteenth century was essentially unknowable and uncommunicable; this is also the aim of the CC which makes the work such an important contribution to thinking about education in the late twentieth century when aspects of community in particular and the external world in general are of such a degree of complexity that perception and consciousness have become such problematic categories.

Williams defines community in three connected ways; firstly, in terms of place; secondly, in terms of continuity and discontinuity; and, thirdly, in terms of consciousness. The first thing to note about the third reference is that, for Williams, the development of human consciousness is a social matter rather than the product of an individual mind. For Williams, 'place' is an important aspect of community but not so much as geographical location but as a socio-economic experience. In this definition 'place' has become a transformative term for class. However, Williams wishes to retain the imagery of 'place' in order to be precise and specific when defining community. Continuity and discontinuity are recurring themes throughout Williams's theoretical and creative writing. Again we have to return to socio-economic questions to enquire about the meaning and significance of these terms. For Williams, there exists a tension between continuity and discontinuity in individual minds and in the collective consciousness of communities. This is not a psychological tension but one determined by the

complexities and defining features of the capitalist system. A contemporary example, which I used in a different context in Chapter 4, to which Williams has often referred is the appeal to 'community' made by the members of the National Union of Mineworkers and their families and supporters', during the 1984 strike in the mining industry. Here communities, both physical and human, had been established by the historical movement of capitalism, in fact by capitalists, only to be destroyed or altered by these very same determinations. This is a very real example of the tension in the collective sense. An example of the tension in individual terms would be the case Williams provides of his, and others', experience of moving across communities, indeed across 'places'. The movement to which Williams refers is that from the working-class to the 'educated' or 'intelligent' class. Williams puts it this way,

"But to many of us now, George Eliot, Hardy and Lawrence are important because they cannot directly connect with our own kind of upbringing and education. They belong to a cultural tradition much older and more central in Britain than the comparatively modern and deliberately exclusive circuit of what are called the public schools. And the point is that they continue to connect in this way into a later period in which some of us have gone to Oxford or Cambridge; to myself, for instance who went to Cambridge and now teach there." (34)

The third element of Williams's formulation of community, consciousness, is associated with his ideas on perception which I will move to shortly. However, consciousness is central to the idea of community. Williams

insists on the significance of consciousness in terms of communities. In his argument consciousness is derived from a cultural, therefore community, base. This has led some marxists to criticise Williams reliance on culture as a theoretical tool when what he should be saying is that consciousness is a product of ideology, in the strongest sense, is ideology. This criticism does not detain Williams who insists on the term culture as a wider category that includes far more than the limited term, ideology, can include within its terms of reference. For example, culture includes education, art, philosophy, political-economy, etc.

In the CC, Williams argues that human consciousness is dependent on cultural experience and that it is possible to place a value on that experience in terms of authenticity. Williams attempts to provide evidence for his claim that authentic human experience resides with the working-class whether urban or rural. In this argument community is a conscious phenomenon with a strong element of 'place' included. The idea of 'place' is important because without it Williams is unable to include local, regional and national distinctions within his wider position.

How do the DCS planners incorporate Williams's idea of community into their course? Largely, it is through analysis and application of the works of authors Williams identifies as articulating authentic experiences of community in their writing. It is these writers who are able, through the articulation of their experience, to unravel the complexity of capitalist society, in other words to describe a 'knowable community'. As I mentioned earlier Williams's thoughts on community are inextricably linked to his ideas on perception.

Perception

The planners of the DCA course accept Williams's claim that contemporary capitalist society has become increasingly complex to the point where the inability to perceive and understand these complexities has profound consequences for its democratic pretensions. In the CC he examines the manner in which several writers have dealt with the problem of perception in these societies and its implications for democracy. Williams centres the problem of perception on three socio-economic structures; versions of the rural community, of the urban centre (the city), and of the altered relationship between the rural and urban experience. Williams's has two concerns with regard to perception; subjective or individual perception, opposed to 'mass society', and, the form of perception associated with the development of industrial and urban experience, collective consciousness. It is the latter that most interests Williams and which provides him with the material to develop a materialist theory of perception. I will take each of these two theories in turn as they are presented in the CC.

Perceptual Subjectivity

Williams describes this mode of perception between the country and the city in capitalist society as at once conventional and ideological. In the CC he examines the novels and poems of several writers who subscribe to this method of perception of the 'crisis' of industrial society and its effects on the rural order. The authors Williams uses to illustrate his arguments include Hardy, Wordsworth, Dickens, Eliot, Gaskell and Joyce. It is what Williams describes as 'excessive subjectivity' that has ideologically symbolised the experience of urban life. Williams quotes Hardy,

"Each individual is conscious of himself, but nobody conscious of themselves collectively, except perhaps some poor gaper who stare round with half-idiotic aspect." (35)

In the chapter 'Cities of Darkness and Light' Williams traces a lineage of this kind of response through Carlisle, Coleridge, Southey and Wordsworth. These writers had seen the processes of the Industrial Revolution as a cause of social atomism. Carlisle wrote in 1831,

"How men are hurried here; how they are hunted and terrifically chased into double quick speed; so that in self-defence they must not stay to look at one another." (36)

and later,

"There in their little cells, divided by partitions of brick or board, they sit strangers ... It is a huge aggregate of little systems, each of which is again a small anarchy, the members of which do not work together but scramble against each other." (37)

Williams includes Engels in this tradition of anti-urbanism. Engels living at the time in urban Manchester, wrote,

"The very turmoil of the streets has something repulsive, something against which human nature rebels. The hundred of thousands of all classes and all ranks crowding past each other, are they not all human beings with the same qualities and powers, and with the same interest in being happy? And have they not, in the end, to seek happiness in the same way, by the same means? ... The dissolution of mankind into nomads, of which each has a separate principle, the world of atoms, is here carried out to its utmost extremes." (38)

Wordsworth describes his own impression of being in the city in this couplet,

"All laws of acting, thinking, speaking man
Went from me, neither knowing
me or known." (39)

This was the form of the response to the urban experience. The individual experience, now atomised, perceived the new social agglomeration as alienation. This could quickly lead to the idea that there could be no such thing as 'society' or the 'collective', only individual responses and ways of seeing the new conditions of urban and industrial life. This view also underlined the similar ideological position of the 'naturalism' of organic rural life. A position Williams has rejected.

In the later part of the twentieth century one form or another of individual subjectivity has been the dominant method for identifying forms of consciousness and knowledge.

So for Williams, perceptual subjectivity is related to an underlying model of life and society. This philosophical position is then applied within a political programme. As Williams writes,

"Thus a loss of social recognition and consciousness is in a way made into a virtue: as a condition of understanding and insight. A direct connection is then forged between intense subjectivity and a timeless reality: one is a means to the other and alternative terms are no more than distractions. The historically variable problem of the 'individual and society' acquires a sharp and particular definition, in that 'society' becomes an abstraction, and the collective flows only through the most inward channels." (40)

This passage from the CC encapsulates Williams's assertion that the theory of perceptual subjectivity as a response to industrialism and urban capitalism is at once a philosophical and political position, positions that have endured to the present day. Further, Williams argues that the ideological position of perceptual subjectivity has been developed and refined to support the capitalist enterprise. The responses to the urban experience by the writers mentioned have been enshrined into a selective tradition. There has been a very different tradition and response to the urban experience to that generated by the theory of perceptual subjectivity. This tradition can be stated in terms of a theory of perception and ultimately a political position and political movement. It is to this tradition I will now turn.

Collective Consciousness

For Williams, collective consciousness is a theory of perception, a way of seeing the external world that best approximates what he defines as 'objective reality'. In a sense other ways of seeing the world, e.g. perceptual subjectivity, are at best false and at worst ideology. In the CC Williams discusses the work of writers who have recognised the tradition and method of 'collective consciousness' and articulated the theory in their creative writing. Williams is able, through an analysis of these writers, to indicate how perception, if it is to be authentic, must be

historically determined. This claim is reinforced in the CC by connecting the historical relation between the changing country and the changing city to forms of 'collective consciousness'. Williams makes the associated claim that historical development contains a persistent thread that finds an equivalence in persistent forms of 'collective consciousness'. The two writers Williams considers in the CC are Lawrence and Grassic Gibbon. Both writers in their different ways affirm the development of the city and the urban experience. I will look at Williams's thoughts on Lawrence and Grassic Gibbon in turn before examining their differences and similarities.

The source for the discussion on Lawrence and Grassic Gibbon is the chapter in the CC, 'The Border Again'. The concept of the 'border' is a recurrent theme in Williams's work and refers to the historical equation he poses between ideas of continuity, discontinuity, mobility, place, and what he describes as 'rootedness'. Williams contrasts the two writers with those who support more individualist and atomistic methods of perceiving the relation between country and city. he writes,

"It is easy to separate the country and the city and then the modes of literature: the rural or regional; the urban and metropolitan. The existence of just these separated modes, in the twentieth century, is significant in itself, as a way of responding to a connected history. But there are always some writers who insist on the connections, and among these are a few who see the transition itself as decisive, in a complex interaction and conflict of values." (41)

The 'border' which Lawrence inhabited was that between mine and farm and between both and the cultural 'border' between education and art. It is to this crisis of mobility that Lawrence responds in his novels and poetry. Lawrence attempts to reconcile the tension that exists between the attractions of the settled habits of mind of rural agricultural life and the vitality of the exploring mind of the less settled urban experience. The tension is partially resolved in an affirmation of the city and its collective experience. There is a sense in which Lawrence wishes to retain a reified image of the country in the new city. He writes,

"The great city means beauty, dignity, and a certain splendour. This is the side of the Englishman that has been thwarted and shockingly betrayed."
(42)

And again,

"We live in towns from choice, when we subscribe to our great civilised form. The nostalgia for the country is not so important. What is important is that our towns are false towns - every street a blow, every corner a stab." (43)

Lawrence yearns for a primitivism that the 'great city' should embody, and where,

"... new clean, naked bodies would issue to a new germination, to a new growth." (44)

This yearning expresses Lawrence's ideas on sexual morality, itself a product of the mobility and metaphorical borderland on which he resides. Lawrence recognises the historical forces which have provided the shape of the new city but rejects the contemporary outcome and, as a consequence, the underlying philosophy and morality (of capitalism) which have determined this outcome and these forces. Williams argues that the root of the falseness to which Lawrence refers is the system and spirit of possessive individualism which has, in Lawrence's words,

" .. frustrated that instinct of community which would make us unite in pride and dignity in the bigger gesture of the citizen, not the cottager."
(45)

So for Lawrence, capitalism and its supporting philosophy of possessive individualism is at once the cause of the welcomed human opportunities of the city and its alienating reality. Lawrence's complaint is in the way that the capitalist city has failed to develop the 'real urban' or 'civic side of man. These ideas have an important class and egalitarian basis. The following quotation expresses Lawrence's affirmation of the emancipatory promise of the city. He writes in The Rainbow,

"Her children, at least the children of her heart, had the complete nature that should take place in equality with the living, vital people in the land, not to be left behind obscure among the labourers." (46)

If Williams applauds Lawrence's constructive urban emphasis and his recognition of social and historical forces in shaping a determined present he parts company with Lawrence on the latter's idea of reconstruction. Williams believes Lawrence was torn between a physical and intellectual commitment which led him to recommend the authorities to,

"Pull down my native village to the last brick. Plan a nucleus. Fix the focus. Make a handsome gesture of radiation from the focus. And then put up big buildings, handsome, that sweep to a civic centre." (47)

For Williams, Lawrence is unable to reconcile the unconscious being of primary relationships and the conscious community of which he approves. On the credit side Lawrence recognises the 'persistent thread' of history which Williams argues is the determining feature of social relationships. Lawrence stresses the promise of the future but in the sense of a direct break with the past. In this way he rejects the possibility of social and political agencies of change as contaminated by the present. Lawrence's conclusions are anti-political. In contrast Grassie Gibbon's writing has a strong political emphasis while retaining many of Lawrence's premises.

As Williams points out in reading Grassic Gibbon's trilogy, A Scot's Quair it is possible to find many resemblances to Lawrence's work but there remains a significant difference. Grassic Gibbon emphasises a version of community which owes its continuity and persistence to a collective consciousness which became a social and political movement. A Scot's Quair charts the historical process of country and city from a small upland farm to the twentieth century streets of the hunger marches. Williams believes that what Grassic Gibbon is tracing is an experience that is distinctive to Scotland, Wales and Ireland,

Williams identifies a distinction between the experience of the English and Scottish, Welsh and Irish rural communities. It is a distinction, Williams is quick to point out, that can be exaggerated. However, as he writes,

"What has never quite happened in these countries, though in Scotland and Wales the penetration has been greater (and extensive industrialisation of parts of the countries has brought its own changes), is the social integration, however bitterly contested, of the English capitalist rural order." (48)

This sense of the persistence of different perspectives of community, a strong sense of independence from the dominant order, has been articulated by Grassic Gibbon into what Williams defines as,

".....a spiritual subsistence which much more than the actual system of ownership is the decisive social mode." (49)

It is this 'subsistence' which is the form of a 'collective consciousness' of a distinct socio-economic community. In the Scots Quair, Grassic Gibbon describes an effective continuity that stretches from pre-historic times through to a twentieth century community which continues to defy poverty. An important feature of the trilogy is the form of the language used by Grassic Gibbon. The language is local, specific, and powerful, expressing the rhythms and words of the community; it is a non-subjective mode of writing. The language is not that of Joyce (50) but shares some of that writer's concern to break with conventional and ideological forms of writing and communication. The world that this language creates is independent and self-subsistent.

The move that Grassic Gibbon charts from country to city of these communities survives the spiritual feeling of independence and self-subsistence. The strength of community is sustained in the radically altered conditions. Williams writes,

"A new and predatory system has taken the people for its wars, displaced them from their land, but:" (51)

quoting Grassic Gibbon.

"need we doubt which side the battle they would range themselves did they live today?" (52)

This continued and collective consciousness maintained for centuries is, in Williams's terms, a 'structure of feeling' that authentically charts the the historical relation between the country and the city. Williams explains the shape of this history,

"More historically and more convincingly, the radical independence of the small farmers, the craftsmen and the labourers is seen as transitional to the militancy of the industrial workers. The shape of a whole history is then decisively transformed." (53)

In its treatment of the General Strike as repeating in different contexts more traditional struggles, the novel embodies the history of the labour movement more authentically than Lawrence's primitivism. Whereas Lawrence denied any connection between an 'ugly' present and a revolutionary future Grassie Gibbon insisted that the displaced labourers, craftsmen and small farmers brought their radicalism to the cities, Williams expresses the point in this way,

"They learned, in altering conditions, new kinds of organisation, new directing ideas, which confirmed and extended a long spirit of bitterness, independence, and aspiration." (54)

Grassic Gibbon draws attention to an authentic example of collective consciousness in a phase of history which has largely gone unrecorded. This example of an affirmation of the city as a site for the revolutionary development of a 'collective consciousness' is set against reactionary views of rural retrospect, as in different versions of 'pastoral'. Williams emphasises this,

"A selection of the experience - the view of the landlord or the resident, the 'pastoral' or the 'traditional' descriptions - was in fact made and used, as an abstract idea, against their children and their children's children: against democracy against education, against the labour movement." (55)

Grassic Gibbon is important, for Williams, because he speaks for 'many who never got to speak for themselves in recorded ways'.

Both Lawrence and Grassic Gibbon, one the romantic the other the revolutionary, articulate a historical tradition, a 'collective consciousness', that is opposed to conventional and ideological accounts of the social relationships contained in the connected development of the country and the city. In the previous section I tried to describe the

dominant interpretation of the relation between the country and the city as outlined by Williams. In the dominant interpretation as enshrined in the literature the response to urbanisation was in a privatised subjectivity which provided a convenient fit with the capitalist philosophy of possessive individualism. In the last section I attempted to outline an alternative to this dominant interpretation of this history through the work of Lawrence and Grassie Gibbon. It is very clear that Williams endorses Grassie Gibbon's account of the 'collective consciousness' of the rural and urban working class and their organised representatives as the authentic response to the capitalist enterprise. More successfully than any other writer Williams believes Grassie Gibbon managed, in his trilogy, to effectively communicate an 'objective reality' and to perceive a 'knowable community'.

Williams refers to education throughout the CC but it is in the English Novel that we find his most sustained account of the role of education in the context of the altered rural and urban experience, particularly in his discussion of the work of Thomas Hardy.

Custom and Education

The designers of the Cultural Studies programme DCS lean heavily on Williams's account of the philosophical and ideological aspects of the

history of the relation between country and city. This account provides the designers with a framework within which they can work through their integrated methodology; the convergence of such 'disciplines' as history, philosophy, political theory and economics. This convergence, known effectively as Cultural Studies sees literary theory as a vehicle for applying their method. A role for education is at the heart of the method and of the concerns of the designers and of Williams himself. We can see this in Williams's analysis of Hardy's treatment of the relation between 'custom' and education.

The distinction Hardy makes between 'custom' and education represents a judgement of value. The best way to approach this distinction is to turn to Hardy's narrative in the Return of the Native. In this passage Clym Yeobright, the returned native, is in conversation with his mother,

"'I am astonished, Clym. How can you want to do better than you've been doing.?'

'But I hate that business of mine.....I want to do some worthy things before I die.'

'After all the trouble that has been taken to give you a good start, and when there is nothing to do but keep straight on towards affluence, you say.... it disturbs me, Clym, to find you have come home with such thoughts....I hadn't the least idea you meant to go backward in the world by your own free choice....'

'I cannot help it,' said Clym, in a troubled tone. 'Why can't you do....as well as others?' 'I don't know, except that there are many things other people care for which I don't....' 'And yet you might have been a wealthy man if you had only persevered.... I suppose you will be like your father. Like him, you are getting weary of doing well.' 'Mother, what is doing well?" (56)

As Williams writes in response,

"The question is familiar but still after all these years no question is more relevant or more radical." (57)

It is necessary then after making the connection between education and value and between education and affluence or 'doing well' to define what Williams, through Hardy, means by 'custom'. Williams attempts the definition in the form of a problem,

"....something that can be put, in abstraction, as the relation between customary and educated life; between customary and educated feeling and thought." (58)

or again,

"Most of us, before we get any kind of literary education, get to know and to value - also to feel the tensions of - a customary life." (59)

Williams moves on from making the distinction and stating the problem to attribute a positive role to education. He writes,

"Our education, ... gives us a way of looking at that life which can see other values beyond it: as Jude saw them when he looked across the land to the towers of Christminster. Often we know in ourselves, very deeply, how much those educated values, those intellectual pursuits, are needed urgently where custom is stagnation or where old illusions are still repeated as timeless truths. We know especially how much they are needed to understand change - change in the heart of the place where we have lived and worked and grown up," (60)

Williams's, retaining the contemporary emphasis, asserts that Hardy's insights are relevant to our own situation,

"For in several ways, some of them unexpected, we have arrived at that place where custom and education, one way of life and another, are in the most direct and interesting and I'd say necessary conflict." (61)

It is very clear that Williams equates 'custom' with class and then makes a consequent value judgement based on this. Hardy is more circumspect. Hardy's views on class are not as firmly rooted in structure as in classical Marxism; Williams's theory on class is less rigid than Marx but he nevertheless accepts the basic premises. 'Custom' for both these writers is that part of cultural life that is outside the influence of conventional education. However, education is not neutral and has precise origins. For both Hardy and Williams, these are class origins. Williams would want to retain this claim to the present. There can be no doubt that both Hardy and Williams agree that conventional education is destructive of 'customary life' because of its class origins, aims and affiliations. This is certainly more easily recognised in Hardy's time than the present where class distinctions are often less readily apparent. If Hardy and Williams's claims for the class-based origins of education are correct we then have to say that education has a strong political dimension. Both argue for the class-based nature of politics. Hardy stresses that all social classes experience a form of 'customary life' determined by their position in the socio-economic structure. This is at once a social observation and a value judgement. The form of 'customary life' experienced by the 'educated class' in both Hardy's and Williams's time is described as alienated and anti-human. There is evidence of this in Williams's critical work and in his and Hardy's novels. Here the clear inference is that the 'customary life' is preferable to the 'educated life' even though both writers admit to the life-enhancing potential of learning. Hardy and Williams hold to the possibility of an education that is not destructive of 'customary' life. In this context Williams writes,

"Without the insights of consciously learned history and of the educated understanding of nature and behaviour he cannot really observe at all, at a level of extended human respect.....That real perception of tradition is available only to the man who has read about it, though what he then sees through it is his native country, to which he is deeply bound by memory and experience of another kind: a family and a childhood; an intense association of people and places, which has been its own history." (62)

Williams is referring here to the experience of the returning Clym Yeobright to his native community from the 'educated' and affluent life of bourgeois Paris in Hardy's Return of the Native. The point Williams is making is that the 'customary' experience can only provide a limited perception of the world. A form of 'education' or more accurately, learning, is an essential requirement if an authentic perception or consciousness is to be realised. The form of 'education' available for both Hardy and Williams seeks only to disengage the values of the 'customary' life from the experience of education. Hence the return of Clym Yeobright who rejects the 'educated' life for the values of his native and customary community. This source of alienation between the 'customary' life and the available education recurs in Williams's work and is further expressed in this way,

"But the isolation which then follows, while the observer holds to educated procedures but is unable to feel with the educated class, is severe. It is not the countryman awkward in his town clothes but the most significant tension - of course with its awkwardness and its spurts of bitterness and nostalgia - of the man caught by his personal history in the general

structure and the crisis of the relation between education and class, relations which in practice are between intelligence and fellow feeling."

(63)

or again,

"That after all is the nullity, in a time which education is used to train members of a class and to divide them from other men as surely as their own passions." (64)

Here we begin to get to the nub of Williams and Hardy's contention that 'customary' life produces values which are more authentic and human than the values of possessive individualism of the educated class. The customary and authentically human values Williams affirms are based on conscious community, collective will and 'fellow feeling' and, for him, reside in the working-class, particularly the organised working-class. These values are in themselves insufficient for, if change is to be progressive, learning and knowledge are necessary in a form distinct from the 'education' of the affluent class. Clym Yeobright is unable to feel with the educated class, returns to the authentic values of the rural working class, but, according to Williams, this action, though understandable, merely results in resignation and a consequent inability to effect necessary change.

What is the form of this education of the dominant class? We have seen something of its values. In Hardy's novels Jude Fawley, Tess D'Urberville and Clym Yeobright are all examples, for Williams, of the force to aspire

to learning and of its negation through the difficulty all had in adjusting to values enshrined in the available and dominant form of education. Williams traces this 'structure of feeling' through to the present day in his chapter Education and British Society in the LR. He describes the form of the values of the dominant education as the 'ladder principle'. However, the criticisms Williams and Hardy make have greater force when they describe the reaction of those wish to hold to 'educated procedures'. In a particular forceful criticism Williams writes of the educated class,

"What Hardy sees and feels about the educated world of his day, locked in its deep social prejudice and in its consequent human alienation, is so clearly true that the only surprise is why critics now should still feel sufficiently identified with that world - the world which coarsely and coldly dismissed Jude and millions of other men - to be willing to perform the literary equivalent of that stalest of political tactics: the transfer of bitterness, of a merely class way of thinking, from those who exclude to those who protest." (65)

In an essay, 'Hardy and Social Class, written with his daughter Merryn, Williams states,

"....there was an attempt to negotiate the difficult relations between moral purpose, learning and teaching on the one hand, and social position, financial betterment on the other. When he came to observe the orthodox

educated world, Hardy saw, by contrast, a dull and false congruity, in which learning and privilege were taken to be naturally interchangeable."
(66)

later in the same essay Williams writes,

"Here at the point of arrival of the most ideal educational mobility, was a deep cancellation of the life of the mind by the specific limitations and perspectives of class." (67)

Williams proceeds to use the example of Jude Fawley's rejection to illustrate his point,

"The recognition is one necessary way of seeing the tragedy of Jude. The straightforward exclusion from established and orthodox learning is already a fact of social class. The contemptuous rejection of Jude is on class grounds alone, with no pretence of academic or educational judgement." (68)

and later,

"But the interaction of class and education functions also in deeper ways, which take it beyond the more negotiable, though still urgent and serious,

problems of access and mobility. The forms of this class education and especially the attachments to dead religion (Biblioll College), betray the ambitious scholar from outside the class: not only denying him access but in directing his mind towards limited class forms which, because of the social dominance, pass for general learning." (69)

Williams insists that the tragedy of Jude cannot be reduced to a 'mere fact of period', although because of subsequent legislation Jude might now be admitted. He writes,

"As we read Hardy's prolonged meditations on the real relations between learning and humanity, between educated and customary ways of feeling and thinking, and between the harsh necessities of material production and the painful complications of every effort towards a higher culture, we find ourselves moved beyond the formulas of the more familiar arguments and returned always to the question which is either left unanswered or at best ironically or precariously answered: 'what is doing well?'" (70)

The answer to this latter question, lies in the resolution of the tension between the educated and the customary life, or, as Williams writes,

"...the educated dumb in intensity and limited in humanity; the customary thwarted by ignorance and complacent in habit." (71)

This tension can only be resolved by the introduction of a fully democratic education which values 'customary ways of thinking and feeling', and which engages with the experience of 'ordinary' people. Williams clearly believes that the English education system is class-based and, therefore, reflects in content and process the values of the ruling ideology. 'Ordinary', or working-class people, reject the aims and values of this education, while continuing to value 'learning'.

It is clear that both Hardy and Williams support a version of learning which would encourage the collective and egalitarian values of the working customary life and which would also promote social and political change. This is Williams's theory of political education. The Cultural Studies programme uses Williams's work as a foundation for its course design. The Social Analysis method widens the theoretical parameters set by the initial position of Textual Analysis. The latter method sought to establish that culture was a 'transformative term for art'. The Textual Analysis method's task was to set out a theory of culture and the 'text' independent of both conventional literary criticism and different accounts of structuralism. Social Analysis differs in that it applies some of the principles established in the first method. One of these applications is the role and function of education in Britain as represented in the literature of the past two hundred years. The Social Analysis method allows Williams to refer these representations to social and political developments during this period. Education is central to these developments. Also central to the whole method is Williams's theory of class in capitalist society and its effects on education and the 'educated'.

In his founding texts of Cultural Studies Raymond Williams sought to represent working-class experience of industrialism. He did this through analysing the reactions to industrialisation from working-class writers such as Grassic Gibbon. A major preoccupation of Williams was the 'experience' of the working-class and how this was represented, or, as was more often the case, simply neglected and devalued. The concept of 'experience' had been conventionally regarded by socialist theorists as commensurate with ideology, certainly since Althusser. The easy slogan was 'all experience is ideology and, therefore, illusory'. Williams rejected this position for two reasons. Firstly, because of its elitism; theory was the only means by which ideology could be penetrated. Secondly, because this Althusserian position entailed devaluing all working-class experience in an incredible act of arrogance. Williams, in *Culture*, set about reconstructing representations of working-class experience in terms of its depth, richness and aspirations.

As I explained in the Introduction, Williams was teaching courses in *Culture and Environment* in 1946. These courses included teaching on television, radio, newspapers and film, work which he later included in *Comm*. In this latter work, further developed in *Culture*, Williams began to consider the effect on working-class culture and experience of the introduction of the 'mass-media'. The planners of Cultural Studies courses developed these two strands of Williams's thinking on culture; representations of working-class experience found in writing, and, the influence of the 'mass-media' on working-class culture and experience. Lastly, there was a third, largely theoretical, contribution Williams made to the founding of Cultural Studies; the inter-disciplinary, multi-disciplinary or integrated method of enquiry. For Williams, the term

Culture, as an object of study, included elements of aesthetics, philosophy, sociology, geography, and literary theory. More than this Cultural Studies is not to be presented as an intellectual innovation competing for curriculum space but should draw on the experience of those engaged in its study. As Williams has influenced it Cultural Studies has become an area for new debates and otherwise marginalised or silenced forms, e.g. working-class writing, women's studies, discourse centred on the relationship between class, race and gender. Later versions of Cultural Studies concentrate on the multi-cultural make-up of contemporary Britain, the debate about the nature of 'post-industrial' society, and studies of industrialism in its application to the Third World and 'global' development.

Cultural Studies is a programme of political education because it describes its aims as promoting social and political change. Its main objectives are to examine the categories of class, gender and race in an increasingly centralised and technological capitalist society through an analysis of the culture of that society. It is this form of enquiry, always with a strong political focus, that engaged Raymond Williams throughout his professional life and formed the basis of his writing on culture, society, politics and literature. It is this extensive corpus of writing from which the planners of the DCS course draw generously. It is interesting that the DCS course should have originated in an Extra-Mural University Department, in effect in adult education. As I explained in the Introduction, Williams spent the first fifteen years of his professional life teaching in adult education. During this period, 1946-60, he was either writing or gathering the materials for the works which have so decisively influenced designers of Cultural Studies programmes.

The preceding discussion of the CDS programme has been largely theoretical but I have also indicated some of the practical implications of the programme and how it differs from conventional approaches to the study of literary production, e.g. the use of film, video, advertising copy, together with other more orthodox texts. Before completing this chapter I will briefly consider the work of Edward Said and its implications for the CDS programme. This is a necessary task because Said provides an additional dimension to the programme while retaining most of Williams initial concerns. This dimension is concerned with the issue of race and community. Said's theoretical work has a general practical application, but I will concentrate on the specific application of his ideas to the Palestinian question.

Edward Said

A writer who shares the same concerns as Williams on cultural and political issues as Williams is Edward Said. However, Said offers a different perspective on these concerns, particularly on the issues of imperialism and racism. It is useful to look briefly at Said's ideas because they serve to illuminate Williams's more abstract concepts.

In the same way as Raymond Williams, Said has related the notion of political criticism to that of political education. As with Williams, Said's criticism is of capitalism and its values. The direction of Said's criticism is aimed at the values of imperialism and racism (the ideological construct of the 'other' is central to his argument) while Williams is more

concerned with class values.

Cultural Studies is opposed to systematic theories, e.g. structuralism and deconstructionism. Both Said and Williams have attempted to develop arguments which can adapt and criticise theory within its social, historical and political context. Structuralism, Deconstructionism, and certain versions of Marxism, according to Said and Williams, are examples of theories which ignore historical context and geographical location or place. The chief criticism of these systems, Said and Williams argue, is that if they are not influenced by location and temporal context then they are nothing but impenetrable systems incapable of influencing change. In this context Said distinguishes theory from 'critical consciousness',

"I am arguing, however, that we distinguish theory from critical consciousness by saying that the latter is a sort of spatial sense, a sort of measuring faculty for locating or situating theory, and this means that theory has to be grasped in the place and the time out of which it emerges as a part of that time, working in it and for it; then, consequently, that first place can be measured against subsequent place where the theory turns up for use." (72)

Said has argued that literary theory, whether of Left or Right, has developed into a 'philosophy of pure textuality'. This 'textuality' precludes itself from the social and political world, he writes,

"....a philosophy of pure textuality and critical non-interference has coincided with the ascendancy of Reaganism, or for that matter with a new

cold war, increased militarism and defense spending, and a massive turn to the Right on matters touching the economy, social services, and organised labour." (73)

Said wishes to affirm the connection between texts, human life, politics, societies and events. He gives some indication in The World, The Text and the Critic that the critical consciousness he wishes to develop in the reader is political consciousness,

"The realities of power and authority - as well as the resistances offered by men, women and social movements to institutions, authorities and orthodoxies - are the realities that make texts possible, that deliver them to their readers, that solicit the attention of critics. I propose that these realities are what should be taken into account by criticism and the critical consciousness." (74)

For Said, cultural theory is the method of analysing 'texts', and the development of a critical consciousness is the educational aim. In this crude outline of Said's contribution to cultural theory and the CDS course it is interesting to consider two examples that he employs, one theoretical, the other practical.

The theoretical example is Said's book Orientalism. Here Said puts to use his humanistic and political concerns for an analysis and description of the rise, development, and consolidation of Orientalism. The study of

Orientalism (essentially a Western construct) in the West, either in the form of ethnographic or literary studies, has produced a representation of the Arab as the 'other', an essentially alien and incomprehensible being. This ideology is especially damaging and effective in the light of the Arab-Israeli conflict and has resulted in a consensus in the West which is strongly felt by the Palestinian. Said writes,

"The web of racism, cultural stereotypes, political imperialism, dehumanizing ideology holding in the Arab or the Muslim is very strong indeed, and it is this web which every Palestinian has come to feel as his uniquely punishing destiny." (75)

Later Said adds,

"The nexus of knowledge and power creating the "Oriental" and in a sense obliterating him as a human being is therefore not for me an exclusively academic matter." (76)

Said sums up his version of what he takes cultural theory to mean when he writes,

"Too often literature and culture are presumed to be politically, even historically innocent; it has regularly seemed otherwise to me, and

certainly my study of Orientalism has convinced me (and I hope will convince my literary colleagues) that society and literary culture can only be studied together." (77)

The practical example Said uses to illustrate his argument is an application of his ideas on Orientalism. This example refers to America's relations and attitudes to Libya and the question of 'terrorism'. Said provided his example in the London Review of Books in 1986.. Said writes that the American people were, once a day, five days each week exposed to what a leading member of Reagan's government described as 'reality time'; the seven o'clock evening news on television. On 14 April 1986 'reality time' presented the American air strikes on Tripoli, one of which killed a child of the Libyan leader, Moamar Gadaffi. Said described the news representation of the event as follows,

"I have never seen anything like it, this display of capsule theatricality, manipulation, violence and unadulterated patriotism, and it still goes on."
(78)

Writing from the position of a Palestinian resident in the United States, Said contends that overriding the representation of the Tripoli attack by the U.S. media was the aspect of 'terrorism'. He writes,

"Terrorism overrides history, politics, economics and above all common sense. It has no new immediately graspable definition, it does not admit of negotiation or argument, its moral force cannot really be challenged except by terrorists, it is applicable virtually everywhere and to nearly everything at any time. Terrorists are, or have become, a Platonic essence: they never change, they have no history or characters, they simply terrorise." (79)

Said contrasts this notion of 'terrorism' with other possible descriptions,

"Terrorism has become a free-floating idea and is associated, not, for example, with Israel's policy in South Lebanon, nor with the bombing of Lebanon by the USSS New Jersey, nor with the atrocious record of the Nicaraguan Contras, nor with the South Korean, Phillipine, Haitain regimes nor with the Salvadorean right, nor with Jonas Savimbi, but with official US enemies whose \$fons et \$ \$origo\$, it seems, is Moamar Gadaffi." (80)

In this example Said attempts to demonstrate how the ideological construct of the 'terrorist' is derived from basic representations of the Palestinian and the Arab as the alien 'other' in Western literary modes. He attempts to trace this textual myth through to its social and political origins. The method Said uses is similar to the way in which Williams analyses the representation of class in the English novel in the CC. Said introduces an international dimension into the field of Cultural Studies in

his effort to connect literature with politics, economics and society in a redefinition of the 'text'. I will conclude this very brief reference to Edward Said's work on cultural theory by illustrating how Williams has influenced Said's intellectual position,

"But what I should like also to have contributed here is a better understanding of the way cultural domination has operated. If this stimulates a new kind of dealing with the Orient, indeed if it eliminates the "Orient" and "Occident" altogether, then we shall have advanced a little in the process of what Raymond Williams has called the "unlearning" of "the inherent dominative mode". (81)

The DCA course is a critical attempt to "unlearn the inherent dominative mode" which is at once educational and political. The course seeks to establish the relations between literary works, televisual productions, popular culture and advertising, etc., and, political, ideological and philosophical positions. The work of Raymond Williams and Edward Said are central to this task as a theoretical foregrounding. In their different ways both attend to questions of class and race but only marginally to the question of gender. This latter omission is covered elsewhere in the course but for reasons of space I have concentrated on these two male writers, one from a working class background in South Wales, the other from Palestine, exiled in America; both working from marginalised 'border' cultures. Both identify political consciousness as the primary aim of education, and, both include within their overall framework similar perspectives on perception, consciousness, community and class.

This concludes the section on the DCS course at the University of London, a course directed at adult London students. In the next section of this chapter I will consider the second example of a Cultural Studies programme, the work of the Centre for Urban Educational Studies. This is a practical example of a programme of political education in this case designed for schools.

Chapter 5.3 Urban Studies

In 1984 an Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) in-service report was published called Making Sense of Cities: the role of Urban Studies in Primary and Secondary Education (1). The report was the work of teachers and academics in London and was welcomed by the Chief Inspector of ILEA schools, Dr. G. Grace of Cambridge University's Education Faculty, and the Chair of the GLC's Planning Committee and member of the authority's Political Education Committee. The Working Party (2) that produced this report was set up by the Centre for Urban Educational Studies (CUES) (3) led by Bob Catterall, Tutor in Community Resources at CUES and Fellow in Multicultural Education at the Institute of Education, University of London. The Report was intended as a working document and basis for further discussion.

Making Sense of Cities claims to break new ground by integrating the theory and practice of urban studies in primary and secondary education. The Report offers practical examples of Urban Studies programmes for use in primary and secondary schools together with a comprehensive proposal for In-Service training for teachers. These examples include single subject and cross-curricular initiatives. The Hargreaves Report, 'Improving Secondary Schools' argued that 'the conceptual dichotomy between academic and practical learning must be challenged and overcome' (4). The authors of Making Sense of Cities claim that Urban Studies provides a concrete example of a way of overcoming this dichotomy. Furthermore, the authors claim that

their Report, although sharing the same concerns as Hargreaves, goes beyond it in attempting to translate theory into practice.

In the final section of this chapter I will examine Urban Studies as a programme of political education, consider the claims of the authors and attempt to show how Raymond Williams's work has proved a vital influence in providing a theoretical foundation for the programme.

Urban Studies as a Programme of Political Education.

Urban Studies differs from conventional programmes of political education through its emphasis on 'structures' as central elements of enquiry. This is illustrated in the the following passage,

"An assumption behind many ideas of change is often that change comes from above ('the top down model') or merely from one direction. Change may in fact come from many directions and frequently follows a 'bottom up' model (change arising out of pressures from below). The relationships between the different pressures for change are complex and require detailed investigation in particular situations. This would involve a consideration

of power structures and political processes, which is an important part of political education." (5)

The authors identify and describe these 'structures' as political because they are concerned with dispositions of power and control. What are the forms of these 'structures' and what denotes them as political? Before attempting to answer these questions it is necessary to clarify the meaning and use of the term 'structure'. The idea of 'structure' is central to the integrated or inter-disciplinary approach to learning encouraged by Williams, Said and the authors of the Cultural Studies Diploma. 'Structure' as an analytical tool facilitates the integrated approach by identifying the linkages operating between the city and the periphery, e.g. between the capitalist Western cities and cities of the Third World. The relation between 'structure', political change and the educational idea of integrated learning is central to Urban Studies' particular claim as a programme of political education. In this context 'structure' refers to historical, economic, political and linguistic structures whose internal relations are constitutive of a complex whole organisation, e.g. the 'western' or 'world economy', or, the economic, cultural and political factors that taken together form the relation between the Third World and the developed Western countries. This theory of 'structure' is close to the Marxist idea of classes or modes of production as determining other areas of human association. The Marxist conception of 'structure' should not be confused with the 'structuralist' claim that 'structures' are permanent constitutive human formations, or, defining features of human consciousness or even the human brain. The Marxist definition denies the existence of permanent constitutive formations or 'structures' that determine human

action and consciousness. Structuralist Marxism, often described as 'genetic structuralism', emphasises constitutive formations of a structural kind but sees these as repeatedly being established and broken down at different stages in history, there is nothing permanent about them. In this Marxist meaning of 'structure' human beings live in and through structures, hypotheses of structure are developed and followed by detailed analysis. This, in broad terms, is what Urban Studies sets out to do; to develop hypotheses of a structure (the city or urban configuration) and to proceed with a detailed analysis. Structuralism is in this sense an emphasis because humanism is not rejected altogether as in the 'structural linguistics' model which reduces human individual or moral motivations to matters of structure. The Marxist model retains the notion of human or social actions as agencies for political and social change within its structural emphasis.

The detailed analysis of the hypothesis developed by Urban Studies as an explanation of the development of the city and the experience of living within it, is the form of political education the model takes. This hypothesis and the form of its analysis cannot be fully understood until the sense of 'political', as used in Urban Studies, is fully clarified. This sense of political is unconventional in that it is not limited to government and associated political institutions but more to do with theories of the possession and exercise of power and relations of power in an international context. The sense in which 'political' is applied by Urban Studies is not concerned with formal studies of e.g. political procedures and institutions, the comparative influence of republics and monarchies, or, the rate and extent of political reform, although it never completely disassociates itself from them. 'Political' as applied by Urban

Studies refers to a structural process that has its roots in history and its present in the form of economic, cultural and financial international relations. The actual process of urbanisation and the fact of the city is itself highly political. A programme of education that addresses itself to this definition of the political needs to reflect this extended application.

An example of what constitutes a programme of political education for the Urban Studies planners might be helpful at this stage for several reasons. Firstly, to consider the authors claims to have overcome the dichotomy between academic and practical learning. Secondly, to consider their claim to have integrated theory and practice. Thirdly, to examine their claim that political education should be considered in the light of political action. Lastly, recognise the influence of the work of Raymond Williams on the programme.

Urban Studies: Beyond the Present Curriculum.

The authors of Making Sense of Cities include in their document a detailed proposal for a course in Urban Studies designed primarily for Inset purposes but with sufficient detail to insert without much modification into a secondary school syllabus. The authors recognise the difficulties

the latter option would present, e.g. constraints of examination syllabuses in Years 4, 5 and 6, and the rigid separation and stern defence of discrete subjects by teachers, advisors and senior educationists. However, despite the conventional resistance to radical initiatives in education the authors point out that their work is part of a tendency. I refer here to two ILEA publications, The Hargreaves Report and the policy statement Race, Sex and Class (6). Making Sense of Cities takes the form of further exploration of the issues and possibilities raised in these two documents. I will examine these issues and possibilities and the theoretical justification the authors make for the course before attempting a more detailed analysis.

The authors wish to stress several theoretical aspects of the programme, these are;

- the importance of an overall understanding of urban phenomena as a totality and not just as a series of discrete topics, issues or problems.
- the need to question the meaning of the term 'urban'.
- the international or global context for urban studies.
- the crucial nature of employment and economic considerations.
- the centrality of the inter-related issues of race, gender and class to an adequate approach to urban studies and to education in general.

In the two ILEA documents just mentioned these aspects of Urban Studies are included in 'social, political and moral education' in Race, Sex and Class, and, 'personal and social education' in the Hargreaves Report. Both documents emphasise that these programmes should serve to integrate a wide range of the school's aims and practices or, to provide a bridge between the school's academic and pastoral work. In Race, Sex and Class 'social, political and moral education' is referred to as the area in which,

"All pupils/students should be learning about the theory and practice of government, rights and responsibilities, the rule of law, social justice, peaceful resolution of conflict, the role of the police, the role of the mass media, economic development, production and trade, political change. Such concepts and topics should be studied with regard to world society as a whole as well as to Britain in particular. All pupils/students should be learning to identify, resist and combat racism in their own sphere of influence." (7)

'Personal and Social Education' as referred to in the Hargreaves Report is held to include; community studies, comparative religious education, industrial education and work experience, mass media and leisure, moral, political and economic education, the social impact of science and technology, social and life skills and information technology.

According to the authors of the Urban Studies programme,

"The policy statement emphasises the notion of resistance to racism, only refers to class and has no specific reference to actual processes of learning; whereas the Hargreaves Report refers to class largely in terms of deprivation, does not refer to resistance and includes extensive reference to actual processes of learning." (8)

In an attempt to move beyond these two provisional recommendations Urban Studies attempts to arrange its programme around, among other matters, relationships between class, notions of resistance and processes of learning in relation to resources. Class, race and gender are the primary theoretical features of Urban Studies particularly in terms of social and political resistance. We can see how this integration is attempted by examining the following theoretical aspects of the course:

1 . The establishment of a strong link between two areas of study often undertaken as largely separate enterprises, Urban Studies and Urban Development, particularly through the process and concept of urbanisation;

2 . Emphasising the contribution of

a) one well-established area of study that is nevertheless neglected in Urban Studies: literature and 'English';

b) three new areas of study: cultural studies, media studies and political economy;

3 . Seeking to relate:

a) experiential understandings developed through descriptive and creative work in a range of media (including art, photography and writing) as well as the use of literature and films:

b) structural understandings developed through analytical work.

4 . Seeking to relate through off-site as well as school-based studies

a) local or community struggles in relation to issues of race, gender and class to:

b) city-wide (and city-region wide), inter or transnational and global struggles;

5 . Seeking to relate current issues and struggles not only to long-term processes but also to political choices that can be made about possible or alternative futures with regard to urban life and, in particular, work.

From this outline of the main features of the course we can begin to assess the claims of the course planners stated earlier. These were, that the programme achieves an integration of theory and practice; overcame the dichotomy between academic and practical learning; recognises political action as an essential component and outcome of political education. Lastly, we need to examine the influence of the work of Raymond Williams on the content of the course and its theoretical foregrounding.

Theory and Practice

The relation between theory and practice has long been a primary concern of socialist political thought from Marx onwards. There is not space here to pursue this complex line of enquiry only to say that this relation applies particularly to socialist thinking about education. A socialist theory of education is required to demonstrate precisely how theory can be translated into effective practice. In the case of the Urban Studies programme this translation is achieved, so the authors claim, through the way in which it takes theory (for example, its analysis of capitalism and imperialism and how these economic and political structure have produced the derived economic and cultural structures of racism, sexism and class) and develops it into a practical programme. I will examine concrete examples shortly. However, even if this primary task of translating theory into practice is achieved the authors are required to fulfil the further condition that the

outcome of a programme of socialist political education must necessarily be concerned to facilitate political choice and action.

Urban Studies presents a number of problems at a theoretical level which need to be addressed before tackling the theory/practice equation. The first of these problems refers to notions of the 'urban' and it is important to clarify the position of the authors of Making Sense of Cities on this question. There are a number of theoretical formulations of the 'urban', a survey of these is contained in Making Sense of Cities. Inevitably, these different approaches have points of intersection or similarity but the differences are decisive and largely ideological in character. I will concentrate on the emphases preferred by the authors of the Urban Studies Working Party responsible for Making Sense of Cities. These, as described by Gerald Grace are, the socio-cultural emphasis and the Marxist or Political Economy emphasis.

a) The Socio-Cultural emphasis.

For Grace this model of the urban,

"..... uses the term urban to imply a social situation in which a marked variety of culture, life-style, religious, political and ideological application is expressed in a concentrated form, particularly in central areas of metropolitan cities." (9)

Studies of the urban are then concerned to map these different cultures and their inter-action. Advocates of this emphasis set out to study the experience of these groups in terms of accommodation and resistance to the city and the wider society. As Grace writes,

"The urban denotes a particular arena in which the struggle for basic resources and services - housing education, health, welfare and recreation becomes unusually salient and visible." (10)

These studies place a heavy stress on the political aspects of struggle emphasising that the urban or the city compound issues of inequality on class, race, culture and grounds. The model of Urban Studies developed in Making Sense of Cities takes this interpretation of the urban as a starting point and from this sets about the task of analysing the extent to which the 'unequal' groups have power over resource allocation. These studies are based upon the premise that all cities, whether in capitalist or Eastern European countries, make visible injustice and excessively unequal power relations. Grace points out,

"This comparative and social structural view of the urban emphasises the linkages between cities and their wider framework, with particular reference to the distinction of power and resources." (11)

The socio-cultural emphasis of the urban is limited when it takes as its object of study the 'city' abstracted from its wider connections, e.g. national and inter-national, economic, political and cultural networks. When these connections are made as in the following model, study of the urban becomes more pertinent in political terms.

The Marxist Emphasis

The Marxist emphasis on the urban gives a particular edge to questions of struggle and conflict and to wider networks and structural locations. In a pure Marxist analysis of the city, the term urban is a suspect one, which, in the use of terms like 'urban culture' and 'inner-city problems', diverts attention from wider socio-political features in society. For Marxists, the metropolitan city represents, as the cultural expression of capitalist industrialisation, the most probable site for class struggle and for the generation of political consciousness and action; some evidence in support of this claim are the 'riots' which occurred in many English cities in the early 1980's. Similar examples have occurred in North American and Latin American cities in recent years. I intend to comment upon the educational implications of this claim shortly. To continue the exposition of the Marxist interpretation of the urban, the fundamental Marxist position on the urban question is that formulated by Grace,

"Marxist theorising emphasises that cities and urban phenomena in general must be looked at in relation to the mode of production, distribution and exchange which has created them. " (12)

This remains the essential Marxist position from which cities and the urban must be identified as secondary and derived determinations. In other words, the urban in Marxist theory is rooted in political economy rather than cultural experience. This is a problem for the authors of a Cultural Studies programme who defend a socialist perspective on the urban.

A brief description of these two interpretations of the nature of the urban was necessary in order to clarify theoretical difficulties on the urban question. It is now necessary to assess more closely the authors claim that their version of Urban Studies successfully integrates theory and practice. The efficacy of the related claims that the authors have overcome the practical/academic learning dichotomy, and that political education and political action should be coincidental depend upon the success of the former claim. Grace approaches these questions in this way,

"We may make a positive claim for activities in urban studies. A claim that in our urban studies we are progressively making visible fundamental social contradictions, an activity which will stimulate processes of socio-political and educational change. A claim that we are challenging notions of cultural dominance through our celebration of cultural comprehensiveness, language variety and community curriculum resources. A claim that we are challenging territorial injustices and

inequalities of power through attempts at community education and action in inner-city areas." (13)

Countering possible criticism from socialist educational theorists who see all education in liberal capitalist societies as forms of ideology and therefore counter-revolutionary, Grace continues,

"This is not, I believe counter-revolutionary so long as the particular teacher, social worker, research worker or community educator constantly seeks to locate his activity in the wider socio-political and historical framework. If the dangers of immersion and of limited theoretical vision can be avoided, then I believe that urban studies have a truly liberatory potential." (14)

What then is the evidence for these ambitious and far-reaching claims for Urban Studies? Firstly, it is necessary to remember that unlike the Cultural Studies programme discussed in the earlier part of this chapter, Urban Studies is school-based, although extended to include Youth Work and Community Education. The proposals for a working curriculum of Urban Studies put forward by CUES are intended for city schools and Youth Centres and take account of the constraints these institutions place on radical curriculum initiatives. However, a number of schools have implemented these working proposals often operating in conjunction with CUES, particularly in London. The evidence for the claims made by Grace and others can be examined more closely by studying one of these programmes. This task will

also be useful in revealing some of the tacit theoretical and philosophical assumptions of Urban Studies. Before looking at this programme developed by CUES it is necessary to make the point at this stage that there exist a variety of such programmes developed by CUES and others. Some use political economy or empirical analysis as their starting points, e.g. development studies, economic surveys and historical analysis. The example chosen here is decisively influenced by Raymond Williams' theoretical and creative work.

The example I will consider is the programme Urban Studies: Beyond the Present Curriculum and in particular Sessions 17-25: Three Worlds: Linkages and Prospects. The course, as I previously explained, is designed as a one year In-Service training course or for two to three years work in schools. The Sessions of the course are arranged as follows;

SESSIONS 1-8: Urban Contexts in Britain

SESSIONS 9-16: Third World Contexts

SESSIONS 17-25: Three Worlds: Linkages and Prospects

Sessions 17-25 cover a number of issues ranging from Black Consciousness and the New Racism; Representations of 'The State of the World'; The City: Socio-Economic Systems and Eco-Systems; The British Experience Reconsidered; Brave New World? Streamlining the Cities'; and Community, City and Curriculum. Williams's influence is felt throughout these issues and the manner in which they are presented. The major themes of these sessions and of the course in general are, experience, imagination and literature, terms which re-occur throughout Williams's work. As the course planners suggest,

"It will be argued that cities are essentially related to actual and potential consciousness of an extended -not merely 'local' - territorial base. The cultural dimensions of race or ethnicity, gender and class are particularly crucial here. In so far as neither the empiricist nor Marxist approaches include such forms of consciousness in their analyses - this may be related to the scant attention given to experience, imagination and literature -there is a need to explore, as already suggested, a third approach (one that synthesises but goes beyond the other approaches). (15)

This third approach is at the heart of Williams's theory of cultural materialism, an attempt to synthesise Marxism with his ideas on culture and consciousness (see Ch.1). Experience, imagination and literature are at the centre of Williams's theory of political education. How are these themes incorporated into this particular section of the Urban Studies course, which itself attempts a fusion of economics, politics and cultural consciousness?

The basic text for this section of the course is Williams's CC. This text provides the theoretical foundation from which other texts, largely fictional in this section of the course, can be related to the major themes of experience, imagination and literature. In the CC, Williams charts the changing attitudes to the country and the city as they are portrayed in English literature from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries and relates them to social and political developments. In this method of social and political analysis Williams places literature, as the record of articulations of forms of cultural consciousness, at the centre of our understanding of social and political development and experience. (For a fuller discussion of Williams ideas on English and literature see Chs.1 and 2). The course designers apply Williams's method in the CC to a wider arena. For example, Third World urban situations and their cultural expressions in literature. Cultural expressions of class, race and gender are related, in the course, to urban economic and political development and change (e.g. mass unemployment, urban redevelopment, manifestations of racism). To understand how the method operates in these examples it is useful to consider two of the major themes, experience and imagination, in more detail (the third theme, literature is covered more fully in Ch.2).

Experience

The authors of the programme make a distinction between 'experience' and education on the one hand, and 'theory' and 'structure' on the other. They write,

"..... it may be useful to clarify one important implication of this approach. This relates to confrontations that often dominate or underlie educational debate between an emphasis on 'experience' and 'education' on the one hand, and on 'theory' and 'structure' and 'study' on the other. (for example, 'development education' is sometimes opposed to 'development studies' in this way)." (16)

These 'confrontations' refer to the argument as to whether education is entirely contaminated or corrupted by ideology to the extent that it has become an agent of the dominant class, gender or culture. In this argument 'theory' and 'structure' rather than 'experience' are regarded as the necessary starting points for analysis, as the means of penetrating ideological constructs and illusions. The authors of Making Sense of Cities on the other hand do not fully accept either position but allocate to experience and thus education, a major role in opposing dominant ideologies. They write,

"A starting point in this course outline has been with experience. ... Since much work which stresses experience in education seems to have difficulty in reaching a point at which whole areas of theoretical and empirical work are considered, it is important at this stage to emphasise the notion of urban 'studies' though without,, in any way undervaluing the role of 'education' as it relates to experience and imagination." (17)

Urban Studies wishes to retain the political significance of experience and education in combating cultural, class and gender domination while at the same time recognising the influence of theoretical and structural analysis. Courses such as 'Beyond the Present Curriculum' and the MA in Urban Studies at Kings College, London are regarded as means of gaining theoretical awareness and overcoming professional immersion.

Experience is put to another use by the authors as an educational, specifically pedagogical, method. It is a method heavily influenced by Raymond Williams in terms of theory and content; having touched on the theory I will now consider the content.

The dominant emphasis in the course is on the city in relation to socio-economic systems (bio-physical or eco-systems in relation to the city are also important aspects of the course, Williams's exploration of this theme from a historical perspective in Cobbett (18) is particularly relevant). Sessions 21 and 22 of the course include study of the film So That They Can Live (19), a documentary about 'the social, cultural and political forces which shape the lives of a working class family in South Wales today.' The film inter-relates themes taken up in the course; history, culture, education, employment, industry and communication. The film also makes use of the CC. Using the film as a basic text Sessions 21 and 22 'include the consideration of a range of possibilities for restructuring British industry and settlements. From analysis of the experience of a South Wales community the course then offers non-sexist and non-racist alternative uses of 'social space' through proposals for future types of settlement. The pedagogical implications referred to include the use of 'off-site' centres in this case the Abergavenny Field Studies Centre and the border country

around Pandy about which Williams writes in his novels. The authors claim that in these sessions they succeed in integrating experience and theory in an educational programme with a strong political emphasis.

The move from studying and respecting the experience of a particular class and cultural group (and the same applies to individual or groups of students) to positing an alternative future derived from concrete facts, through a programme of political and social action, depends, claim the authors, upon making a connection between imagery, imagination and knowledge.

Imagination

In Ch.2 I examined Williams account of the role of imagination as expressed in WS. In this chapter I will consider how the planners of the Urban Studies programme have applied this account. In WS, Williams's account of imagination was counterposed to other accounts which defined imagination as a privileged and creative, elite ability possessed by particular authors. In CC Williams applied his theory of the imagination to his analysis of the development of literature, society and politics over four hundred years. The Urban Studies course is a concrete educational application of this theory. At the centre of this theory is a claim for the importance of representational fiction as a bridge between 'the factual' and 'the imaginary'. The treatment of this theme is contained in the early, more

theoretical parts of the course. In Session 6 entitled 'Scenarios,' 'the role of the imagination' as a theme is equated with 'scenario' (i.e. 'an account or synopsis of a projected course of action or events'):

'projected' is the key term to keep in mind. 'Scenario' is used to emphasise the idea of linking 'imagination' to 'facts'. The authors use part of a series produced by Thames TV entitled The English Programme. This part, which acts as a starting point for Session 6, follows a project from George Green's School, London. The programme shows two stages of their school's work, 1) their immediate response to the desolation of parts of Docklands in London and, 2) a study of the history of the docks aimed at helping the students to 'repopulate and re-animate its current desolation'.

The programme, as part of a unit on poetry, was designed 'to show how a poet's choice of imagery depends on knowledge of, and attitudes to, a particular subject. As the course planners explain,

"The intention here is to develop further that sense of the connection between imagery and imagination and knowledge (as well as attitudes) in relation to fiction." (20)

A novel is also chosen in each section of the programme to illustrate the difficult process of building an adequate bridge between 'the factual' and 'the imaginary'. One of these novels Orwell's 1984, selected because of its importance as a contribution to global 'scenarios', for the use made of it by 'world-systems' theorists and, for its exploration of the key contrast between areas of urban decay and semi-rural retreats, illustrates

clearly Williams's concern to relate imaginative representations to political and social analysis.

The idea of imaginative 'scenarios', illustrated through examples in poetry and novels, is a crucial one in Urban Studies. The device is a central element of the theory of political education that lies behind the course. This sense of political imagination, with its influences on knowledge, attitudes and experience, is closely related to the stress the course planners put on the necessity for a programme of political education to both integrate theory and practice and to overcome the dichotomy between academic and practical learning. As with Williams, political literacy and understanding are insufficient conditions for a programme of political education because they fail to provide a vision for political action and change.

Experience, imagination and literature are major themes of Williams work as I have tried to show in earlier chapters. The Urban Studies course developed by CUES applies these theoretical themes in the context of a practical programme of political education. I will now consider how this programme meets its requirements of overcoming the academic/practical learning dichotomy and providing an integration of theory and practice; these two requirements are inextricably linked.

Academic/Practical Learning Dichotomy.

There are a number of practical proposals the course planners put forward for overcoming this dichotomy which, if successful, mark off Urban Studies as a programme of political education which highlight the fostering of political commitment and change. These proposals have learning and pedagogical implications which in themselves derive from arguments in philosophy of education. I will consider the most important and radical of these proposals, for the extensive use in the course and, by implication all such programmes of political education, of 'off-site' investigation. The course authors repeat the Hargreaves Report's recommendations for the establishment of Urban Study Centres. It is useful to include the proposal here in full and examine briefly a practical example, before considering its educational and philosophical implications.

"Intensive Off-Site Investigation"

a) Part of the challenge and opportunities presented by urban studies and multicultural education can be met by moves towards more 'open' schools. What is also required, however, is periodic further exploration of classroom based learning by means of intensive off-site investigation.

b) Such work often requires an off-site study base. This must involve the identification of, and negotiaton for, possible off-site study bases (including Teachers' Centres', buildings or space in buildings that become

available through decisions taken with reference to falling rolls). Urban Study Centres provide a specialised example of the potential of such study bases.

c) Key matters of school organisation, curriculum development and teachers' working arrangements are involved in the development of such work. (For a secondary school, some of these matters have been documented on the basis of work with Woodberry Down and South Hackney schools - see the CUES Report on 'Community-based Education').

d) Such work has important implications for the debate about progressive education (child-centred versus knowledge-based, collaboration v. investigation, etc.) and invisible v. visible pedagogies." (21)

So far as can be understood no such centres have been introduced in the ILEA or elsewhere in Britain. However, collaborative projects have been initiated and provide examples of the type of substantial work Study Centres could successfully extend. One of these projects is the work undertaken with London schools in association with CUES by the Cockpit Cultural Studies Department(22). A key element in this work has been to promote the value of both the political economy of urbanism as an aim, and 'images' or fantasy within a pedagogical method. The work of the Cockpit is based on photography using the experiences of young people, e.g. youth cultures, hobbies and family background, as raw material for project, display and

exhibition work. Much of this work takes place on location in places familiar to the students.

A further example of an off-site project is the involvement of East London schools with the Joint Docklands Action Group. The JDSAG is a campaigning group set up to fight what it describes as 'the monetarist devastation' of East London. A substantial amount of this work takes place 'off-site' and its main themes are, social decline or devastation and racism. As the course notes outline,

"The possibility that monetarism is a key contributory factor to that decline and to the form and intensity of racism or that no such connection can be traced would be examined." (22)

A leading member of JDSAG defends an analysis of the Docklands issue as Political Struggle. Political organisation, propaganda/media action and research are all central components of this analysis. As the JDSAG point out, it is not sufficient to study action or teach about politics. It is necessary to be part of a political movement.

There exist other examples of programmes of political education that make use of off-site facilities; of these the Notting Dale Technology Centre is probably the best example (23).

All these projects insist that off-site provision offers a more appropriate setting for a programme of political education than that of the traditional

school and classroom. These projects provide practical examples of how the dichotomy between academic and practical learning can be overcome through the use of different media and modes of experience. Integration of theory and practice is achieved through the application of political analysis to concrete political situations, often described as political struggle. The influence of Raymond Williams is felt throughout the Urban Studies course through his theoretical and creative work.

A criticism of the course is that its implementation can only be marginal, confined to a small number of projects involving an equally small number of students. There is also little consideration given to outcomes, e.g. do students necessarily develop a radical political consciousness through participation in these projects? A further criticism might be: is the path to political alignment, struggle and political change really one of political education rather than the unacceptable moulding of attitudes and dispositions? The course planners cannot be held responsible for the extent of the implementation of their courses and their more general inclusion in schools, colleges and universities. The identification of outcomes is predominantly a research question. The charge of indoctrination, it can be assumed, is unlikely to deter the course planners. This is because they claim their method successfully identifies extensive levels of political, social and economic injustice in terms of sexism, racism and class inequality. The aim of the method is to expose these injustices and to consider ways in which change can be made effective. The courses are politically committed examples of political education in the way that anti-racism and anti-sexism programmes aim to both reveal the extent of sexism and racism, and to change sexist and racist attitudes and practices. The course planners claim that their aims are democratic and this is

reflected in the methods and course content, for example, in the way in which the students cultural, and social 'experience' is integrated within the course. The pedagogical methods of the course are also claimed to be democratic. There is some evidence to substantiate this claim that the student-centred and exploratory teaching methods are encouraged as against teaching methods where the teacher offers a prescribed body of knowledge for the students' consumption.

Conclusion

To conclude this analysis of the Urban Studies course I will consider its philosophical implications. The central philosophical ideas behind the Urban Studies programme echo Williams's thoughts on perception and knowledge examined in the first part of this chapter. Essentially Williams maintains that the way we perceive the world and the knowledge we have of it are only surface phenomena; this notion is derived from Marx's theory of the appearance/essence distinction in which Marx claims that the world with which we have direct and immediate contact is, in fact, a distortion of an underlying reality. Engels took this further to include the total operation of the workings of nature; in Engels this operation amounted to a mechanistic and scientific process. More modestly, Marx identified economics, more specifically, the means of production, as the essence which itself is the 'reality' of an objective world. Phenomena which disguise

this essence, e.g. including political procedures, education, art, etc., are ideological distortions designed to present a surface appearance that supports the existing social and economic order.

The Urban Studies authors accept this philosophical argument and add a further dimension, which is implied in Marxism but is made explicit in the philosophical ideas of structuralism. The authors undertake the theoretical, but also educational task, of relating surface phenomena or appearance to underlying structural formations. Thus linkages are made between phenomena that occur in, e.g. London Docklands or the Jamaican urban economy, to structural and causal formations such as the international financial markets or the processes of development and international trade. In addition to this theoretical task the authors relate cultural representations of these urban situations to structural formations. The idea of power structures is central to political education in this respect.

An aim of education in this argument is to reveal underlying essential structures and their ideological purpose. A further aim, as we have seen, is to facilitate action that will result in altering these structures; political education is equated with political action and change. Political action is here associated with 'bottom up' methods of political change rather than the 'top down' model conventionally taught. These aims of education have pedagogical implications to do with the organisation of schools as well as staff/student relationships. A successful introduction of the Urban Studies course into a British state school would require a more democratic set of procedures in these schools than exists at present. Teachers and students would need more flexible working arrangements the

traditional teaching methods require. Particularly important would be the use of 'off-site' provision. Students would be encouraged to follow more independent learning procedures which would test the knowledge and authority of the teacher. The implications are that the process and content of education would become a more negotiated, democratic and collective enterprise.

The theoretical and cultural analysis of Raymond Williams is at the centre of the Urban Studies and Cultural Studies programmes examined in this chapter. Within their different emphases these two programmes of political education represent examples of educational practices which are directly derived from Williams's work. Urban and Cultural Studies and the derived Media Studies represent the most exhaustive and coherent of educational programmes so far developed from Williams's theoretical, critical and creative work.

Notes

1. Williams's Culture and Society, E.P. Thompson's Making of the English Working Class and Richard Hoggart's The Uses of Literacy are generally accepted as the founding works of the 'humanist' tendency.
2. The work of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham, directed by Stuart Hall, is associated with the 'structuralist' tendency along with Terry Eagleton's Literary Theory, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1983.
3. E.P. Thompson, William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary, Merlin, London, 1977.
4. see T. Eagleton, S. Hall et al.
5. L. Jackson, The Cultural Critics, RKP, London, 1979.
6. L. Althusser, For Marx, Allen Lane, London, 1969. L. Althusser & E. Balibar, Reading Capital, Verso, London, 1970.
7. T. Eagleton, op. cit.
8. Stencilled Occasional Papers, CCCS, University of Birmingham, 1970's.
9. M. Arnold, Cultural and Anarchy, Murray, 1860.
10. Ibid.
11. The philosophical arguments in defence of relativism are derived from Kant, see C. Taylor, 'Neutrality in Political Science', 3rd. series, eds. P. Laslett & W. Runciman, reprinted in A. Ryan, The Philosophy of Social Explanation.
12. I. Newton, Principia, 1686.
13. F.R. Leavis, Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture, Cambridge, 1930.
14. Williams, Culture and Society, p. 333.
15. D. Hargreaves, Challenge for the Comprehensive School, RKP, London, 1982.
16. Williams, New Left Review 82, Nov-Dec, 1973.
17. Urban and Cultural Studies, see Parts 2 and 3 of this chapter.
18. Williams, Marxism and Literature, p. 108-109.
19. Williams, Culture, p. 12.
20. Williams, Ibid. p.12.
21. Williams, Ibid. p.12-13.
22. Williams, Ibid. p.13.
23. Berger, Ways of Seeing, Penguin, London, p.149.
24. Ibid. p.151.
25. Ibid. p.153.
26. Ibid. p.131.
27. Jackson, The Cultural Critics, p.166-167.
28. Ibid. p.167.
29. Williams, Culture, p.13.
30. see A. Porter and B. Crick, Political Education and Political Literacy, Longman, 1978, and, J. and P. White, 'The Programme for Political Education: A Critique', Teaching Politics, 5(3), 1976.
31. E. Said, Travelling Theory, Orientalism, and The World, The Text and The Critic.

Part 2.

1. Certificate and Diploma in Cultural Studies, Department of Extra-Mural Studies, University of London. A three year modular and inter-disciplinary course designed for adult students.

2. The Centre for Urban Educational Studies was set up in 1981 by Bob Catterall and Ruth Mendelsohn and is based at the Institute of Education, University of London. An offshoot of the Centre is the London Urban Studies Working Party (Inset).
3. Internal outline proposal for the Diploma.
4. Ibid.
5. Williams, Writing in Society.
6. see F.R. Leavis, Education and the University, London, Chatto and Windus, 1961.
7. see M. Arnold, Culture and Anarchy and I. Richards, Principles of Literary Criticism (1926).
8. Williams, Writing in Society, p.181.
9. Ibid. p.181.
10. Ibid. p.181.
- 11.. There are an extensive list of working-class written autobiographies available from independent publishers, particularly Virago.
12. op. cit. p.181.
13. Ibid. p.184.
14. Ibid. p.184.
15. The film, Country and the City, was made independently by Mike Dibb.
16. Said's, Travelling Theory and Orientalism have been heavily influenced by Williams's work as Said has recognised, the latter, however, has the issue of race closer to the centre of his work than does Williams.
17. Williams, The Country and the City, p.304.
18. see Ibid, Ch. 24.
19. see also note 11.
20. Williams, The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence, p.16.
21. Ibid. p.17.
22. Ibid. p.16.
23. Williams, The Country and the City, p.289.
24. Ibid. p.165.
25. Ibid. p.302.
26. Ibid. p.304.
27. Berger, op. cit., p.148.
28. see C. Fletcher and N. Thompson, Issues in Community Education, London, Falmer Press, 1979; A. N. Fairbairn, 'The Leicestershire Community Colleges and Centres', Nottingham Working Papers in the Education of Adults, No.1, Department of Education.; Anders et al, Community Education Seminar Report, University of London, Goldsmiths College, 1978; C. Bell and H. Newby, Community Studies, London, Allen and Unwin, 1972; J. Thompson ed., Adult Education for a Change, London, Hutchinson, 1980.
29. Williams, Keywords, p.76.
30. Ibid. p.76.
31. Williams, op. cit. p.164.
32. Ibid. p.166.
33. Ibid. p.163.
34. Williams, The English Novel, p.95.
35. quoted in Williams, The Country and the City, p.215.
36. quoted in Ibid. p.215.
37. quoted in Ibid. p.215.
38. quoted in Ibid. p.215-216.

39. quoted in Ibid. p.242.
40. Ibid. p.246.
41. Ibid. p.264.
42. quoted in Ibid p.266.
43. quoted in Ibid. p.266.
44. quoted in Ibid. p.266.
45. quoted in Ibid. p.267.
46. quoted in Ibid. p.266.
47. quoted in Ibid. p.267.
48. Ibid. p.269.
49. Ibid. p.269.
50. see J. Joyce, Dubliners, 1914; Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 1916; Ulysses, 1922; Finnegan's Wake, 1939.
51. Williams, The Country and the City, p.270.
52. quoted in Ibid. p.270.
53. Ibid. p.270.
54. Ibid. p.270-271.
55. Ibid. p.271.
56. quoted in Williams, The English Novel, p.104.
57. Ibid. p.105.
58. Ibid. p.97.
59. Ibid. p.97.
60. Ibid. p.100.
61. Ibid. p.109.
62. Ibid. p.110.
63. Ibid. p.111.
64. Ibid. p.110.
65. Williams and M. Williams, 'Hardy and Social Class', in M. Page ed., Thomas Hardy: The Writer and His Background, London, Bell and Hyman, 1980, p.37.
66. Ibid. p.38.
67. Ibid. p.38.
68. Ibid. p.38.
69. Ibid. p.38.
70. Williams, The English Novel, p.107.
71. E. Said, The Word, the Text and the Critic, pp.241-242.
72. Ibid. p.5.
73. Ibid. p.5.
74. Said, Orientalism, p.28.
75. Ibid. p.28.
76. Ibid. p.28.
77. Ibid. p.27.
78. Said, London Review of Books, June, 1986.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid.
81. Said, Orientalism, p.28.

Part 3.

1. A Centre for Urban Educational Studies publication.
2. This ILEA Inset Committee met once or twice a term over a three year period. Their Report was intended as a working document and basis for

further discussion.

3. CUES was set up jointly by ILEA and the Institute of Education, University of London in 198 and was originally based at the Robert Montefiore School in East London.

4. Hargreaves, Improving Secondary Schools.

5. Making Sense of Cities, p.2.

6. Race, Sex and Class 2: Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools, and Race, Sex and Class 3: A Policy for Equality: Race 1983.

7. Race, Sex and Class 2, p.21.

8. Making Sense of Cities, p.20.

9. Ibid. p.48.

10. Ibid. p.49.

11. Ibid. p.50.

12. Ibid. p.51.

13. Ibid. p.53.

14. Ibid. p.54.

15. Ibid. p.32.

16. Ibid. p.25.

17. Ibid. p.25.

18. Williams, Cobbett.

19. Williams, So That They can Live, Cinema Action, 1982.

20. Making Sense of Cities, p.26.

21. Ibid. pp.59-60.

22. The Cockpit Theatre was an ILEA project that followed a Cultural Studies approach to working with young people, particularly with use of photography.

23. Making Sense of Cities, p.25.

24. Ibid. p.57.

Conclusion

Raymond Williams was not known primarily as a philosopher nor an educationist, neither did he set out to develop a systematic philosophy of education. In an interview I had with Williams in 1988 he referred to this as an omission and regretted not having written more on education. Moreover, he mentioned that he was in the process of writing about vocational education in particular (1). The results of this work were denied to us by his untimely death in 1989.

Education appeared as a constant theme, implicit and explicit, throughout Williams's work. The task I set myself in this thesis was to discuss the works, published and unpublished, in which Williams refers to education with the aim of revealing the extent to which Williams had a philosophy of education. Williams did not have a philosophy of education in the conventional sense of providing a formal account of his views based on philosophical principles and methods. However, I want to conclude that through his specifically educational writings and in his general comments on education, Williams provided both a developed critique of the British educational system as well as a sustained and radical contribution to thinking about education in Britain in the late twentieth century. I would argue that the fundamentals of this contribution do form the substance for a philosophy of education.

Williams's emergent philosophy of education has, I would argue, a number of fundamental features. Firstly, he connects public and private forms of education with the prevailing social and economic arrangements of a society; in this argument education, politics and economics are inextricably linked. In the LR Williams traces the historical relationship of education to British society and concludes, for the most part, that education in Britain has had the instrumental aim of preparing people for pre-defined roles in the various sections of capitalist industrial society. For Williams, an historical analysis of the role of education in British society is fundamental to knowing why the dominant aims of education prevail, and in understanding why contemporary issues in education have emerged.

Secondly, Williams opened up new areas of enquiry in literary and cultural studies, communications, ecology and social and political theory. His cultural work was rooted in his concept of a long revolution; the democratic transformation of society in order that inequality and oppression would cease to exist. The works in which he developed his ideas, CS, LR, Comm and T200, not only became set texts on academic syllabuses, but inspired ordinary men and women who did not have the benefit of higher education (Williams's contribution to adult education cannot be over-stated). Williams's intellectual project cannot be described in conventional academic terms; he was the architect of a radically new discourse which was not simply inter-disciplinary but integrated, seeking to break down the barriers of what he recognised as arbitrary and artificial subject boundaries. If Williams's integrated method must be given a name then it would be Cultural Theory. Cultural

Theory denies the existence of conventionally discrete 'forms of knowledge' claiming that this artificial separation impairs our authentic understanding of the world.

Williams's integrated method informed the change of perspective in the teaching of the arts, humanities and literature, and the burgeoning of Cultural and Media Studies, which occurred in the 1960's. Linguistics, literary criticism, political theory, sociology and philosophy were integrated into the new discourses of Communications, Media and television Studies, Urban Studies and Cultural Studies. This method, also underpinned by Williams's theory of language (see ch.2), was constructed by him as a response to the instrumental aims of education in British society he had identified in the LR, and what he saw as conventional methods of enquiry which were obstructive of understanding.

Thirdly, Williams connected education to values. The aims of education in capitalist societies, he argued, reflect the values of capitalist priorities. These values are individualist, competitive and instrumental and provide the intellectual foundation for social structures of domination and oppression. This is a quite conventional marxist analysis of education. However, unlike marxist philosophers of education Williams identifies a positive and liberating role for education within capitalist society. The innovations outlined in the previous paragraph provide examples of how educational programmes can embody and exemplify an alternative to the dominant set of values. The values that Williams would want to support are those detailed in Ch.4, for example, the values of community, mutuality, neighbourhood and solidarity on which he

would build his philosophy and practice of education. Williams adherence to these particular values reflect his humanist instincts which placed him at a distance from structuralist marxists in the 1970's and '80's.

The fourth fundamental principal of Williams's educational thought is the way in which he recognises and values the 'lived experience' of the learner in the learning process. There is a clear sense in which Williams is applying this concept to adult learners, on whom the term 'experience' fits more easily. However, it is clear when Williams is discussing education and 'mature adolescents' (see Ch.1) that the concept of 'lived experience' has universal application. Williams believed passionately in the idea of an educated and participatory democracy, and education, particularly adult education 'one of the best and deepest traditions in Britain', played an essential part in the vision of a better society. In Ch.1 I referred to the way in which Williams differentiated between 'learning' and 'education', the difference being one of value. 'Learning' is what is sought, 'education' (or, 'official learning') is what is offered. Williams is referring to the gap he believes exists between learners' needs, particularly those of adult students, and the perception of need by educationists and politicians. Ch.5 contains an extended discussion on Thomas Hardy's distinction between 'customary' and 'educated' values to which Williams continually refers.

Williams points to the philosophy and practice of the Workers' Educational Association (WEA) as an exemplification of the way in which the learner's 'lived experience' is taken into account when the process

and content of courses and syllabuses are drawn up. For Williams, the educational philosophy of the WEA meets two essential conditions of his own philosophy of education, that the 'lived experience' of the learner is valued and that the educational process involves a democratic relationship between the learner, the tutor and what is being taught. There is a strain of anti-authoritarian thinking in Williams's work on education and this is evident in his support of 'direct' democracy in the learning process. Further evidence of the democratic impulse to Williams's educational thinking was that he always sought to connect intellectual questions with community and ordinary life in his work and as part of his philosophy of education. This might explain his continued popularity, particularly among young students who, arguably, recognise its relevance to their own lives.

The final fundamental feature of William's contribution to thinking about education is his role as a teacher, although not in the conventional sense. The forward-looking feature of Williams's work together with his immense theoretical and innovative contribution to thinking about politics, culture and education in the twentieth century have helped to confirm Williams as a significant pedagogical figure through his writing. As Judith Williamson has said, 'Raymond Williams cleared a space in which other people can work and argue' (2). In this sense Williams's work provided a model of understanding of education and society which people of later generations have taken up. Williams presented his work as an unfinished product within which the arguments and debates could continue. In these terms he can be seen as a facilitator and teacher.

Williams's novels provide important illustrations of his thoughts on education while supplementing his theoretical work and reinforcing his pedagogical claims. In Border Country, and later Second Generation, education is at the centre of the narrative. Williams is able, through his novels, to write into his philosophy of education concepts which he finds difficult adequately to express in his theoretical work. The concepts I refer to are 'experience', the distinction he holds between 'customary' and 'educated values', and his metaphor of the 'border'. Williams attempts to clarify these concepts in ENDL and in many of his articles and essays but they remain obscure and intangible; they are given life and meaning in his novels.

In the writing of the thesis I have been conscious of the need, wherever possible, to simplify Williams's notoriously difficult writing style into intelligible form. This has proved a laborious but necessary task. I have discussed Williams's writing style at length in earlier chapters but I want to make one further point on this subject. In a television programme, A Tribute to Raymond Williams David Ellis Thomas, leader of Plaid Cymru and colleague of Williams, expressed his views on the latter's writing style in the following way'

"I think he avoided the crisis of writing itself because he had the sense of speaking with people, of a dialogue ..., and therefore he didn't get stuck into the whole notion that writing is just about producing something in a vacuum - he's actually in dialogue both with a particular past and a particular community." (3)

Ellis-Thomas's comments go some way towards explaining Williams's writing style in emphasising the sense of dialogue with an audience with which he is in a pedagogical relationship.

In addition to identifying the fundamental essentials of Williams's philosophy of education, the main thrust of the thesis has been to present his work on education as an example of political education. This example is very different from forms of political education that are concerned with the description of institutions and formal political processes, or are concerned to promote a political democracy without reference to cultural and economic structures (4).

The central claim of Williams's theory of political education is that the cultural process of a society, which includes forms of education, can provide the instrument of change which transforms the ownership of the economic process through a new and radical kind of politics. Williams provides an outline of what this new kind of politics might look like in an essay written for the Socialist Society entitled, Democracy and Parliament (5). In this essay Williams attempts a major redefinition of socialist democracy. The essay includes proposals for constitutional change, devolved local government, industrial democracy, professional democracy, and the democratic reform of communications technology. A political education for a socialist democracy would focus on the connections between economic, cultural and political change. In the final chapter I discussed two programmes of political education which make these connections; Urban Studies and Cultural Studies.

The final thing to say about Williams's theory of political education is that it does not come in the form of a set of proposals nor can it be contained in a text book. Essentially, this theory comes in the form of an argument, an argument which remained unfinished but which contained the elements of the theory and the 'lived experience' from which the theory was derived. It is a difficult argument and a complex theory which recognises a complicated society. His theory of political education aims to imagine a new, social order fully democratic in all respects.

Williams's theoretical contributions to thinking about education were considerable; in the late 1950's Williams presented his proposals for a 'core curriculum'; in the 1970's he wrote at length on the importance of vocational education and training and at what stage this should be introduced; throughout his writing he stressed the need for 'mass access' to higher education and the value of continuing education; he wrote on the question of language development in children; he examined the development of political consciousness of adults through education; and lastly, he devised and promoted the whole area of Popular Culture, Film, Media and Communication Studies, all now contained under the 'subject' areas of Cultural Theory and Cultural Studies.

In Chapter 1 are presented what I considered the central concepts in Williams's work; culture, language, materialism and ideology. In Chapter 2 I began the task of constructing a theory of education from his work. Chapter 3 was concerned to identify Williams's political theory from the whole range of his writing. Chapter 4 is a crucial chapter where I

identify the three major themes, community, solidarity and ecology which taken together provide a basis for a theory of political education in Williams's work. In the final chapter I discuss two practical examples of political education heavily influenced by Williams's thinking on education; Urban Studies and Cultural Studies.

Williams argued that education, like learning, should be a life-long process. Access to education should be seen as a right not a privilege. The aims of education, for Williams, were to contribute to the process of achieving an educated and participatory democracy within a vision of a society free of oppression and domination. A central purpose of the thesis has been to argue that Williams's work on education, particularly in the way in which it connects education directly with culture, economics and politics forms a telling and prescient contribution to philosophy of education in Britain in the 1990's.

Notes

1. Interview with author, Jesus College, Cambridge, 1988.
2. J. Williamson, Tribute to Raymond Williams, Channel Four, 1988.
- 3 D. Ellis-Thomas, Ibid.
4. For example, The Programme for Political Literacy.
5. 'Democracy and Parliament' in ed. R. Gale, Resources of Hope, 1989.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References in the first section of the bibliography appear in chronological order. References in the remaining sections are in the order in which they appear in the text. Books, including novels, Plays, Short Stories and Films by Williams appear in the first section. Articles and essays are included in the relevant chapter section. The bibliography includes only those works which are referred to in the thesis.

Works by Raymond Williams

1. Books

- Reading and Criticism, Man and Society Series, London, F. Muller, 1950.
- Drama from Ibsen to Eliot, London, Chatto and Windus, 1952. Revised edn. London, Chatto and Windus, 1968.
- Raymond Williams and Michael Orrom, Preface to Film, London, Film Drama, 1954.
- Drama in Performance, revised edn., Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1968.
- Culture and Society 1780 - 1950, London, Chatto and Windus, 1958. New edition with a new Introduction, New York, Columbia University Press, 1963. Translated into Italian, Japanese, Portugese and German.
- The Long Revolution, London, Chatto and Windus, 1961. Reissued with additional footnotes, Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1984.
- Briatin in the Sixties: Communications, Penguin Special, Harmondsworth, Baltimore, Penguin, 1962. Third edition, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1976. Translated into Danish and Spanish.
- Modern Tragedy, London, Chatto and Windus, 1966. New edition, without play 'Koba', and with new Afterword, London, Verso, 1979.
- S. Hall, Williams and E.P. Thompson (eds.), May Day Manifesto, London, May Day Manifesto Committee, 1967. 2nd. edn., Penguin Special, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1968.
- Drama from Ibsen to Brecht, London, Chatto and Windus, 1968. Reprinted, London, Hogarth Press, 1987.
- The Pelican Book of English Prose, Volume 2: From 1780 to the present day, ed., R. Williams, Harmondsworth, Baltimore, Penguin, 1969.
- The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence, London, Chatto and Windus, 1970. Reprinted, London, Hogarth Press, 1985.
- Orwell, Fontana, Modern Masters Series, Fontana/Collins, 1971. 2nd edn., Fontana, Flamingo paper editions, 1984.
- The Country and the City, London, Chatto and Windus, 1973. Reprinted, London, Hogarth Press, 1985.
- J. Williams and R. Williams (eds.), D. H. Lawrence on education, Harmondsworth, Penguin Education, 1973.
- R. Williams (ed.), George Orwell: A Collection of Critical Essays, Twentieth Century Views, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Television: Technology and Cultural Form, Technosphere Series, Fontana/Collins, 1974. Translated into Italian.
- Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, Fontana Communications series, Fontana paperbacks, 1976. New edn., New York, Oxford University Press, 1984.

M. Axton and R. Williams (eds.), English Drama: Forms and Development: Essays in Honour of Muriel Clara Bradbrook, with an Introduction by R. Williams, Cambridge, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Marxism and Literature, Marxist Introductions series, London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977. Translated into Italian.

Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review, London, New Left Books, 1979. Verso paperback edn., 1981.

Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays, London, Verso, 1980. New York, Schocken, 1981.

Culture, Fontana New Sociology Series, Fontana Paperbacks, 1981. U.S. edn., The Sociology of Culture, New York, Schocken, 1982.

R. Williams (ed.), Contact: Human Communication and its History, London and New York, Thames and Hudson, 1981.

Cobbett, Past Masters series, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 1983.

Towards 2000, London, Chatto and Windus, 1983. U.S. edn., The Year 2000, with a Preface to the American Edition, New York, Pantheon, 1984.

Writing in Society, London, Verso, 1984. U.S. edn., 1984.

M. Williams and R. Williams (eds.), John Clare: Selected Poetry and Press, Methuen English Texts, London and New York, Methuen, 1986.

Raymond Williams on Television: Selected Writings, Preface by R. Williams, ed. A. O'Connor, Toronto, Between the Lines, 1988.

Resources of Hope, ed. R. Gable, London and New York, Verso, 1989.

What I Came To Say, London, Hutchinson Radius, 1989

The Politics of Modernism, ed. T. Pinkney, London and New York, Verso, 1989.

2. Short Stories, Novels, Plays and Films.

Short Stories

Short Story in Cambridge Front, no. 2 (1941), 'Red Earth'. Source: Outlok: A Selection of Cambridge Writings, R. Williams, M. Orrom, M. J. Craig (eds.) Cambridge, 1941.

'Sack Labourer', in English Short Story 1, ed. by W. Wyatt, London, Collins, 1941.

'Sugar', in Outlook: A Selection, pp. 7-14.

'This Time' in New Writing and Daylight, no. 2, 1942-3, ed. J. Lehmann, London, Collins, 1943, pp. 158-64.

'A Fine Room to be Ill Inn', in English Story 8, ed W. Wyatt, London, Collins, 1948.

Novels

Border Country, London, Chatto and Windus, 1960. Reissued, 1978.

Second Generation, London, Chatto and Windus, 1964. Reissued 1978.

The Fight for Manod, London, Chatto and Windus, 1979.

The Volunteers, London, Eyre Methuen, 1978. Paperback edn., London, Hogarth Press, 1985.

Loyalties, London, Chatto and Windus, 1985.

People of the Black Mountains, Vol. 1: The Beginning, London, Chatto and Windus, 1989.

People of the Black Mountains, Vol. 2: The Eggs of the Eagle, London, Chatto and Windus, 1990.

Plays

Koba, in Modern Tragedy, London, Chatto and Windus, 1966.

A Letter from the Country, BBC Television, April 1966, Stand, 12 (1971), pp. 17-34.

Public Enquiry, BBC 1 Television, 15 March 1967, Stand, 9 (1967), pp. 15-53.

The Country and the City, (television documentary, Where We Live Now series), 1979.

Williams's unpublished plays include a television play, The Volunteers. See The Listener, 20 February 1969.

Films

One Pair of Eyes, Large Door, date unknown.

The Country and the City, Producer M. Dibb, Where We Live Now series, 1988.

Introduction

- J. McIlroy, Studies in the Education of Adults, Vol. 22, October 1990; and, Vol. 23, April 1991.
- Oxford University Archives, DES/M/2/1/2-3, 1954-62.
- Oxford University Archives, DES/SB/2/1/29-44, 1946-47.
- Williams's Personal File, DES/F/10/3/4
- R. Hoggart, Uses of Literacy, London, Penguin, 1957.
- E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, London, Pelican, 1963,
- F.R. Leavis, Culture and Environment, London, 1933.
- F.R. Leavis, Letters in Criticism, London, 1974.
- F.R. Leavis, '"Great Books" and a Liberal Education' in Commentary, Vol. XV1, July - December 1953.
- R. Williams, 'The teaching of Public Expression', Highway, April 1953.
- R. Williams, 'The Idea of Culture', Essays in Criticism, 1953.
- R. Williams, Open Letter to Tutors, The Workers' Educational Association Pamphlet, 1961.
- R. Hoggart, Speaking to Each Other, Vol. 2, London, Chatto and Windus, 1970.
- Report on Trade Union Education, University of Oxford Delegacy for Extra-Mural Studies, Report of Director.
- The Clegg Report on Trade Union Education, 1959.
- R. Fieldhouse unpublished paper, Oxford and Adult Education 1946-61, University of Exeter, undated.
- R. Williams, 'Public Expression', unpublished paper for conference on teaching methods in trade union education, 1956.
- D. Hare, The Guardian, June 3, 1989.
- S. Heath, 'Modern English Man', Times Higher Educational Supplement, 20 July, 1984.
- G. Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness, London, Merlin, 1971.
- A. Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, ed. Hoare and Nowell Smith, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- D. Hargreaves, The Challenge for the Comprehensive School, London, RKP, 1982.
- T. Mulhearn, The Guardian, January 29, 1988.
- F. Inglis, Times Higher Educational Supplement, February 5, 1988.
- T. Lovell, Knowable Pasts, Imaginable Futures, unpublished conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
- R. Samuel, 'Philosophy Teaching by Example: Past and Present in Raymond Williams', History Workshop Journal, 1989.
- T. Eagleton, Raymond Williams: Perspectives, London, Polity, 1989.
- J. Taylor, 'Long Revolutions: Gender and Genreation in the work of Raymond Williams', unpublished conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
- C. Steadman, 'Writing, Teaching and Learning', unpublished conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.
- N. Chomsky, Times Higher Educational Supplement, February 3, 1989.

Chapter 1

- Open University, E353, State, Society and Education, 1980.
- Open University, Open Forum 65, 1981.

Open University, E361, Education and the Urban Environment, 1978.

Open University, A/100/33, Industrialisation and Culture, 1973.

Open University, D102/10, Language and Authority, 1982.

Open University, A312/03, The Nature of Wuthering Heights, 1981.

Open University, D283-1, Sociological Perspectives, 1971.

Open University, D2099/01, The State in Society in 1984, 1984.

S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, London, RKP, 1976.

K. Harriss, Education and Knowledge, London, RKP, 1978.

M.R. Matthews, The Marxist Theory of Schooling, Sussex, Harvester, 1980.

The Plowden Report, H.M.S.O., 1867.

ed. A. Porter, Principles of Political Literacy: The Working Papers of the Programme for Political Education, University of London, Institute of Education, 1977.

F.R. Leavis and D. Thompson, Culture and Environment, London, 1933.

F.R. Leavis, Letters in Criticism, ed. J. Tasker, London, 1974.

F.R. Leavis, English Literature in Our Time and the University, London, 1969.

T. Crowley, News from Nowhere, No. 6, February 1989, Oxford, Oxford English Limited.

F. de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, London, Duckworth, 1983.

N. Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1965.

J. Mitchell, 'Women: The Longest Revolution', New Left Review, 40, 1966.

Open University, Social Science Foundation Course, transcript of radio broadcast.

J. Osmond, The Divided Kingdom, London, Channel 4 Books, 1988.

R. Williams, 'The Mining of Meaning: Key Words in the Miners' Strike', New Socialist, 25, March 1985.

J. and L. Milroy, Authority in Language, London, RKP, 1985.

J. Marenbon, English Our English: The 'New Orthodoxy' Examined, London, Centre for Policy Studies, 1987.

K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1968.

ed. W. Molesworth, English Works of Thomas Hobbes, London, Bohn, 1840.

J. Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, ed. A.C. Fraser, Oxford, OUP, 1894.

R. Williams, 'You're a Marxist Aren't You' The Concept of Socialism, ed. B. Parekh, London, Croom Helm, 1975.

L. Goldman, Pour Une Sociologie du Roman, Gallimard, 1964.

S. Timparano, On Materialism, tr. L. Garner, London, Verso, 1980.

L. Althusser, For Marx, London, Penguin, 1970.

L. Althusser, Reading Capital, London, NLB, 1970.

L. Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy, NLB, 1971.

R. Williams, 'Socialism and Ecology', SERA Pamphlet, 1982.

A. Briggs, Learning to Look, Open University Lecture, 1981.

F. Engels, The Condition of the English Working Class, London, Blackwell, 1985.

Chapter 2

C. Steadman, Writing, Teaching and Learning, unpublished conference paper, University of Warwick, 1989.

J. Pearman, 'Memoir 1881-83', and R. McMillan in selected articles, Clarion and Labour Leader, 1890's.
New Statesman, August 1987.
 B. Doyle, English and Englishness, London, Routledge, 1989.
 I.A. Richards, The Principles of Literary Criticism, London, 1924.
 G. Steiner et al, The Critical Movement, London, Faber, 1964.
 The Kingman Committee, Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Teaching of English Language, London, H.M.S.O., 1988.
 D. Hargreaves, The Challenge for the Comprehensive School: Culture, Curriculum and Community, London, RKP, 1982.
The Nation, January 1959.
Education Reform Act, 1988.
Education, March 1960.

Chapter 3

K. Harriss, Education and Knowledge, London, RKP, 1979.
 R. Holmes, Coleridge, Oxford, OUP, 1982.
 R. Williams, 'The Bomb and Democracy', Sanity, April 1965.
 S.T. Coleridge, On Constitution of Church and State, 1837 edn.
 T. Allsop, Table Talk, reproduced by Nonesuch Coleridge.
 J.S. Mill, Autobiography, reproduced in World Classics.
 ed. W.G.T. Sledd, The Complete Works of S.T. Coleridge, 7 vols., 1884.
 ed. D.V. Ernham, Essay on His Time, 3 vols., vol.1.
 ed. L. Patten and P. Mann, Lectures 1795 on Politics and Religion, 1971.
 B.E. Rooke, The Friend, 2 vols., vol. 1, 1969.

Chapter 4

R. Bhaskar, Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy, London, Verso, 1989.
 J. Locke, 'What Is Enlightenment?', Kant on History, ed., L.W. Beck, New York, 1963.
 R. Williams, 'Ideas and the Labour Movement', New Society, Nov./Dec., 1981.
 R. Williams, 'Socialists and Coalitionists', Future of the Left, ed. J. Curran, London, Polity Press, 1988.
Highway, April, 1952.
 R. Williams, 'Media, Margins and Modernity', Politics of Modernism, London, Verso, 1989.
 A. O'Connor, Raymond Williams: Writing, Politics and Culture, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989.
 ed. T. Eagleton, R. Williams: Critical Perspectives, London, Polity Press, 1989.
 R. Williams, 'The Robert Tressell Memorial Lecture', History Workshop, Issue 16, Autumn 1983.
 R. Williams, 'Strictly Personal', Education, March 4, 1960.
 R. Williams, 'Hesitations Before Socialism', Resources of Hope, 1989.
 R. Williams, 'Uses of Cultural Theory', The Politics of Modernism, 1989.
 V.N. Volosinov, Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, tr. L. Matejka and I. Titunick, New York, Seminar Press, 1973.

M. Bakhtin and P. Medvedev, The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship, Harvard, 1985.

L. Althusser and E. Balibar, Reading Capital, London, NLB, 1968.

Chapter 5

T. Eagleton, Literary Theory, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1983.

E.P. Thompson, Williams Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary, London, Merlin, 1977.

L. Jackson, The Cultural Critics, London, RKP, 1979.

L. Althusser, For Marx, Allen Lane, London, 1969.

CCCS, Stencilled Occasional Papers, University of Birmingham, 1970's.

M. Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, London, Murray, 1860.

C. Taylor, 'Neutrality in Political Science', A. Ryan, The Philosophy of Social Explanation.

I. Newton, Principia, 1686.

F.R. Leavis, Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture, Cambridge, 1930.

J. Berger, Ways of Seeing, London, Penguin, 1982.

A. Porter and B. Crick, Political Education and Political Literacy, London, Longman, 1978.

J. and P. White, 'The Programme for Political Education: A Critique', Teaching Politics, 5 (3), 1976.

E. Said, Post Modern Culture, London, Pluto Press, 1985.

F.R. Leavis, Education and the University, London, Chatto and Windus, 1961.

C. Fletcher and N. Thompson, Issues in Community Education, London, Falmer Press, 1979.

A. Fairbairn, 'The Leicester Community Colleges and Centres', Nottingham Working Papers in the Education of Adults, No. 1, University of Nottingham, 1978.

Anders et al, Community Education Seminar Report, University of London, Goldsmiths College, 1978.

C. Bell and H. Newby, Community Studies, London, Allen Unwin, 1972.

J. Thompson, Adult Education for a Change, London, Hutchinson, 1980.

J. Joyce, Dubliners, 1914; Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, 1916; Ulysses, 1922; Finnegan's Wake, 1939.

R. Williams and M. Williams, 'Hardy and Social Class', N. Page, Thomas Hardy: The Writer and His Background, London, Bell and Hyman, 1980.

E. Said, London Review of Books, June, 1986.

Making Sense of Cities, a Report by the Centre for Urban Educational Studies, 1984.

Race, Sex and Class 2: Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools, 1983; and, Race, Sex and Class 3: A Policy for Equality: Race, 1983.

R. Williams, So That They can Live, Cinema Action, 1982.

Conclusion

D. Ellis-Thomas, Tribute to Raymond Williams, Channel Four Film, 1988.

R. Williams, 'Democracy and Parliament', ed. R. Gale, Resources of Hope, 1989.

ABBREVIATIONS

Raymond Williams's works are cited from the following editions, accompanying abbreviations (dates of original publication in parantheses).

RC	<u>Reading and Criticism</u> (1950) F. Muller, 1966
DIB	<u>Drama from Ibsen to Eliot</u> (1952) Peregrine Books, 1964
PF	<u>Preface to Film</u> * (1954) Film Drama, 1954
DP	<u>Drama in Performance</u> (1954) F. Muller, 1954
CS	<u>Culture and Society</u> (1958) Pelican Books, 1976
BD	<u>Border Country</u> (1960) Chatto and Windus, 1960
Comm	<u>Communications</u> (1962) Pelican Books, 1973
SC	<u>Second Generation</u> (1964) Chatto and Windus, 1964
MT	<u>Modern Tragedy</u> (1966) Chatto and Windus, 1966
DIE	<u>Drama from Ibsen to Brecht</u> (1968) Chatto and Windus, 1971
MDM	<u>May Day Manifesto</u> ** (1968) Penguin Books, 1968
ENDL	<u>English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence</u> (1971) Chatto and Windus, 1971
CC	<u>Country and the City</u> (1973) Chatto and Windus, 1973
TEL	<u>Television:Technology and Cultural Form</u> (1974) Fontana, 1974
KW	<u>Keywords</u> (1976) Fontana, 1983
ML	<u>Marxism and Literature</u> (1977) OUP, 1977
PL	<u>Politics and Letters</u> *** (1979) Verso, 1979
C	<u>Culture</u> (1981) Fontana, 1981
T2000	<u>Towards 2000</u> (1983) Chatto and Windus, 1983
WS	<u>Writing in Society</u> (1984) Verso, 1984

* With Michael Orrom

** Edited

*** Series of interviews with New Left Review