

POLICY AND THEORY ON RACE AND EDUCATION:

A CRITIQUE OF MULTICULTURALISM AND ANTI-RACISM

BY STEPHEN EDWARD BURT

A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

Multicultural and Anti-Racist Education have emerged in the 1980's as the main alternative approaches to race and education. But the debate between them has become a sterile one. The central arguments of the 'radical' critique that underpins anti-racist education have revealed fundamental flaws in the analysis and strategy of multicultural education. However, this has not led to a coherent alternative framework for policy and practice. Rather, it has suggested that it is theoretically and practically impossible to oppose racism in and through education. My aim is to demonstrate that such a conclusion depends upon errors in how the 'radical' critique theorises the racial structure of society, in how it analyses policy and practice on race in education and consequently, in how it relates racial structure to educational processes.

The theoretical and methodological differences with the 'radical' critique provide the major foci of the thesis. The first is an extensive consideration of theories of racial stratification which draws upon an outline of race relations in post-war Britain. The second is the analysis of different approaches to race and education, their periods of dominance, their base values and concepts and the relation between them. The third focus is the 'anti-racist' policy of an LEA and this allows one to clarify the relation of LEA policy to national policy and school practice. Fourthly, I outline a model of institutional racism in education in order to give detail of the relation between racial structure and educational processes. The final focus is the ideological and practical educational context for multicultural and anti-racist education.

Through the issues that I consider I aim to suggest a theoretical and methodological framework for the analysis of policy and practice which incorporates the insights of the 'radical' critique but engages with the complexity of the relation between race and education.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
Introduction	4
Chapter One. <u>Black Labour in Post-War Britain: Racism, Migration and Settlement</u>	15
Chapter Two. <u>Race, Class and Racism</u>	51
Chapter Three. <u>The Historical Specificity of Black Oppression</u>	89
Chapter Four. <u>The Development of Racialised Forms of Education</u>	127
Chapter Five. <u>Reading Policies, Interpreting Initiatives</u>	174
Chapter Six. <u>Beyond a "Radical Critique" of Multicultural Education</u>	225
Chapter Seven. <u>Multicultural Education: Ideologies and Practices</u>	279
Chapter Eight. <u>Conclusion</u>	312
Bibliography.	322

Introduction.

Education has long been employed as a metaphor, a model and a projected means of development, for new visions and ways of organising society. Paradoxically, education also fulfills a central function in the perpetuation of the cultures, values and organisation of the society within which it is located. The tension between these two properties of education underlays and permeates the concerns of this thesis.

Since the first post-war arrival of black people from Britain's erstwhile colonial possessions, questions have been posed about the characteristics of an educational system appropriate to the needs and experiences of black migrants. Growing awareness of racial inequality in British society led to inquiries into the role of education in perpetuating those inequalities and both complementing and contradicting this, to questions about the potential for education to oppose and to reduce, those inequalities.

The last forty years have seen, in response to the presence of black children in British schools, a plethora of policies, statements of official concern and the development of new approaches to the curriculum. However, despite this level of activity little seems to have changed in the extent to which black people face discrimination and disadvantage in all aspects of British society including schooling.

The general importance of race to education and the relevance of education to questions of racial equality and inequality was given a new pertinence and visibility in the late 1970's when the activity of overtly racist political groups grew in and around schools. The issue of racism, of prejudice and discrimination came to the fore and helped to cast doubt on the appropriateness of previously dominant policies and practices which had emphasised the particular cultures and needs of black pupils.

An impetus for change and re-evaluation also came with the growing awareness of black parents, pupils and political

leaders that the policies and practices that were supposed to be promoting equality of educational opportunity were failing to secure any significant change. The demand for new, more radical and systematic approaches which would go to the core and root of racial disadvantage and discrimination grew from this and started to spawn alternatives to what had become loosely referred to as 'multicultural education'.

A third strand, developing in parallel to the above with many points of contact and interaction, was constituted in theoretical discourses on the origins, processes and structures of racial discrimination and disadvantage. Established analyses that simplified questions about the nature of racial stratification, especially those subsuming race, racial inequality and racism under 'more fundamental' problems of class, were subjected to new and detailed critique.

It is in these elements of critique, dissent and dissatisfaction that this thesis had its genesis. They revealed the necessity and prompted the desire to examine and analyse current policies and practices, their assumptions and deficiencies, their political and educational role and social meaning. They pose, in the most general terms, 'the problem of race and education' and suggest how established critiques of multicultural education could be extended in order to ground the development of a theoretical framework adequate for alternative policies and practices.

Elements of the Problem.

One can identify three levels at which the problem has been articulated: theory, policy and practice. The first element hinges on theoretical understandings of the nature of racial stratification which have far-reaching implications for educational policy and practice. Theory has fulfilled certain roles in the articulation and legitimation of policies and practices but has usually been implicit and inarticulated, poorly developed and inadequate.

Even less well developed have been theoretical analyses of the specific relation of educational processes and structures to racial stratification. Education has been seen as either the panacea or an irredeamable part of the problem. Hence, it is unclear how possible it is for education to disrupt the reproduction of that stratification and what the limits are to educational action.

Policy, it appears at first sight, has been produced in copious amounts on national, LEA and school 'sites'. But, in all three, the relation of this 'policy' to practice is often obscure. Nationally in particular, it is unclear what in fact constitutes 'policy'. Many documents and reports of committees of inquiry, select committees etc. have been produced and they appear to be officially sanctioned and directed towards affecting practice but whether they can accurately be called 'policy' remains to be seen. Problems in identifying policy are further compounded by the unevenness of policy development between LEA's, the variety of approaches employed and the different implicit conceptions of what makes a policy, as opposed to a statement of position or intent.

The development of practice is characterised by similar problems. 'Multicultural education' as an approach to practice and as a set of practices, has developed unevenly and in a wide variety of forms. It has often been ad hoc or tokenistic, more a method of exercising control and containing black pupils than a development of new forms of education appropriate to promoting equality of opportunity.

At each of these levels of activity confusion has been compounded by the terms that have been employed to describe the perceived problems and the prescribed solutions. Clarity about the meaning of different terms and the significance of which is used, has been virtually impossible to establish. The terms, "multicultural education" (MCE), "multi-ethnic education" and "multiracial education" have been used interchangeably to refer to a wide range of approaches rather than specific sets of frameworks, policies or practices.

As I have mentioned, "multicultural education" in particular, is currently used as the generic term and this has compounded the problems of identifying different approaches, of specifying characteristics, values and assumptions. It has also made it harder to describe and analyse the changes in approach which have occurred since the earliest forms of "immigrant education" in the 1940's and 1950's. Consequently, I intend to restrict "multicultural education" to refer to a specific set of contemporary set of policies and practices(1) and will use "racialised forms of education" as the generic term.

This usage will be seen to contradict both Mullard's(2) and Troyna and Ball's(3) approaches. To periodising 'the educational response' to black migration to Britain. Mullard(4) refers to "racial forms of education", a term and concept very close to mine but through the use of "racialised" I hope to convey a point that will be argued in Chapter Seven, that educational responses to black pupils are in fact 'racialised forms' of more general educational approaches.

Troya and Ball(5) restrict 'racialised' approaches to those policies and practices in which race is an explicit feature. They are correct to argue that early approaches had race as a specific but inexplicit focus and concern but, as I hope to demonstrate, through this they over-emphasise the importance of the rhetoric of policy and practice at the expense of the ideological message, role and location of those earlier educational responses. I shall argue that they were in all but terminology 'racialised'.

Articulating the Problem.

Three general issues have dominated debates around race and education: first, the appropriateness of established forms of educational provision given the advent of a 'multiracial' society; secondly, the relation of educational processes and structures to racial inequality; thirdly, the potential for education to reduce racial inequality.

These three concerns have been articulated in various ways, using a range of concepts and implicit analyses of issues and problems. Under-achievement, indiscipline, social control and disaffection; racism, prejudice, ignorance, intolerance and ethnocentrism; disadvantage, special needs, language and culture. Each has featured in expressions of 'the problem' and through them 'the problem' has been expressed and interpreted.

The range of expressions of 'the problem', the analytical and terminological confusion attending the specification of 'an approach' and a tendency to aggregate conflicting policies and practices all demand greater clarity and precision.

An outline of the development of policy and practice will form the basis for identifying the progression of values, aims and conceptions of the problem characteristic of 'officially sanctioned' approaches. It will also provide the basis for exploring and analysing the most important contemporary opposition between racialised forms of education, that between multicultural education and anti-racist education (ARE). It is in that debate that critical developments have crystallised and in which this thesis should therefore be located.

The opposition between MCE and ARE is a polarised one. It involves different emphases in practice, two analyses of education and of the racial structure of society, and two sets of aims and rationales for policy. The basis of ARE is a critical one, it is founded on what will be termed the "radical" or "anti-racist" critique of MCE. It is critical of the organisation, processes and effects of educational provision as well of the analyses, policies and practices of MCE.

A critical stance is a major strength when identifying the lacunae and problems in MCE. It works from an explicit analysis of the role of schooling in reproducing inequalities but as a basis for policy and practice, ARE has a number of important deficiencies. Because of a combination of theoretical tenets which have sometimes been assumed rather than demonstrated, certain versions of the radical critique have effectively dismissed the possibility of promoting racial

equality through education and have therefore regarded all school based action as at best diversionary.

The theoretical basis of the radical critique, and hence of ARE, is organised around two major issues. First, the racial structure of the social formation: the basis of racial stratification, the relation between race and class, and the origin and nature of racism. Secondly, the meaning and significance of the educational response to post-war black migration. This rests on a version of the history of racialised forms of education since the late 1950's which informs the analysis and critique of MCE. This approach to racialised forms of education draws on theories of educational reproduction and of racial stratification in general. Each of these strands of theory provides a focus for the thesis.

However, the radical critique of MCE does not yet provide an adequate theoretical basis or framework for an alternative anti-racist practice. General problems in analysing racial stratification lead to misconceptions about the racially specific nature of educational processes and structures implicated in the reproduction of racial stratification.

In the anti-racist critique of MCE two sets of relations play a crucial but unacknowledged role. The first is the relation between the national, local (LEA) and school sites on which the development of MCE, and indeed of all racialised forms of education, has taken place. The second is the relation between the three levels on which racialised forms have been constituted, the levels of theory, policy and practice.

In general terms, many of the problems of the anti-racist critique derive from assumptions that the three levels are homologous and that there is a close correspondance between the three sites. This represents a complex and contradictory set of relations and interactions in a simplified form and threatens to undermine the power of the anti-racist critique and so limit its potential as a basis for policy and practice.

The relation between theory, policy and practice is a theme that runs through much of this thesis. The anti-racist critique

has focused upon 'pluralist' models of the social formation implicit, assumed or underlying multicultural policies and practices. But these critiques have often re-acted to the presence of these models as if they were explicit analytical frameworks which generated, both logically and causally, the policies and practices with which they are associated.

Similarly, it has been assumed that multicultural practices have followed from multicultural policies and so are logically and historically grounded on the pluralist models discerned in the policies. This involves a view of the genesis of practice which is not corroborated by empirical research. It further misrepresents the relation between developments in policy and those in practice. It is in fact the disjunctions and contradictions between theory, policy and practice that provide one of the motors for change in any or all of the three levels.

The emphasis on the three levels and sites suggests the major issues to be considered and the methodology and form of argument employed. A majority of studies of MCE, or of race and education generally, have tended to concentrate on one or two sites or levels and have as a consequence ignored the extent to which each site and level is affected by and affects each of the others. But constraints of time and space dictate that some specific focus be made. My approach will be to concentrate on the national and LEA sites but to consider their relation to school policy and practice. Similarly, I will focus on theory and policy but will be concerned to raise questions about their relation to practice. A detailed examination of policy and theory is the major concern but through this, I hope to problematise the relations between the three sites and between the three levels and so identify some of the elements of a more adequate model of those relations.

The Organisation of the Thesis.

The interpretation and analysis of the educational response to the presence of black children in British schools, that is, of racialised forms of education, depends on a series of inter-

related contexts. The most general context is the history of black peoples' experience in post-war Britain. An outline of this will be the task of chapter one. It will provide the background and general context for educational developments and will reveal some of the phenomena for which a theoretical analysis of the racial structure of Britain must account.

Chapter two takes up these issues and attempts to relate them to a number of theoretical debates which have been extremely influential in how race, racism and the racial structure of the social formation have been conceptualised. First, I shall draw together some of the arguments which show that a problematic based on the opposition between economic classes and political forces is fundamentally flawed and show that the deficiencies and assumptions of that problematic underlay some of the problems encountered in analysing the relation between race and class.

The second debate concerns what racism is and how it is to be conceptualised. Four levels of racism: beliefs, practices, institutions and structures will be identified. But two of these will be focused on: beliefs and attitudes; the relation of racism to the social structure of society. The other two levels will be examined in an educational context in chapter six.

Thirdly, I will question the assumption implicit in many Marxist attempts to relate race and class, that they are discrete and separate concepts and social phenomena and that their relation is 'external' to their meaning. This will ground the contention, made in chapter three, that there is an 'internal' historical relation between race and class which has its origins in colonial relations.

Chapter three will develop these theoretical issues through re-examining the significance for contemporary racial structure of British colonial history. This will not be a systematic exposition of the development or even of all the major features of colonialism but will be an exploration of those aspects of the race-class relation illuminated by an understanding of colonial relations. The idea that colonialism and slavery have

left a legacy will be re-evaluated and the consequences for how one conceptualises contemporary racial structure drawn out.

Through outlining a theoretical model of the racial structure of Britain I hope to develop theoretical tools for criticising and assessing the assumptive base of ARE. It should also inform an assessment of the appropriateness and potential of different policies and practices in the field of race and education. It will specify the nature of the problems they confront and the structural context in which they operate.

Chapter four will lay the basis for the analysis of racialised forms of education. My first concern will be to sketch the development of both national and LEA policies and compare these to the changes that have taken place in practice in schools. The initial task will be to show not only what has happened but also to demonstrate that disjunctions and contradictions between the sides have characterised their evolution as much as agreement and consistency. I will also show that some of the dominant analyses of policy simplify the complex conditions and relations affecting policy production.

The second part of chapter four will pose the question of what a racialised form is, how one differs from another. I will ask at what level, theory, policy or practice, should one identify or typify a racialised form? I hope to show that it is in the relation between them, through their interaction, that a racialised form of education is constituted.

In chapter five I will give a detailed analysis of the production of a policy for racial equality produced in Berkshire LEA. It will be used to assess the accuracy of arguments and conclusions about LEA policy found in the anti-racist critique. It will help to clarify the relation of national policy making, and the national racial and social context in general, to policy activity in LEA's. Looking then to schools and the organisation of educational provision, one can reconsider the role of policy with respect to practice and ask how, or whether, it is supposed to engender change.

The Berkshire study argues that 'reading' policies depends not on 'symptomatic reading' but on substantive analysis of the conditions and processes of policy production. In general the empirical analysis will suggest answers to questions about LEA policies and their significance and role with respect to practice. It will further indicate ways in which the general racial structure of society can be interpreted, given form and substance within the organisation of educational provision. It will point to elements of what will, in the next chapter, be developed into a model of institutional racism in education.

In chapter six I will consider in more detail the major points of difference and conflict between MCE and ARE. Starting with a consideration of the characteristics and the form of the dominance of MCE the major problematic areas of MCE will be described and analysed. Through this the central arguments of the anti-racist critique of MCE will be outlined. The second part of the chapter will concentrate on racism in education. How does it relate to the racial structure of the social formation as a whole? How does it operate? In particular, what is involved in the concept of institutional racism?

Chapter seven considers a determinant of how racialised forms of education have developed that has received scant attention in the radical critique. That is the educational-ideological basis for the practical limitations of MCE. First, I will show how the close relation of the ideology of progressivism to the ideology of multiculturalism underpins critical problems in MCE. Secondly, through concentrating on the ideologies of professionalism and teacher autonomy, I will develop elements in the model of institutional racism which involve teachers' and schools' relations with parents.

The overall aim of this thesis is to develop a theoretical framework for the analysis of policy. This is a methodological aim as well as an analytical one directed not only towards criticising and assessing policy but also towards practice. It aims to suggest what an adequate theoretical framework for practice should look like.

Introduction. Notes and References.

- 1) These policies and practices are broadly those that Mullard has identified as 'ethnicist' i.e. based on notions of irreducible ethnic differences and which institutionalise those differences in LEA organisation and new appointments. For further comment on this see chapters four and six.
- 2) See for example, Mullard (1984a).
- 3) See Troyna and Williams (1986).

Chapter One. Black Labour in Post-War Britain: Racism,
Migration and Settlement.

Introduction.

This first chapter provides an outline of patterns of post-war black migration and settlement and of the ways in which black labour has been utilised. It will provide a general background against which to read educational initiatives and will also raise major questions and issues that subsequent analysis of the structural location of black labour will address. Issues which must be considered not only by models of racial stratification but also by educational theories, policies and practices which seek to promote racial equality.

Different ways need to be considered for reading the causes of migration, the impetus to settlement and the reasons for increasingly restrictive anti-immigration legislation. Migration can not be explained through simple 'push' or 'pull' models, both featured in the dynamics of migration and were historically underpinned by relations of dominance, of exploitation and inequitable development structured within colonialism and imperialism.

This formative historical relationship between coloniser and colonised begins to suggest an internal relation between white and black labour, and between race and class, which will be developed at length in the following two chapters. The conditions and reasons for the limitation of the flow of migrant labour raise the further issue of the relation between the economic and the political with respect to race. I argue that interpreting anti-immigration legislation solely in terms of the needs of 'capital' for migrant labour ignores political pressure for restricting black migration. That pressure therefore features as a dysfunctional manifestation of a popular racism which drew on colonial ideologies. This suggests that both the economic and political determinants of subsequent forms of structural racism can be located within the 'legacy' of colonialism but that there is no simple or

consistent relationship between them. Again, this provides a major theme for the subsequent two chapters.

A third issue considered in chapter one is the development and the content of contemporary racism. In particular, I focus on Barker's argument that, over the last ten years or so, a new form of racism has arisen. Barker's argument suffers from seeing an emphasis on culture and difference, as opposed to biology and superiority, as surplanting rather than complementing older racist ideologies and theories. It also focuses on racism as a justificatory and explanatory ideology rather than as a structural feature of the social formation. It does, however, offer an indicator of a move, identified in education by Mullard, towards an ethnically based racism, ethnicism. Hence, it reveals one of the major foundations of the theory and politics of MCE.

Chapters two and three work towards elucidating structural concepts of race and racism. This involves re-posing the relation between race and class and showing that the historical relation between white and black labour is crucial to the development of both. Such an 'internal' relation between race and class depends upon the structural relation between white and black labour within colonialism.

"Class" as a concept and in its institutional forms, already relates to race as an absence. The subjective concept of the working class as white, male, skilled, employed etc. has been given force and form through the development of the institutions of working class political and cultural life. Both depend upon, and operate to reproduce and validate, structural relations between this 'privileged' section of the working class and other types of labour, particularly black labour. The historical approach takes up the general model of class formation through economic, political and cultural processes interacting to produce institutional forms of classes. Forms which represented the conditions and relations of class formation within colonialism and hence the dominant relation between black and white.

Together, objective, institutional and subjective relations between white and black labour contribute to significant differences in the way in each type of labour enters into production. This compounds the antagonisms between white and black labour based on consequences of the greater rate of exploitation of black labour to provide a material basis for racism and conflict. Racism, including that of the white working class, is therefore a matter of structural relations rather than attitudes and beliefs.

Together the first three chapters provide the context and theoretical framework and foundation for the educationally specific chapters that follow. This is true in four distinct but related ways. First, chapter one provides the historical context for post-war changes in education. The periodisation of immigration legislation and perceived labour needs shows that no simple and direct relationship between policy and the needs of the economy can be supported. Similarly, chapter four demonstrates that simple periodisations of the 'educational response' fail because of the complex relation between developments in theory, policy and practice, and because of the degree to which 'superceded' racialised forms endure. Interpreting developments in education depend upon seeing them in the light of general social developments.

Secondly, the theoretical model of racial stratification explored in chapters two and three offers a structural context for education. Thirdly, they therefore reveal what it is that policies and practices designed to promote racial equality are trying to affect and change. This is crucial if the limits to educational action are to be accurately understood.

Fourthly, an historically based structural concept of race makes vital comments on specific issues about race and racism which arise in the content of multicultural and anti-racist education. Many of these centre on the concept of culture. For example, the lasting effects of slavery for either white or black people are usually seen in MCE and ARE as cultural, but the general model suggests that any legacy of slavery must be

structural. The last three points show why the detailed consideration of general issues of racial stratification are so crucial to this thesis.

In considering the development over the last twenty-five to thirty years of racialised forms of education, chapter four addresses one of the issues around which the anti-racist critique has crystallised. At issue is not only an accurate history or typification of different periods but also how one identifies what may be seen as one identifiable 'approach'. It has become the received wisdom that the 'educational response', both national policy and local practice, can be periodised through the dominance of the key concepts of assimilation, integration and cultural diversity. I attempt to show that although these terms have successively dominated official discourse and do attest to changes in conceptualisation, the tri-partite distinction obscures as much as it illuminates. The historical overlap between them, continuity of under-laying social and educational aims, perpetuation of ostensibly superseded values and approaches all point to the limits of this periodisation.

Chapter four is about what happened when and why, but it is also about the relationship between national, local and school activity and how theory, policy and practice relate and interact. Simple identifications of what approach has been dominant when tend to ignore contradictions and tensions in these relationships. I attempt to demonstrate that the anti-racist critique offers a reading of the relationships between these sites and levels which draws on a general functionalism and a monolithic concept of the state - considerations elaborated in chapter six. This shows that there is an overlap, a dependency between the form the argument takes and the analytic framework within which it takes place. This point is further emphasised through the way in which my analysis of the racial structure of the social formation in relation to educational structures and processes under-pins the form of my argument.

The following three chapters take up, in different ways, areas of deficiency in the theoretical critique at the heart of ARE. Chapter five continues the concern with the relation between theory, policy and practice in racialised forms but pursues this through attempting to clarify the status, meaning and significance of LEA anti-racist policies. Clearly, the analysis of a policy development in one LEA will not provide a detailed reading of all LEA policies but that is not the intention. The choice of what has widely been considered to be a 'radical' policy is designed to allow an examination of a policy which might meet some of the criticisms leveled at earlier "multicultural" policies and to see whether different conclusions about its significance can be drawn. But more than this, Berkshire's policy offers the opportunity to study a policy which is well articulated in a range of ways and hence to develop broad guidelines for analysing LEA policies.

Chapter five shows that simple readings, or models, of the meaning of LEA policies on race and education, especially of those with an 'anti-racist' patina, cannot accommodate the complex conditions and processes of their production and implementation. It suggests a way of reading policies which, on the basis of the crucial distinction between statements of intent and policies as such, revolves around the relation between the articulation of the 'policy' through various stages. It is clear that although an explicit framework or analysis may suggest certain priorities and approaches, it does not determine these. An approach or analysis has to be developed at each of the stages if it is to be seen through, in a consistent way, to implementation and change. This is a problem not only for interpretation in practice, for implementation, but the analytic framework is deficient because it engages only with the racial context for education, not with the form taken by racism and racial structure in education. A 'correct' analysis will have little impact if it remains at a level of generality which obscures its educational relevance and implications.

The problems inherent in the "anti-racist" framework of the Berkshire policy to an extent depended upon the limits of the political consensus which allowed it to be adopted by a 'hung' council. This is particularly true of the form of racial specificity employed in which essential links to processes and structures of class discrimination were not made so that their role in racial discrimination could not be addressed.

In the first part of chapter six, I consider further aspects of the opposition between MCE and its anti-racist critics. This centres on their different understandings of racial and general social structure and leads to examining how the anti-racist critique places MCE within racism. Three inter-connected propositions need to be considered: first, that through its emphasis on cultural difference, MCE ignores racism -- especially with respect to its structural origins; secondly, that when considering racism, MCE interprets it as a matter of attitudes and beliefs alone; thirdly, that partly through this failure to engage with structural racism, MCE helps to manage and contain its effects. Whilst I accept this as a statement of some of the effects of multicultural policy and practice, this analysis replicates major problems characteristic of the anti-racist critique as a whole. The argument confuses intentions with effects and reaches conclusions about the limitations of policy and practice on the basis of a symptomatic reading of what is perceived as their assumptive base and conceptual framework. This simplifies the relationship between school and its racial and social context, mis-represents the relationship of theory to policy and practice, and fails to engage with the empirical problem of identifying the contexts and processes leading to the development of policy and practice.

The second major concern of chapter six is one of the most important theoretical issues of the thesis: the relationship between the racial structure of the social formation and the processes, practices and organisation of education. Problems in conceptualising this relationship under-ly the fact that the Berkshire policy's analysis of racial structure remains

unrelated to educational processes. My consideration of this issue revolves around the interaction of the racism of the social formation and the processes and structures of schooling and attempts to outline a model of institutional racism in education. That model has four interacting parts: racial and social context and location; the reproductive and socialising role of education; institutional relationships both within education and with other institutional systems; practices, processes and organisational features of schools.

The model attempts to outline the racially significant features of the institution. It is based on a prioritisation of structural concepts of race and racism. It suggests that individual acts of discrimination, personal prejudices, beliefs and justificatory ideologies remain unchallenged as an effect of the processes and relationships of institutional racism and because of the location of individuals within it.

In chapter seven, I attempt to draw some of the lines of connection between the form in which MCE has been developed and other educational ideologies and practices. I concentrate on those which have not only played a major formative role but also represent significant barriers to the development of anti-racist education because of the antipathetic power relations that they express. This builds on the identification, in chapter six, of the relations between teachers and schools, and black parents as an aspect of institutional racism. The ideologies and practices of progressivism and professionalism which have affected the form of MCE and of some types of ARE, if not challenged, will seriously undermine the anti-racist project and will offer institutional solutions rather than a re-constitution of power relations in education. This is a problem that anti-racism has to solve in practice.

The first task then, is to consider the historical context for post-war policies and practices on race and education through examining the development of racism and the position of black labour in that period in the context of patterns of migration and settlement.

Post-War Migration of Black Labour

The rise and fall of the migration(1) of black people to Britain over the last forty years has been an integral part of many of the changes in the social and economic fabric of Britain during that period. In particular black migration has been the pre-condition for the development of "racialised forms of education". The pattern it has followed has deeply affected the progression of these forms. The basis and background for black migration is an essential context for understanding the position of black people in British society, but it is also a pre-requisite for the analysis of the meaning that race currently has within education.

In order to provide the general historical and racial context for innovation and intervention in education four main sets of issues and problems need to be considered in this chapter. First, I will consider the relation between changes in the requirements for black labour, the succession of immigration legislation and patterns of migration and settlement. Secondly, this will be used as a basis on which to examine the form in which black labour has been utilised and hence to raise some problems about the class position of black workers. Thirdly, I will consider how current forms of racism are formed from a number of threads: state action, popular "common-sense", institutional and structural changes. Fourthly, I will outline how anti-discrimination legislation may combine with legislation on immigration and the 'criminalisation' of black communities as a dual strategy for the state to deal with black communities.

The key feature governing the migration of black people to Britain in the period since 1945 is their role as a labour force. Possibly the major issue concerning black migration is how the demand for extra labour, which black people were supposed to meet, connected with black aspirations and needs for better paid employment.

During the time when the demand for labour in general has decreased, the original movement of black people to Britain in the search for work has been increasingly represented as purely voluntary. Such an argument clearly feeds on common-sense racism and is used to justify repatriation. To counter this argument it may be argued that black migration, far from being voluntary was directly linked to the demand for cheap labour willing to take on the least desirable jobs in the Western Capitalist countries. The specific source of that labour, the Caribbean and South Asia, can then be explained by reference to Britain's colonial and imperialist past.

These two 'explanations' represent in their most simplified form analyses of migration based on either "push" or "pull" factors. The latter approach is useful as a first approximation because it links migration to the demand for labour and hence to the form and extent of economic activity within Western Capitalist countries. However, even if one accepts it as a starting point it is necessary to ask to what extent there is a push factor as well as a pull. Also, if the initial spur to migration was the availability of jobs, do the subsequent fall in the extent of migration and its eventual total curtailment correspond exactly to labour requirements? This raises the question whether the economic and the political determinants of restrictive immigration legislation have in fact been totally consistent and in phase.

It is important to realise that the arrival in Britain of 'foreign workers' in the post-war period did not only involve migrants from the Caribbean and South Asia(2). As the import of labour power, it is a phenomenon shared by all advanced capitalist countries. Britain's use of black labour is part of a trend with respect to migrant labour in general(3). It must be put in the context of the economic activity of the period which Castles describes as,

"...the most rapid and sustained development of production in recorded history."(4)

The characteristics of migration are complex and varied. They involve refugees, workers from colonies and former colonies, guest workers, contract labour and others. However, Castles argues for a framework which concentrates on the features common to different countries. He claims that,

"The general use of imported labour reflects a particular stage in the development of the capitalist mode of production, in which a long period of expansion made it essential to transcend the boundaries of national markets."(5)

He argues that in each country the basic causes were similar and that it is the uneven development of the capitalist system that provides the essential historical (and analytical) context(6). On this basis, Castles claims that the introduction of new workers was a pre-condition for the extension of production and the introduction of new techniques, it was the only way in which capitalists could accumulate capital(7).

Castles' emphasis, like that of Nikolinakos(8), is on structural changes and changes in the labour requirements in the major centres of capitalist production. This is located within a model of the structure of the world market which distinguishes between "centre and periphery"(9). The first is characterised by advanced forms of production and the control of world trade whereas the periphery is primarily a supplier of labour power and of certain commodities and a market for the industrial products of the centre. The result of this is the underdevelopment of the periphery and hence,

"Labour migration is a form of development aid given by the poor countries to the rich."(10)

For Britain, colonial links provided the focus on the Caribbean in particular in the 1940's and early 1950's. Those links allowed organisations such as London Transport to encourage migration from the Caribbean and made them likely to be accepted but a history of colonial relations has affected black migration in more fundamental ways.

The economic disparities between the Caribbean and Britain made migration an attractive proposition for British employers and for potential migrants. Nikolinakos summarises the economic relations, partly founded on colonialism which underpin this situation:

"The surplus labour in the emigrant countries and the prevailing unemployment there are the results of the low accumulation of capital and allied economic backwardness coupled with their past dependence on imperialism."(11)

Therefore, migration not only achieves a balance of supply and demand but also the,

"...perpetuation of the dependency relationship between periphery and centre."(12)

Nikolinakos(13) further points out that all countries of emigration were formally or informally dependent on colonial powers. Their economic structures and their class structures were determined by this relation of dependence. Although I remain unconvinced of the 'stabilising function' of migration for both emigrant and immigrant country that Nikolinakos posits(14), the relation of dependence and relative underdevelopment would seem to explain the attractiveness of migration with its offer of employment and a higher standard of living.

Taking Nikolinakos' and Castles' emphasis on the structure of the world market one can suggest that it is not only 'pull' factors that are founded on international economic relations based on colonial exploitation, but the basis of the 'push' factors is to be found there also. This emphasis on historical relations within colonialism will be developed to form a central theme in later chapters(15) when the question of the relation between race and class is posed.

The Exploitation of Black Labour.

Exploitation of one country by another is one of the three levels of exploitation that Nikolinakos identifies. The other two are the exploitation of the individual migrant and of

migrants as a group, or in Nikolinalos's terms, as a sub-proletariat(16). Nikolinakos sees the role of migrant labour as a reserve army of labour which secured economic growth and a standard of living(17). He claims that foreign workers are super-exploitable because they can be deported, they are underprivileged with respect to native workers, they have no political rights. Discrimination then raises the rate of exploitation of migrant workers(18).

Green(19) adds to this the fact that the cost of the social reproduction of migrant labour is low. For the first generation of black workers the cost of general education and training had been paid for by the country of emigration. Black people received less from state welfare because of the age structure of the black population, because of the high proportion of working people to dependents. So migrant labour was profitable in the first instance but as the social cost of reproduction is increasingly met by Britain and as the age structure changes, profitability diminishes.

Nikolinalos concentrates on the features he sees as common to all countries in which foreign workers are employed in significant numbers. But, as Phizacklea and Miles(20) point out, even with the provisions of the 1971 Immigration Act, black migrant labour cannot be deported en masse. Also, the politico-legal status of black labour in Britain is not the same as in other European countries. Early migrants at least had the right of abode and the same legal status as the indigenous population. Phizacklea and Miles(21) argue that the UK citizenship that commonwealth residents enjoyed made migration and finding employment easier for them than for migrant labour from Southern Europe. But as Sivanandan argues, the position of black labour in Britain has over the last twenty-five years moved progressively closer to its European counter-parts(22).

Phizacklea and Miles' criticisms of Nikolinakos show some of the features peculiar to Britain. They use these to argue that black labour in Britain should be seen as reproduced as part of the working class, as black indigenous labour(23). The

move towards settlement supports this argument but as will be shown in chapter two, their conception of the class position of black labour is extremely problematic. To view it just as a part of the working class begs a plethora of questions.

The super-exploitability of black migrant labour makes it attractive for metropolitan capital. But this suggests that when labour requirements fall and when the costs of reproducing that labour rise, migrant labour should then be expelled from the metropolitan economy. It suggests on the other hand that, black migrant labour should be encouraged by capital and by the state until it ceases to be economically necessary. It will become apparent in the section that follows, that in Britain the pattern is not that simple. In some ways it has followed the logic of this view but in others it has contradicted it.

Patterns of Migration.

Castles' and Nikolinakos' positions both imply that there should be a correlation between the flow of migrant labour and the demand for that labour. Given that the major constraint on the flow of migrant labour has been immigration legislation one must ask whether this has corresponded to labour needs.

In 1948 a Labour government introduced a nationality act(24) which was the first and last piece of post-war legislation to encourage an increase in the number of black workers migrating to Britain. Subsequent immigration legislation in 1962(25), 1968(26), and 1971(27) and a new Nationality Act in 1981(28) have progressively restricted rights of entry and abode for black people in Britain. Through this legislation, other reductions in 'vouchers'(29) and recently the need for visas(30) the categories and numbers of black workers and their dependents allowed to enter and settle have been made fewer and fewer.

Prompted by successive Immigration Acts, a realisation grew in the 1960's and 1970's, particularly among Asian communities, that settlement offered the best option. Communities and

religious and cultural institutions were beginning to be re-created in Britain. The consolidation of a better standard of living was going to take longer than originally expected and the removal of the possibility of returning home on a trial basis meant that family re-unification depended on settlement in Britain.

The trend between 1962 and 1981 is very clear: a growing restriction of entry to Britain of all black people and an attempt to remove or de-stabilise their right to live here. The cumulative restriction through successive legislation, Sivanandan(31) argues, has served the specific needs of capital. He claims that British legislation on immigration involves a movement towards a contract labour system, the usual form in which migrant labour is utilised(32).

This direction of development is, as I will show later, complemented by elements of state strategy and action on policing and on race relations. But, as Green(33) points out, Sivanandan's account does not adequately describe the complex relations between the actions of the state on immigration and the 'needs of capital'. Immigration legislation has not perfectly fitted the needs of capital, it reflects political interests as well(34).

Green argues that one must question Sivanandan's contention that the interests of the racist political lobby co-incided with the interests of the economy for two reasons: the existence of localised labour shortages meant that there were specific requirements for immigrant labour; legislative control was not necessary in order to reduce primary immigration and it had the effect of prompting secondary immigration in order to 'beat the ban'(35). Green concludes that racist opposition to immigration limited the full exploitation of a system of migrant labour(36).

Castles supports Greens' conclusion when he identifies a very unfavourable position with respect to labour supply in Britain(37). He says that,

"...taking account of emigration from Britain, the supply of labour had ..(in the mid-1950's)..been more or less stagnant since 1945. This together with the strength of the labour movement, which has resisted attacks on the incomes and conditions of workers, is at the root of the chronic crisis of profitability of British capital."(38)

Britain needed a greater supply of labour but it reacted to political and ideological pressures to limit black immigration. Or as Green(39) puts it, the state has managed the contradiction between the processes of economic exploitation of black labour and the social consequences thereof.

To explore this further, if one examines the turning point for black migration to Britain, the 1962 Immigration Act(40), two types of pressure and context can be identified: those internal and those external to the metropolitan centre. Externally, attempts to set up a West Indian Federation following independence in the Caribbean and to get a bilateral agreement on immigration had recently failed(41). Also, in 1960 the Indian Supreme Court had judged that the past practice of withholding passports was unconstitutional(42).

The internal features have been far more prominent in discussions of the 1962 Act. Foremost amongst these is the growth of pressure from the organised political right and of the incidence of racial attacks and clashes which culminated in the attacks on black people in Nottingham and Notting Hill, London, in August and September 1958. Local anti-immigration groups formed and the ground had been laid for restrictive legislation. Such legislation was further fueled by the growth from 1961 to June 1962 of immigration which followed the external developments described.

Sivanandan's argument that the 1962 Act should be viewed as a product of a fall in the demand for labour is less tenable in the light of these other factors. He claims that by the middle of the 1950's demand had already begun to drop(43). This allows him to correlate the economic and political imperatives which impinge on the control of black migrant labour. But there

are many conflicting views of what Britain's labour requirements were in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

If one puts the beginning of the control of migrant labour in a European context, the same moves are evident but they do not happen until 1973 or 1974. Castles identifies the 1960's as a part of the continuing economic boom in which labour demands were high. If Green's comments are recalled it is clear that the 1962 act was not motivated solely by economic considerations. The resultant constraints on labour supply may have been one cause of Britain's poor economic performance(44).

Racism, which owed a lot of its content and form to Britain's colonial past, and fear about public disorder are themes launched in 1962 and recurring in later legislation. These themes also provide the official linkage, discussed later in the chapter, between legislation on immigration and race relations, between the control of numbers and racial harmony.

The combination of different elements in bringing about the 1962 Act begin to show how economic, ideological and political considerations have interacted on race. Each is rooted in its own way in Britain's historical relationship with its ex-colonial possessions. Chapter three will examine in detail the form that colonial legacy takes and its effects on the racial and class structure of British society.

The Insertion of Black Workers into the Labour Process.

The role of black labour, the economic causes of migration and the 'super-exploitation' of black people suggests that their 'position' in society is not adequately conceptualised by regarding them solely as members of the working class. Their subordinate position with respect to the white working class indicates that even if black people are predominantly working class, some form of 'intra-class' stratification is operating.

Sivanandan(45) claims that in Britain a racial division of labour forms the basis for intra-class stratification. Castles argues that the 1971 census shows black workers to be,

"...concentrated in ship building, vehicle production, textiles, construction and food processing...in services they were mainly in transport and communications, hotels and catering and the National Health Service."(46)

They were also concentrated in factories where shifts are worked, with unsocial hours(47), low pay and unpleasant working conditions(48). Phizacklea and Miles show that black workers are predominantly manual workers, and that more than two fifths are in semi- and un-skilled jobs(49). Afro-Caribbean people in particular are concentrated in skilled manual work but very few black people are in non-manual employment. Phizacklea and Miles conclude that,

"...although the majority of black workers are not concentrated in unskilled jobs in Britain, neither are they randomly distributed through out the working class."(50)

This occupational pattern, especially the concentration of black people in manual labour is being reproduced through systematic and individual racism. Black people have been consistently allocated to the least desirable working class jobs and this is one factor in determining that there is a difference between the material life of the black working class and sections of the white working class.

The particular subordinate position of black people has been conceptualised through notions of an 'underclass', a 'sub-proletariat' and various other types of intra-class fractions, sections and strata(51). If one understands "working class" to be defined purely in terms of a particular but broad relation to the means of production the importance and the reality of the above divisions and differences can be glossed over. But the above pattern, as well as representing a racial fragmentation, has set in progress processes of material and cultural re-alignment among the white working class. It has,

"...allowed social advancement to sections of the indigenous working class; this took the form both of objective upward mobility through occupational promotion and improved

income, and of subjective mobility in higher status relative to a new status group."(52)

This fact and the occupational distribution of black people derives in part from the specific labour shortages black migrant labour was supposed to fill. They provided the first basis upon which discriminatory employment practices were secured. The job opportunities that followed from this led to the 'deskilling' of the first migrants. Many 1950's migrants from the Caribbean were skilled people who found no opportunity to use their skills because they were refused access to such occupations(53). The type of labour required for expansion was helped by discrimination by both employers and trades unions to limit black workers' access to higher status and better paid employment.

Further disproportionate deskilling and unemployment follow to a large extent from the patterns of employment. Recent technological advances have deskilled many jobs and totally removed others. This process has affected black people because of discrimination and prejudice but other processes have also been important. Castles(54) argues that the shorter average duration in employment of migrant workers makes them more vulnerable to redundancy, those in less skilled jobs lose their jobs first and migrants work mainly in the sectors that have declined most rapidly in the recession.

This scenario is important for explaining why the recession has hit black people hardest but it also shows how the disproportionate number of unemployed young blacks is caused not only by the discriminatory processes that restrict their job opportunities but also by the contraction of the sections of the economy which have provided their parents with employment, albeit low status and low paid.

This account shows how black people suffer disadvantage and discrimination in employment and how that is closely tied to the requirements of capital which prompted the original migration. It reveals a major way in which discrimination occurs but the systematic nature of that discrimination raises

a number of very significant problems for how one should conceptualise the economic and political relations within which black labour is inscribed. The occupational structure outlined clearly has significance for the 'internal' divisions in the working class but to what extent do those divisions suggest that black people actually occupy a different 'class position' to their white counterparts? An idea of "objective interests" based on the essential material unity of the working class, would seem to be threatened by the systematic differences between black and white workers. Further, the experiences of black workers at the hands of the organised white working class would seem to deny the existence of any cross-race class unity, rather it indicates that intra-class differences are far more significant than is usually acknowledged.

Black Workers and the Labour Movement.

Black experiences of the white labour movement are central considerations for both analysing the potential political cohesion of the working class and in understanding the relationship between racial and class divisions. The response of the organised working class to black people has, at least until the mid 1970's, has been one of systematic opposition to the presence and the advancement of black workers.

One of the clearest examples of this occurred in April 1968. Following Powell's speeches on the 'threat' of mass immigration by Kenya Asians, London dockers and Smithfield market porters marched to Westminster in support of Powell.

Explaining this sort of response is a major political and theoretical problem. Resentment and antipathy based on work experiences are sometimes cited as possible reasons. Where white and black workers have been employed in the same industries problems of communication and racism may have endangered unity and trade union organisation but this has been exacerbated by the vulnerability of migrant labour, its weak socio-economic position, and the divisive uses made of it by employers(55). This is a position that allows employers to

use black workers to keep wages low and threaten the standard of living and the defensive power of the white workers.

The relationship of black workers to employers and to white workers has led to a number of attempts on the part of black workers to improve their standard of living and to secure trade union rights. In following the development of 'black' or 'immigrant' strikes, Sivanandan highlights how disputes were supported by the "Asian community" but lost through the lack of official union backing(56). He cites other examples in which black workers sought higher wages and access to promotion to jobs "reserved" for whites. He claims that white workers supported the wages claim but not access to promotion(57).

Sivanandan argues that by the time the predominantly black work force at Imperial Typewriters struck,

"...there was virtually a standing conference of black strike committees in the Midlands and a network of community associations and groups plus a number of black political organisations, all of which came to the aid of the strikers."(58)

Possibly the most famous "immigrant strike" took place in mid-1977 at the Grunwick Laboratories in London. Sivanandan claims that,

"The basic issue for the strikers was the question of racist exploitation with which union recognition was involved, but, in the course of accepting union support, they also accepted the union line that union recognition was really the basic issue, losing in the process the lasting support of the black people."(59)

The Grunwicks dispute Sivanandan interprets mainly in terms of what it meant for the social contract with trade union leaders and Labour ministers wanting to minimise any damage. But making the recognition issue central corresponded with labour movement conceptions of its legitimate concerns and activities. But it is most significant that in order for this to happen the vulnerability and lack of power of the Asian workforce which was a direct product of its racial composition

had to be subsumed under traditional "colour-blind" understandings of class and union solidarity.

A change of response on the part of the trades union movement can be seen in the late 1970's when it began through the TUC to commit itself in principle to opposing racism and racial discrimination. However, Castles(60) and Miles and Phizacklea(61) have claimed that the TUC only moved to combat racism when the National Front grew and posed the threat of organised racist politics. That was the focus, not the disadvantage of black and migrant workers nor the fight for the specific material conditions of black workers.

The examples above show how in the 1960's and early 1970's the trades unions responded to workplace struggles with either lack of support or outright opposition. Sivanandan(62) claims that the "black community" responded with support for black workers and hence offered a different base to that which white workers could expect. This poses key questions about processes of class formation and segmentation. The importance of "culture" and "community" to the development of black political organisation questions the dominance of the work place in the making of classes. It suggests that racial or ethnic identifications not only cut across class but may in certain circumstances replace it as the primary identification.

Conflict between some of the priorities and aims of black and white workers and their institutions, pose political and theoretical questions about the limitations of traditional class analysis. It shows that race is clearly an issue for class, it asks how appropriate are the established institutions of the white working class for representing the interests of all members of 'the class'. The allocation of black people to different strata within the working class, different patterns of employment, differences in material interests, different sources of support and different primary identifications, all highlight the problems that derive from an assertion of the fundamental and objective unity of 'the class'. These issues will be returned to in chapters two and three.

Processes in the Development of Contemporary Racism.

The changes in the demand for migrant labour, the form that labour has taken and the response and role of the organised labour movement have all contributed to contemporary forms of racism. Two further aspects need to be given an initial examination in relation to developments already outlined. The first of these is 'structural racism', what it is and how it has developed; the second is the 'content' of racist ideology.

Much of the early racial conflict and antagonism was rooted in the workplace but other processes have combined with this to produce a more general "popular racism". It feeds on the conflict around employment, housing etc. but has been generalised and complemented by the development of a more systematic 'structural' racism. A disadvantaged and subordinate position with respect to white labour and marginalisation from the institutions of the working class, such as trade unions, has further structured the position of black labour.

The state has reacted to fears about the political consequences of "popular racism" and to a perceived drop in labour needs by introducing discriminatory immigration legislation. The state has also played an important role in feeding that racism through the way in which it has justified and explained legislation, it has aided in the construction and legitimisation of racism, but how has this happened?

The role of the state has been generally to take on the responsibility for managing the political and economic effects of racism. This has been carried out through the policies adopted on 'Law and Order', on Race Relations and in Education and other areas of social policy.

These actions of the state must be related to the changes in labour migration and the change from economic expansion to decline. They must therefore be related to a particular contemporary racism, not racism in general. It is a racism of material decline(63). Both attitudinal and structural aspects of racism must be located within this framework.

Miles(64) has argued that the fact that industrial and social decline in Britain has been accompanied by the settlement of migrant labour has led to the identification of immigration as the cause of that decline. He claims that this link has also led to the strength of racial rather than class identifications and loyalties.

Miles wishes to stress that "colonial stereotyping" cannot offer a full explanation of the contemporary currency of racism(65). The arguments offered above support this contention. If a colonial legacy is deemed sufficient explanation for racism then the central role of the state in the reproduction of racism can be ignored. It would ignore the particular features of contemporary racism. The popular link made between decline and immigration must be part of an explanation of racism but it does not account for the availability of racial categories nor why immigration is 'acceptable' as an explanation for material decline. It does not explain why racism was sufficiently powerful to lead to restrictive immigration legislation eleven or twelve years before economic decline led to reduced labour requirements(66).

It appears necessary to look further back than the growth of post-war migration to understand the source and dynamics of contemporary racism. Hall(67) argues that the racial antagonism visible in the late 1940's and 1950's was not only a reaction to immigration, racial problems did not start then, they are rooted in Britain's colonial and imperial past. That "rooting" is not just a matter of a legacy of prejudices and stereotypes, racism is endemic to the British social formation, it is intrinsic to the dynamics of British politics and of the economic crisis, it is part of English culture and belongs to the "English Ideology"(68). This continues to be true but much has happened to the form and structure in which racism appears.

Sivanandan(69) claims that the 1962 Immigration Act is the watershed in the development of racism as well as the crucial turning point in the control of the migration of black labour.

He argues that prior to that, racism was officially condemned but the change from the regulation of black labour by the market to regulation by the state led to racism being respectable and sanctioned. For Sivanandan, racial prejudice was neither structured nor institutionalised before 1962. It operated primarily through social life: housing, schooling, employment etc. After 1962 it began to be institutionalised and so became a matter of power not prejudice.

There are problems with this argument. Sivanandan is correct to identify a change in the role of the state in the regulation of black migrant labour and in the relation between the official view of racism and popular beliefs and attitudes but that does not mean that racism had not previously been structured or institutionalised. 1962 witnessed a change in the form in which racism was institutionalised. I have suggested that the economic relation between the capitalist countries of Western Europe and their (ex-)colonies i.e. the structure of the world economy, involved structured relations of dominance between them. That was a form of structured and systematic exploitation of one "race" by another and hence was a form of institutionalised racism. By 1962 the movement of black labour to the metropolitan centre had already begun a new form of institutional racism secured through the specific form in which black labour was exploited. 1962 saw the beginning of the state regulation and further transformation of the form of institutionalised racism characterised primarily by the transformation of the legal and political status of migrant labour. It was the beginning of one part of a dual strategy for both controlling the aspirations and potential disaffection of black workers and for managing the dysfunctional effects of current and previous forms of racism.

State sanctioning of racism through discriminatory immigration legislation laid the ground for a more overtly racist politics which developed in the late 1960's and early 1970's. It allowed Powell for example to express beliefs which were previously "morally unsayable"(70). It was the beginning

of an anti-immigration consensus which although originally identified with the right wing of the Conservative Party soon impressed itself on the Labour Party also. The reason for this was illustrated by Peter Griffith's victory in the 1964 General Election on the basis of a clear anti-immigration campaign(71).

Powell, in each of his speeches has addressed popular fears and prejudices. He was an early pioneer of racial arguments which employed culture as a key concept. His "rivers of blood speech"(72) in particular drew heavily on the idea that different cultures existing side by side would necessarily lead to conflict. Margaret Thatcher also addressed popular fears in January 1978 when she made her now famous "swamping speech". That too helped to shift popular concerns away from housing, employment and education and towards the more general field of culture. It also sowed the seeds of a specifically ideological understanding of culture itself(73).

Barker(74) identifies the idea of "culture swamping" as central to the development of what he terms a "new racism". It is, he argues, conceptually distinct from a more traditional racism because it posits irreconcilable cultural differences between races rather than the inherent and biologically based superiority of one race over another. He shows that many right-wing politicians and commentators are justifying prejudiced and discriminatory policies, behaviour and beliefs on the grounds of cultural difference. They attempt to avoid the charge of racism through not appearing to embrace notions of racial superiority. To that extent Barker's contribution is useful but whether one is witnessing a truly "new" racism is doubtful. The conceptual and justificatory strands Barker cites may not call on the usual biological basis nor involve notions of superiority but the structural and institutional racism found in many areas of social life do not depend solely on either articulation of an ideology of racism. Although the developments he describes may feed popular racism they do not necessarily replace beliefs and attitudes about superiority, they merely add to them and offer a sheen of respectability.

Central to Barker's argument is identifying what he calls "the argument from genuine fears". It illustrates how popular prejudice is addressed but transformed by justifications for greater immigration control. He quotes Whitelaw:

"Over the years Britain has been an absorbant society, welcoming all comers and in due course assimilating them into our way of life."(75)

Barker comments that,

"The literal untruth of this apparently innocuous statement is unimportant, for the statement formed the backdrop to an important gambit - the 'argument from genuine fears'."(76)

That argument has the following form: there are fears and resentments held by people who are just ordinary folks, they are genuinely afraid and therefore the object of their fears is real. This concept of "genuine fears" Barker claims,

"...acts as a bridge between an apparently innocent description and a theory of race...On its way through the meanings 'genuine fears' picks up the idea of a 'way of life', which is made to mean the same as 'culture'. For our genuine fears are aroused when our way of life or culture is threatened."(77)

Culture is offered as a natural thing, based upon a narrow vision of shared heritage and values and intrinsically bound to a cultural group's natural home. Human nature is invoked to justify fear or antagonism towards other races and nations, it is seen as natural to form a bounded community, a nation, and,

"Your natural home is really the only place for you to be; for that is something rooted in your nature via your culture."(78)

"We have here the bones of a theory that justifies racism. It is a theory linking race and nation."(79)

Justifications of this type used into a state strategy of curtailling black migration and criminalising the resident black population. It utilises the idea of black people as alien and poses "them" as a threat to "our way of life". They also serve a wider ideological function by promoting a mythological

vision of the past, of British traditions and values, as a vision of the future. A fixed notion of human nature is employed but it is not within a fixed vision of society, it is used to justify and create a new form of society(80).

The value of Barker's approach is to identify clearly that justifications for institutional (and structural) racism do not necessarily invoke biological science and that irresolvable difference can do the same work as superiority. It is important for the analysis of contemporary forms of racism that one recognises that "racism" can be applied to ideologies, practices and processes, structures and institutions which do not employ biology or notions of superiority. Barker describes a development in the ideology of racism which I will show to be particularly important within education because of the use made of culture and difference in the analytical base of MCE. However, whether it deserves to be called a "new racism" is, as I have suggested, doubtful. That would involve an unwarranted concentration on the ideological aspects of racism at the expense of the structural and institutional.

Combatting Discrimination, Promoting Equality.

The effects of immigration legislation in structuring the social position and experience of black people in Britain show that the state has played a central role in the development of contemporary racism. Immigration legislation coupled with policies on policing and law and order, have been described as one part of a "dual strategy" on the part of the state in the management of racism(81). Anti-discrimination legislation, successive Race Relations Acts, make up the other.

The economic decline that has followed the post-war boom and the resultant restructuring have affected, although not 'determined'(82), the control of migrant labour and its 'position' in Britain. The political consequences of this restructuring are increasingly institutionalised racism and the marginalisation of large sections of the working class, particularly youth and black people. Economic and political

elements make up the interacting components of what has been conceptualised as an "organic" or "deep structural" crisis of the social formation(83). The actions of the state, both coercive and co-optive, can be interpreted within the context of crisis, as crisis management, as part of the racism of material decline(84).

In this context, it is necessary to consider the meaning of legislation the prima facie purpose of which is to combat discrimination. To examine the theoretical and political problems this raises in a detailed and comprehensive way is clearly beyond the scope of this work but identifying certain key features and questions will help to provide a context for discussing equal opportunities initiatives in education.

The first two attempts to develop anti-discrimination legislation, in 1950 and 1956, were both through private members bills in the House of Commons(85) and both failed. It was not until 1965 that the first Race Relations Act(86) was introduced by the Labour government. But its co-incidence with the reduction, in August of that year, of the number of vouchers available(87) fuels the argument that its purpose, and that of all Race Relations legislation was to manage the effects of restrictions on immigration.

Further Race Relations Act were passed in October 1968(88) and in June 1976(89). Sivanandan argues that the 1976 Act and the formation of the CRE was a piece of crisis management, it managed the effects of racism. He concedes that the CRE was given a few more powers to deal with discrimination but,

"...develop in the process a class of collaborators who would manage racism and its social and political fallout."(90)

Ben-Tovim et al(91) argue that the 1976 Act, the CRE and local CRC's should be seen as more contradictory phenomena than Sivanandan would suggest. Each is a 'site of struggle'. They identify a range of motives for the 1976 Act and whilst they recognise black peoples' cynicism and suspicion over such legislation, they point out that none opposed strengthening

it(92). They argue that the apparent role of the CRE in co-opting black leaders and defusing black protest is not a product of a governmental strategy but more of the structure and accountability of the CRE itself(93).

The "Race Relations Industry" can therefore involve either oppositional activity or collaboration and co-option. The debate here between Sivanandan and Ben Tovim is implicitly one about how one conceptualise the state and the position of "quasi-state" bodies such as the CRE, whether one adopts a "monolithic" model of the state. It is also a question about power, whether it is exercised directly, meeting little opposition at 'the point of application' or is contested and meets with resistance or refusal.

The question of how to interpret anti-discrimination legislation raises many of the same issues as initiatives and interventions concerning race within education. Not the least of these is the importance of approaches to the state and to power(94). Generally, debates about anti-discrimination action provide an important context within which specifically educational activity should be assessed and evaluated.

'Crisis' and Criminalisation.

Economic re-structuring has affected black workers disproportionately because they have been used to cushion other workers from its effects(95), and because patterns of employment of black labour i.e. the racial division of labour, make black people particularly vulnerable to those effects.

Reductions in the total labour requirements in countries of 'the centre'(96) have affected black people particularly because of the characteristic features of black employment: the shorter average duration in employment of migrant workers makes them vulnerable to 'last in, first out' rules when redundancy occurs; workers in the less skilled jobs lose their jobs first; migrants work mainly in the sectors that decline most rapidly during recession; migrant workers forestalled the decline of

centres of production; discrimination in hiring, promotion and firing(97).

Developments in the political sphere, especially the effects of economic re-structuring, unemployment and marginalisation have exacerbated the vulnerability of black communities. As Castles puts it,

"...Western European states are developing an ideological and political offensive against the minorities as part of their strategies of political crisis management."(98)

Hall identifies a 'symbolic' role for race and racism:

"Blacks become the bearers, the signifiers of the crisis of British society in the 1970's: racism its final solution."(99)

He argues that the language of racism connects 'the crisis of the state' above with the state of the streets below, it makes the crisis real for ordinary people(100). It draws on the apparent crisis of race which has been a central theme of recent political rhetoric since Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech but,

"This is not a crisis of race. But race punctuates and periodises the crisis. Race is the lens through which people come to perceive that a crisis is developing. It is the framework through which the crisis is experienced."(101)

Black people, predominantly youth, are identified as a threat to societal values, to a way of life. A 'moral panic' ensues which crystallises popular fears which have a real basis and by providing a simple and identifiable social object seeks to resolve them. It calls on the authorities to take control and therefore can justify an increase of social control. In this way it functions as one of a structured group of popular authoritarian ideologies(102).

These connections not only interpret restructuring and change but also justify a state strategy of criminalisation to deal with their effects. It is a strategy of repression and the division of opposition. Various aspects to this have different impact and importance for different black and ethnic minority

communities. Sivanandan(103) has shown how successive immigration legislation has moved the legal and economic position of black workers closer and closer to the position of migrant workers which means their rights in general have been diminished and their power to defend themselves severely restricted. Consequently,

"As the access to welfare benefits and citizenship by birth became increasingly dependent on immigrant status, all those with foreign names or faces are becoming more and more subject to police and immigration surveillance."(104)

This is a process which has been more of a pressing problem for members of the Asian communities than Afro-Caribbean communities but parallel developments in policing have led to similar effects for the latter groups. The "Sus" law and police campaigns of "stop and search" and "swamping" operations have all attempted to police not particular sections of black communities but the communities as whole. This is a reaction to the political effects of economic restructuring expressed as fears about increased 'lawlessness' and to the practical strategies adopted by sections of black and white youth to combat their wagelessness. As Hall et al explain, the connection between members of the (criminalised) black working class consists not of crime but of wagelessness. Crime conceals and expresses 'the growing wagelessness of the black proletariat'(105).

Conclusion.

This chapter offers the broad context within which the analysis of "racialised forms of education" must proceed. It opens the door to three paths which need to be traced through the chapters that follow. The first follows the development of policies and practices on race in education illuminated against a background of black peoples' experiences of the white working class and its organisations, development of apparently contradictory anti-immigration legislation and Race Relations

Acts, and criminalisation and marginalisation. The general periodisation provides a bench mark for interpreting an educational periodisation of policies and practices.

The second path that opens up pursues major theoretical issues concerning the analysis of race in Britain. The main issues focus on the relation of race to class stratification, particularly the relation between the politics of race and the politics of class. The post-war history of black peoples' experience, especially of the white labour movement, means that simple views of black workers as a section of the working class cannot be sustained. Questions about the 'class position' of black workers suggest that much more needs to be understood about the role of political and economic differences and identities in processes of class formation.

The third path connects the previous two and shows why general issues of racial specificity and stratification are crucial to this thesis. How one interprets past approaches to racial equality in education and how one attempts to lay a foundation for alternatives, depends upon how one models the racial structure of British society. It will become clear in chapters four to six that no approach, no 'racialised form of education' has yet developed an adequate model. Chapters two and three will therefore attempt to provide some of the missing elements of a model in order to develop some of the simplicities and to fill some of the lacunae in current anti-racist frameworks for policy and practice.

Up to this point I have identified issues and problems but provided few solutions. Before one can start to interpret educational developments and build upon existing analyses of them one has to develop a general framework of theory, an outline of racial stratification which can provide a starting point for educationally specific considerations.

Chapter One. Notes and References

- 1) The term "migrant" rather than "immigrant" is preferred in order to acknowledge that the initial intentions of the majority of black people who came to Britain before 1962 were to improve their earnings and standard of living and then return to the country of emigration within a few years (see Castles (1984) p.12, Gibson and Barrow (1986) p.25.). It also highlights a connection to the European phenomenon of "migrant labour" which I will use as a major context for analysing black migration to Britain. It also allows a denial of current inaccurate and pejorative uses of the term "immigrant".
- 2) See Castles (1984) p.41.
- 3) Castles (1984) p.1.
- 4) Op.cit. p.20.
- 5) Op.cit. p.2.
- 6) Op.cit. p.7.
- 7) Op.cit. p.23.
- 8) Nikolinakos (1975) pp.6-8.
- 9) See Castles Op.cit. pp.15-16. Rex (1983) pp.167-8 also uses this distinction.
- 10) Castles and Kosack (1973) p.428, also quoted by Castles (1984) p.16.
- 11) Nikolinakos (1975) p.9.
- 12) Ibid.
- 13) Op.cit. p.10.
- 14) Op.cit. p.11.
- 15) See chapter three in particular.
- 16) Op.cit. p.13. The use of different terms to identify the particular form of exploitation suffered by blacks is an issue which will be discussed in chapter two.
- 17) Op.cit. p.8.
- 18) Op.cit. p.13.
- 19) Green (1979) p.21.
- 20) Phizacklea and Miles (1980).
- 21) Op.cit. p.14.
- 22) See Sivanandan (1978).
- 23) Op.cit. p.16.
- 24) British Nationality Act 1948.
- 25) The 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act stipulated that commonwealth citizens wishing to work in Britain would now need an employment voucher obtained in their country of origin. This was aimed solely at primary immigration and so the entry of dependents was not restricted at this time.
- 26) 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, introduced by a Labour government to avoid the possibility of an influx of 'Kenya Asians' following threats that they would be expelled from Kenya. This act marked a major turning point because for the first time it made the distinction between British citizens who were "patrials" and those who were not. A "patrial" was defined as someone with a parent or grand-parent born in the UK and consequently it

- distinguished in effect between British citizens on the basis of colour.
- 27) In 1971 a Conservative government introduced further legislation. The 1971 Immigration Act restricted the right of abode to patrials. All other British citizens from the commonwealth and citizens of the commonwealth needed a quota voucher or work permit. Restrictions were also introduced on the right of entry for dependents, entry certificates were required which were discretionary and did not guarantee entry.
 - 28) The 1981 Nationality Act. The major effects of this act were first to restrict greatly the entry of dependents through putting the onus of proving dependence on the would be immigrant and through insisting on entry certificates when queues in the sub-continent were increasing. Secondly, commonwealth citizens will within five years of the act coming into force no longer be able to become British citizens by registration, it will be necessary to seek nationalisation. Thirdly, children born in the UK have British citizenship only if their parents had a legal right to be settled when the child was born.
 - 29) The impact of the 1962 act was strengthened in August 1965 when the white paper Immigration From The Commonwealth announced the reduction of the number of vouchers available.
 - 30) Visas were introduced for immigrants from India and Pakistan in 1986. See 'Statement of Change in Immigration Rules' (1986) CMND 9914.
 - 31) See Sivanandan (1976) p.348.
 - 32) Sivanandan (1976). See also Green (1979) pp.23-24 for a summary of why migrant labour is the most effective form for exploiting foreign labour.
 - 33) Green (1979) p.24.
 - 34) Ibid.
 - 35) Green (1979) p.25.
 - 36) Green (1979) p.26.
 - 37) Op.cit. p.26.
 - 38) Op.cit. p.26.
 - 39) Green (1979) pp.27-28.
 - 40) Op.cit.
 - 41) See Parry and Sherlock (1971) pp.295-7.
 - 42) See Layton-Henry (1984) p.3
 - 43) See Sivanandan (1976) pp.351 & 353.
 - 44) See Castles op.cit. p.30.
 - 45) Sivanandan (1981) p.113. See also Green (1979) pp.19-20.
 - 46) Op.cit. p.129.
 - 47) Both of which will incidently affect the extent to which black parents will be able to participate in their children's education. The importance of this for racial equality will be spelt out in chapters four to six.
 - 48) See Castles op.cit. p.132 and Sivanandan (1976) pp.348-9.
 - 49) Phizacklea and Miles (1980) pp.18-20.
 - 50) Op.cit. p.20.
 - 51) See note 17 above.

- 52) Castles, op.cit. p.8.
- 53) See Sivanandan (1981) p.112.
- 54) Op.cit. p.148.
- 55) See Castles (1984) p.27.
- 56) Sivanandan (1981) p.121.
- 57) Sivanandan (1981) p.138.
- 58) Op.cit. p.140.
- 59) Op.cit. p.144.
- 60) Op.cit. p.156.
- 61) Miles and Phizacklea (1977) p.503
- 62) See Sivanandan (1981) pp.116 & 127.
- 63) For further elucidation of this idea see Miles (1982) p.290 and Solomos (1982) p.9.
- 64) Miles (1982b) p.290.
- 65) Miles (1982b) p.290.
- 66) See the earlier discussion of the comparison between moves to restrict labour migration in Britain and in other European countries.
- 67) Hall (1978) p.24.
- 68) Ibid.
- 69) Sivanandan (1981) p.119.
- 70) See Rex and Tomlinson (1979) p.288.
- 71) See Sivanandan (1981) p.122.
- 72) See Foot (1969) p.112. this speech was delivered in Bermingham on 20.4.68.
- 73) See chapter six for a discussion of the significance of these and other concepts of culture for educational policies and practices on race.
- 74) Barker (1981)
- 75) Op.cit. p.13.
- 76) Ibid
- 77) Op.cit. p.16.
- 78) Op.cit. p.21.
- 79) Op.cit. p.22.
- 80) See Barker op.cit. p.31.
- 81) See Sivanandan (1981) and (1976).
- 82) This was shown clearly in the discussion of the pressures and conditions relating to the 1962 Immigration Act.
- 83) See Solomos et al (1982).
- 84) Ibid.
- 85) See Rex and Tomlinson (1979) p.39.
- 86) Race Relations Act (1965).
- 87) Immigration From The Commonwealth (1965) CMND 2739.
- 88) Race Relations Act (1968).
- 89) Race Realtions Act (1976).
- 90) Sivanandan (1981) p.141.
- 91) Ben-Tovim et al (1981) pp.159-163.
- 92) Op.cit. p.160.
- 93) Op.cit. pp.163-4.
- 94) For a discussion of these issues with respect to educational policy on race, see chapter six.
- 95) Castles (1984) pp.148-9.
- 96) Op.cit. p.33
- 97) Op.cit. pp.148-9.

- 98) Op.cit. p.38.
- 99) Hall (1978) p.31.
- 100) Hall (1978) p.32.
- 101) Hall (1978) p.31.
- 102) See Hall (1978) pp.33-34.
- 103) Sivanandan (1976) pp.347-357.
- 104) Castles, op.cit. p.47.
- 105) Hall et al (1978) p.391.

Chapter Two. Race, Class and Racism.

Introduction.

The central axiom of this and the next chapter is that how one understands the racial stratification of Britain has profound implications for analysing how education contributes to racial inequality and hence for how it may help to establish racial equality. Different approaches to racial stratification suggest and sometimes explicitly inform, different racialised forms of education. Theoretical positions provide an analytical framework and influence priorities and general strategies.

Theoretical critiques of various racialised forms have taken as one focus the assumptive base discerned beneath policies and practices. But the role of theoretical frameworks within racialised forms, how they affect policies and practices, is, as will become apparent in chapters four and five, considerably more complex than some critics would have one believe.

Key elements of the theoretical frameworks that, in some sense, ground different racialised forms represent aspects of an analysis of the racial structure of the social formation. Whether explicitly considered or not, the concept of racism is central. But to what does it refer? Is it purely a matter of beliefs and attitudes or are social structures and institutions involved? What is the historical cause or origin of racial disadvantage, what secures its continued reproduction?

Considering the problem of racism raises a number of issues which I will attempt to clarify in this and the following chapter. Questions of the continued influence of colonialism underpin much debate around race relations and racial structure both generally and with reference to education. Much of chapter three will therefore be devoted to understanding the form of the colonial legacy and this will also be used to clarify a number of more general theoretical issues relevant to race.

Concepts of racism operate within racialised forms of education to identify what is specific about racial, as opposed to class and gender based disadvantage. Each racialised form

works with a view, whether explicit or implicit, of the particular nature of racial stratification or disadvantage and those views are therefore a major point of opposition between different overall approaches. It is the primary theoretical task of this and the next chapter to analyse the nature of that racial specificity in order to ground a critique of various types of educational intervention.

Racial specificity needs to be understood through two major theoretical issues: the relation between race and class: the distinction between exploitation and oppression. The analysis of racial stratification has been dominated by attempts to specify how it relates to the class structure of society. But, as I shall show, that relation remains one of the most theoretically complex and problematic within the literature.

The question of gender, with a few noticeable but far from satisfactory exceptions(1), is significantly absent from considerations of race and racism. The discussion that follows will be similarly guilty but it will have certain implications for how race, class and gender are to be theoretically related. The analytical impasse in relating race and class has made it impossible to undertake the task of extending any analysis to gender. My approach to race and class could not just be extended to include gender, that would implicitly deny the fundamental significance of gender, but if my deliberations contribute to any advance at all then they illustrate a methodology for outlining complex and dynamic relations between different parameters of stratification.

The distinction between exploitation and oppression is closely tied to questions of race and class. That distinction will play a general theoretical role but it is also one of the most important conceptual tools for relating the overall approach to the specific problems of analysing racialised forms of education. In fact different racialised forms could be categorised and their limitations revealed through a description of how they separate, relate, conflate or ignore exploitation and oppression.

The nature of oppression is particularly important for the politics of race and for understanding educational interventions. "Culture" is a major axis in debates in both these areas, it is the stake and the terrain of oppression. It will be important therefore to explore the significance of culture for racial issues and to raise questions about the relations between (black) politics and (black) culture.

Overall a theoretical outline of the structure of racial disadvantage must point to the character and origins of basic social antagonisms relevant to race. On that basis it becomes possible to identify roles for 'racial' policies in education in minimising, managing or removing those antagonisms. This helps to explain the contention of the "anti-racist critique" that officially sanctioned policies and practices have the primary function of managing racism and its effects. An outline of the racial structure of the social formation will contribute to a theoretical basis for evaluating the anti-racist critique and for developing further approaches to race in education.

As an overall approach to the issues outlined, an emphasis on the historical determination of current structural relationships underlays much of the discussion that follows. It is expressed in the theoretical preference for the concept of "class formation" over "class position". This should be theoretically located first, in the Marxist problematic which attempts to understand the relationship between the different 'levels' of the social formation: the economic, the political and the ideological. Secondly, it can be linked to the question of the significance of "race" at a time of crisis through relating processes of re-structuring to the structural legacy of colonialism. In that context, the considerations that follow might be used as a background to the current relation between race, education and a "structural crisis"⁽²⁾ of the British social formation.

These issues suggest certain tasks and priorities. First, outlining the nature of economic class and its relation to the formation of political forces. This is necessary in order to

show the limitations of some influential explanations of racism and racial disadvantage but also to ground subsequent discussions. Secondly, the nature of racism, its relation to the needs of "capital" and to the development of capitalism. Thirdly, the relation between the concepts of race and class. Each of these areas will contribute to understanding what is specific about racial stratification and the particular characteristics of racial exploitation and oppression.

Economic Classes and Political Forces.

In recent analyses of race, many of the most influential approaches have concentrated on its relation to social class and have used as a starting point the theoretical insights of forms of Marxism(3). How these have taken shape has to a large extent derived from debates around Marxist concepts of class.

Consequently, the question of the social basis and origin of racism has been approached through attempting to ground it in the structure of class society. Both theoretical projects have had to contend, some more critically than others, with a Marxist metaphor for social structure: the distinction between base and superstructure. As a first approximation, this can be said to denote the relation of determination between 'the economic', understood as the base, and 'the political' and 'the ideological' seen as the two levels of the superstructure.

In "classical" Marxism(4), class and class membership are constituted at the economic level, defined in terms of a relationship to the means of production. This is an objective notion of class, class membership is independent of the consciousness of individuals. Class is constituted materially rather than by shared ideas, education or culture, they may follow from class membership but they do not determine it.

When taken in its most simple or 'vulgar' form, this concept has been acknowledged by Marxist theorists as increasingly problematic(5). Who constitutes the proletariat when the number of people directly involved in production is diminishing is

both politically and theoretically significant. The allocation of a 'class position' to public sector workers, to those in service industries, to the increasingly unionised white collar workers and particularly to the unemployed, makes the way in which class has traditionally been analysed within Marxism problematic. The growing feminist critique(6) of the gender-blindness of class analysis raises further doubts about the basis of class position and the Marxist assumption of the primacy of class exploitation and oppression.

At the present time and especially with reference to race, the class position of the unemployed is the most significant problem. Given that the Marxist concept of class refers primarily to the location of groups in production relations, changes in the capitalist mode of production which have produced surplus labour and intense political struggles over the composition of this surplus population(7), are difficult to analyse in class terms.

Further, if class is defined solely in terms of relations to the means of production, then what is the role for politics, for culture and community in making classes? Ethnic unity and identification are important factors in the organisation of political forces but if class is based purely on economic relations then such factors are politically diversionary and theoretically insignificant. Generally it has been argued that such a concept of class has led to 'left' theoreticians under-emphasising culture and hence to leaving ideology and consciousness inadequately theorised(8).

The problems of race and racism are therefore inextricably linked to current debates between 'structuralist'(9) and 'culturalist'(10) Marxists. Each express a general concern to avoid 'reductionism'. But in the following sections it will become apparent that especially when attempting to explain racial antagonism and racism both have their problems. Structural models employing the concept of "relative autonomy", do not solve the problems of class and race. But some concept

of a structured social formation is essential if purely voluntaristic accounts of class formation are to be avoided.

From "Manifesto Marxism" to "Marxist Culturalism".

Johnson identifies three 'stages' in the development of Marxist concepts of class. The first 'stage' he refers to as "Manifesto Marxism" in which the possibility and process of political change rests primarily on a class achieving consciousness of itself as a class. This involves distinguishing two aspects of the proletariat as a class: "the class-in-itself", determined by its objective relation to the means of production and hence to the capitalist class; "the class-for-itself", a political and conscious entity which unites subjective perceptions with objective position. It is, as Johnson points out, only in this second moment that the class becomes active, a collective agency or force(11).

The distinction between the "in-itself" and the "for-itself" represents a distinction between economic classes and political forms or forces. Johnson claims that some such distinction is analytically indispensable,

"But these two forms of analysis are also bound in the original formulation into a necessary and causative unity."(12)

In this Marxist variant, the relation of the proletariat to capital necessarily produces it as a revolutionary class. Its achievement of revolutionary consciousness is worked through teleologically organised stages towards an inevitable outcome. It follows from this that the cultural and ideological forms of working class (or black) politics are not legitimate objects of political concern or analysis.

Johnson identifies the second 'stage' in the work of Lenin:

"Lenin developed that side of "Manifesto Marxism" that emphasised the importance of political struggles determining outcomes...He stressed the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society."(13)

Lenin's analysis,

"...moves constantly between the 'objective' or 'economic' aspects of immediate tactical situations and the 'subjective' features, matters of organisation and consciousness...Yet the main themes are handled in a way that suppresses the cultural or ideological content or object of politics and obscures questions about popular attitudes and feelings."(14)

For Lenin, ideology serves to obscure class interests and is founded on delusion. It is a means by which control is exerted over the working class. As such, perceptions and images of the working class which serve to divide that class, racially based images of 'working classness' for example, are merely false. In this view such images serve ruling class interests, and do not in any way spring from the working class itself(15). But as I shall show, this ignores many of the processes and contexts through which the concept of the working class and subjective understanding of it have been formed.

Johnson's third 'stage' begins in the work of Antonio Gramsci and forms the basis for the "Marxist Culturalist" school which Johnson represents. He argues that,

"Gramsci was the first major Marxist theorist to take the culture of the popular masses as the direct and privileged object of study and of political practice."(16)

The development through these stages represents a change in the view of the role of politics. "Manifesto Marxism" had been an essentially quietistic, millenarian politics whereas for the Gramscian approach and its heirs, the content of ideology and culture become objects of politics, recognised as integral to the meaning and reality of class.

Johnson's main concern is to release culture from a 'tight' relationship to economic relations in order to prioritise 'the political' and to ground the development of a concept of political culture. This is sustained primarily through a critique of the "necessary" development of particular political forms and forces. He criticises the "in-itself, for-itself"

formulation and begins to develop a concept of class in which 'the working class' is constituted through economic, political, ideological and cultural processes. But the problem of how these processes are related has not been solved, it has more been posed differently, without assumptions of determination. I hope to demonstrate that this offers a more productive basis for analysing race but when one attempts to extend it to questions of race it soon becomes clear that it is the concept of class itself that is problematic.

Objective Interests and Working Class Divisions.

Rex and Tomlinson(17), although treating all Marxists as the 'Manifesto' variety, underline the methodological and conceptual problems of sustaining a Marxist concept of class. They correctly identify the subsidiary hypothesis that economic class is the basis for objective interests. They mistakenly claim that such self-interest arises from differential control of property rather than a common relation to the means of production, but the objective nature of interests is a vital but problematic component of Marxist social theory.

The question of interests and their material basis is fundamental to Marxist analysis of the formation of political forces, and hence to the form in which classes are organised in politics. Consequently, given the political divisions(18) within the working class along racial lines one must ask whether this is the result of ideology or whether it represents any difference in 'objective' interests. One must ask what the basis is for 'intra-class' racial stratification.

Johnson attempts to circumvent these problems when he argues that the material conditions of class,

"...profoundly shape class cultures less by specifying "interests" more by supplying a kind of agenda with which culture must deal."(19)

A class culture is therefore the reaction to and partial articulation of, what Clarke et al refer to as a "class

problematic"(20). This is constituted by the economic conditions of existence, including the social relations of production entered into as a class. Class politics and the form in which they are expressed are similarly to be understood as framed by material conditions and as a negotiation with an objective economic situation. But conceding the necessity of some concept of objective material conditions does not have to involve the historical, causal and conceptual prioritisation of that concept and its separation from political forms and political culture.

The above formulation would not satisfy Rex and Tomlinson. They argue(21) that the Marxist view of the role and perspective of the proletariat is an attempt to respond to the Kantian quest for a sociological a priori, it is "metaphysics of labour". The core of their critique is that Marxists use "categories that transcend the immediate and observed world"(22). They prefer Weber's "ideal types", refusing to "abandon sociology for metaphysics" and arguing against the idea of possible access to real structures which lie behind the appearance of events.

Rex and Tomlinson prioritise "events" not "laws" on the grounds that all events could have been otherwise. A contingent view of outcomes is a central methodological tenet of my project but Rex and Tomlinson's insistence on "events" will be seen to undermine their ability to make sense of these events. It invites the confusion of common-sense and analytical categories. This is particularly a problem in race relations research where common-sense categories should be a major object of study. Rex and Tomlinson are also led to using laws and forming hypotheses without acknowledging that this is being done. Substantive sociological analysis is necessary, laws which demand that events comply will not lead to an understanding of complex social processes but analysis must both be and admit to being, more than "pure description".

This is a methodological and theoretical dispute. It depends on whether "class" represents relations founded on the 'deep structure' of the social formation or refers to a variety of groups engaged in conflict of a more contingent and transitory nature. It turns on how one relates "common interests" to observable behaviour. The "class-in-itself" is designed to ground, to explain causally, the actual behaviour of economic actors. As such it is only indirectly observable with its realisation in a "totally conscious proletariat" which will take on a role commensurate with the unravelling of its historic task. What one observes, the forms in which the working class becomes organised, becomes a political force, can always be dismissed or re-interpreted because they fall short of the political and historical insight which identifies with objective forces. Such an interpretation of the Marxist paradigm, when applied to the events described in Chapter One is neither materialist nor historical. Ideologies, cultures and political forms are not grounded in material conditions and the actual processes of class formation and organisation are ignored because they do not appear to emanate from the principal class dialectic. A concept of class, based solely on economic relations, therefore cannot account for the experience of black workers in post-war Britain.

Material circumstances are vital to the understanding of political forms and forces but not based on a simple opposition between two homogeneous classes. The racial structure of occupations and black experience of white working class organisations indicate the existence of economic and political divisions within the working class. It needs to be shown these divisions along racial lines are related both structurally and historically but this, I contend, will involve an understanding of how classes are constituted through both economic and political processes. The processes of class formation are central to understanding the current meaning of race; race is integral to the processes of class formation.

The contradictions and unresolved problems suggest that to attempt abstractly to relate the economic and the political is to pose the problem in a way unlikely to lead to its resolution. It indicates that a substantive analysis of the development of the relation between economic position and political forms is needed if racial stratification is to be understood. A central component of that should be how race affects class formation. To do that in detail would clearly be beyond the scope of the present work but I will offer, in the next chapter, a schematic outline which will reveal some of the components necessary for understanding the specificity of racial stratification and its relation to class structure.

The purpose of this section has been to problematise Marxist approaches to grounding political differences and 'interests' in an objective view of economic position. The discussion suggests a number of preliminary conclusions with respect to race. First, if class is constituted both economically and politically then the political divisions, along racial lines, take on a greater significance for racial stratification. Those divisions need to be explained via the nature of 'the working class', not through the actions and interests of the ruling class.

Secondly, it casts doubt on the concept of 'economic relations' as it is currently used. It questions whether that concept 'ideologises' economic relations; representing as uniform, a range of 'different' economic relations which can only be partially defined through focusing on their common elements. This raises further problems of how one identifies 'different' economic relations and of making racial generalisations about common - but more 'narrowly' defined economic relations.

Thirdly, questioning the usefulness of the Marxist metaphor for social structure has implications not only for class and race stratification but also for how racism is analysed. As the next section will show, racism has been approached as a matter of ideology and culture, as located in the levels of the

superstructure but if the 'structural' involves the ideological and the cultural then should racism be viewed as in some sense 'structural'?

Processes and Concepts of Racism

The axis of debate concerning the analysis of racism is the relative importance attributed to beliefs and structures in its reproduction. This section will be concerned with examining two approaches representing the poles of this debate. One which focuses on beliefs and attitudes and sees racial stratification and systematic racism as deriving from those beliefs. The other prioritises structural features of the social formation, especially economic structures and relations, and sees beliefs and attitudes as in some way 'derived' from those structures.

The differing approaches reflect not just different analyses of racism but also different understandings of what it is. The concept of racism suffers from being used to refer to a wide range of sources, processes, effects and rationales relevant to racial discrimination and disadvantage. In order to clarify the situation a little it may be useful at the outset to identify four levels on which 'racism' operates. To call all of them "racism", it may be argued, is confusing but in popular and sociological usage each is referred to as "racism", in fact part of the debate is about what the term may legitimately encompass. The four levels I will term racism as ideas, racism as practices, racism as institutions and racism as structures.

The four levels should not be seen as separate or unconnected. The main theoretical task concerning racism is to explain the inter-relation between them. The value of this categorisation will be to help to analyse, as Hall(23) suggests, specific racisms and to show how they articulate with different structures of the social formation.

The first category, "racism as ideas", includes beliefs, attitudes and prejudices. They can be predicated on notions of superiority or difference(24) and employ stereotypes and

generalisations. They operate in three main ways: to justify inequality, to explain inequality and to ground negative orientations towards racial or ethnic groups. No particular level of explicitness or consciousness is implied by this category but that will become an issue when the relations between the role of an individual and racist practices and institutions are considered(25).

"Racism as practices" needs to be restricted to a specific meaning which will exclude actions which derive primarily from an individual or general cultural source - even though those sources cannot be divorced from structural and institutional considerations. By "practices" I hope to convey a sense of habit and system involving individuals and groups of actors but not dependent upon their consciousness of the origin, intention or effects of those practices. Beliefs and attitudes may often justify certain practices but will not of themselves give rise to those practices. Practices will therefore be located within institutions.

"Racism as institutions" is part of what Ben-Tovim, for example, means by institutional racism(26) and is mainly set up in opposition to the concept of individual or attitudinal racism(27). "Institution" has, as Williams claims(28), become the normal term for any organised element of society but such a definition would be too wide to be of much theoretical use. Ben-Tovim(29) lists some of the major state agencies and activities which carry out and reproduce racism: education, the police, housing, immigration and social services but it is not clear that these are in fact institutions. That is not to say that racism is not endemic and systematic within these agencies, nor that it is not institutionalised within them but certain aspects of their functioning will be better understood through my fourth category.

Institutions are locations or sites for practices. They organise, give meaning to and legitimise practices. Dominant and received truths, explanations and traditions justify practices within an institutional context. They in turn are

closely related to the role, social location and effective limits of the institution.

"Racism" as structure" refers to two things: first, the objective features of the macro organisation of society, economic, power and legal relations, what is usually meant by 'the structure of society'; secondly, the relation between institutions, the organisation of particular systemic parts of the social formation. Schools for example are educational institutions, have a structural relation to the system of educational provision and to other non-educational institutions, and they have a relationship to the structure of the social formation as a whole.

The four levels give only a sketch of a model of racism that will be developed in this and subsequent chapters(30). My initial concern will be to discuss how emphases on the first and fourth of these have sought in opposition to each other to explain racism. Problems with accounting for racism and explaining its reproduction through attitudes or structure alone will point to the necessity of examining practices and institutions and attempting to relate the four levels(31).

Beliefs and Attitudes.

The most developed approach to prioritise and focus on beliefs is in the writings of John Rex. His approach to racism derives from his overall approach to the sociology of race relations which he says,

"...must take account of subjective definitions, stereotypes, typifications and belief systems in the business of defining its field."(32)

He stresses the causal agency of such belief systems but he also claims to emphasise the dependence of these belief systems on underlying structures. What Rex means by structures and how belief systems are dependent on them is a major problem with his work(33).

Rex argues that it is one of the sociologist's tasks to explore,

"...both the relation between the racist theory and the underlying structure, and that between racist theories and other theories."(34)

There is a problem of vagueness here. The notion of "belief systems" conveys a sense of unity or coherence for a set of beliefs but without indicating the source or basis of that coherence. "Racist theory" would be linked to racist beliefs but more explicit and better articulated.

Rex recognises this distinction when he claims that the, "...conceptual content of social relations need not always be set out in the form of explicit and well articulated theories."(35)

However, the relationship between beliefs and theories is neither clarified nor explored. This is significant because it means that Rex does not consider the relation of common-sense to explanation and justification within racist ideology. Consequently, important processes in the propagation and legitimisation of racist ideology are not examined.

Rex's work is an example of what Hall calls 'the sociological tendency'(36) in the analysis of racially structured social formations. That tendency stresses,

"...the autonomy, the non-reductiveness of race and ethnicity as social features. These exhibit...their own forms of structuration, have their own specific effects which cannot be explained away as mere surface forms of economic relations."(37)

"It draws attention to the actual form and dynamic of political conflict and social tension in such societies - which frequently assume a racial or ethnic character."(38)

The emphasis is on the lines of division and conflict that are manifest at a particular time. Political oppositions that do not follow the lines indicated by the nature of the 'class-in-itself' are acknowledged as "real". Accepting a "sociological" focus does not necessarily involve denying the importance of economic relations for race or ethnic relations but means refusing to reduce the latter to the former.

Explaining the contribution of economic relations to the origins of racism and the racial structure of societies is, however, a major problem for Rex. Although he refers to structures, to class and economic determinations he sums up his position by claiming that,

"The stratification system of a society arises from the subjective picture or model of social relations which comes to men's minds when they think of their society as a whole."(39)

It would not be uncommon to label this as an "idealist" formulation and hence to deem it unworthy of consideration. However, more telling and useful criticisms can be advanced both in relation to other elements of Rex's theory of race and in terms of the problems it leaves unexplained. Primarily, problems arise because of inconsistency with Rex's account of the historical composition of the white working class and of its influence on the social structure of metropolitan societies(40). That account allows an interpretation of the process of class formation as an historically and institutionally structuring one with respect to beliefs, self-images, views of 'colonial workers' and racial stratification.

Even if the "subjective models", to which Rex refers, gave rise to structures and institutions - which he sometimes seems to argue - it would be reasonable to expect a stratification system to change if and when "men's minds" were changed. There seems to be little evidence of that with respect to racism.

Rex approaches problems of racial tension and racial separation primarily through an examination of the metropolitan society's value system and the chances of a 'colonial worker' being incorporated in to it. He points out that the value systems of advanced capitalist societies have a complex structure which includes ruling class values, counter values, truce-related values(41) and status values which subjectively transmute class attitudes(42). He argues that it is therefore necessary to look at all aspects of a value system because the incorporation of outsiders can only be understood

as incorporation into an existing complex value and social system(43).

Rex claims that in protestant societies(44) colour is a sign that "a man is only entitled to colonial status"(45) and further that,

"...where colour discrimination is consistent with the metropolitan culture and value system, it is likely to operate as a means of classifying the colonial immigrant and placing him in a state of relative rightlessness outside the stratification system."(46)

"Minority status" is ascribed to groups identifiable through colour, who will therefore not be assimilated. Rex combines this with an analysis of "different degrees of freedom" experienced by different races under colonialism as a further basis for assessing differing chances of assimilation.

He emphasises prestige and status, implicitly giving them precedence over more structural determinants of social stratification. Rex argues that what amount or degree of prestige is accorded to 'various ethnic states of segments in a plural society' is not a question of cultural practices nor of the possession of particular qualities but depends of the degree of violence suffered by their ancestors and therefore the extent of a tradition of freedom.

"Hence the low status of the negro in any system of racial or ethnic stratification in a plural society has much to do with the fact that he comes from a people who were more unfree than any others."(47)

Rex further poses the question:

"...what elements in the metropolitan citizen's perception of the colonial immigrant are most significant in mapping his place in relation to the metropolitan stratification structure?"(48)

He answers that they are,

"...the political and economic status of the colonial worker, as it is understood, his stage in cultural evolution and his colour and other physical characteristics."(49)

Rex is using highly questionable notions such as "stage in cultural evolution" and is focusing on a subjectively defined concept of status² which he sees as determining social stratification. He is seeking to identify a 'causal role' for beliefs and perceptions with respect to social organisation but his consideration of beliefs apart from their institutional and structural location means that he is unable to answer, in a consistent way, questions about the effectivity of beliefs. His approach does not allow him to relate the different elements of the overall perception of the 'colonial worker' and consequently his answer has no theoretical coherence. Colour, as one basis for racial stratification, does not necessarily imply the same position in the social structure as a history of violence and 'unfreedom'. If both do affect perceptions of 'immigrants', what happens when they contradict each other?

Although Rex refers to the variety of values that exist in metropolitan society - some of which directly oppose others - he focuses on race relations problems between white and black members of the working class. He thereby ignores how opposed class positions are linked through a racially specific British identity and consciousness closely tied to Britain's colonial past. He also, because of his focus on beliefs rather than structural position, cannot consider the class-specific aspects of racism. This means that its differing role and significance for different classes cannot be addressed.

Implicit in Rex's account is a view of the form in which British society and social structure contains a colonial legacy. He attempts to ground a legacy of beliefs and culture on experiences or traditions of violence and unfreedom but no means or method of transmission or reproduction of these beliefs and culture is identified. The question of the form in which a legacy survives is not asked, it is assumed that it is as beliefs and culture.

Rex is attempting to ground racist beliefs in Britain's colonial history, and he seeks to identify the processes by which those beliefs can have real effects on the system of

stratification. Both are necessary tasks in analysing racism but it is clear that Rex's account is missing major components of an adequate theory. The concepts that he employs are ambiguous and lack clarity. However, there is a 'tension' in Rex's work, although theoretically inadequate, his work is valuable because it identifies certain "social facts" that any competing theory must account for and hence it points to weaknesses in many Marxist accounts of racial stratification and racism. I hope to demonstrate that it is possible to develop an alternative emphasis on structure, institutions and practices that takes up and accounts for Rex's descriptive insights but avoids the problems identified.

Racism and the Capitalist Mode of Production.

A 'structural' emphasis in accounting for racism can primarily be associated with Marxist approaches. But it will soon become clear that this does not mean that a Marxist analysis necessarily sees racism as structural, as part of the structure of the social formation, rather, racism is seen to derive from the structure. The problems with this approach derive in general from a particular concept of structure(50), a concept closely tied to the base-superstructure metaphor discussed earlier.

The post-war period covered in chapter one illustrates how racism can operate to divide the working class along racial lines and hence undermine the possibility of black workers securing improved pay, conditions and security. Disunity also prevents the identification of interests which cross racial or ethnic lines and so racism aids in the general disorganisation and lack of solidarity among the whole working class. Such is a description of the effects of racism on the processes and institutions of working class politics. But does it also identify the fundamental meaning and source of racism? Because racism has operated broadly in the interests of capital, it has been assumed that it necessarily and always does so, that it derives from the relations of capitalist production(51).

This represents the second of the two 'tendencies' that Hall identifies, the 'economic'. He claims that it takes,

"...economic relations and structures to have an overwhelmingly determining effect on the social structures of such formations...those social divisions which assume a distinctively racial or ethnic character can be attributed or explained principally with reference to economic structures and processes."(52)

Cashmore and Troyna cite Co. as one of the first to argue that racial antagonism was a 'fundamental trait of capitalism':

"Race as a socially defined category is a product purely of the development of capitalism."(53)

This view depends upon identifying the emergence of "race" as a concept in the 16th/17th century when the foundations of modern European capitalism were being laid by colonial expansion(54). On this basis, it might appear that the distinctions and antagonisms to which "race" refers were produced by the advent of capitalism.

Robinson argues that on the contrary, the origins of the racial distinctions that underlay racism and nationalism are to be found in feudal society, they pre-date capitalism and influenced the form of its historical development(55). He claims that,

"European civilisation, containing racial, tribal, linguistic, and regional particularities, was constructed on antagonistic differences."(56)

The development of the capitalist mode of production then exacerbated and emphasised those differences:

"The bourgeoisie which led the development of capitalism were drawn from particular ethnic and cultural groups; the European proletariats and the mercenaries of the leading states from others; its peasants from still other cultures; and its slaves from entirely different worlds. The tendency of European civilisation through capitalism was thus not to homogenise but to differentiate - to exacerbate regional, sub-cultural, dialectical differences as racial ones."(57)

Robinson(58) appears to argue that this formed the basis of the availability of racial categories and of racism when it emerged in the 17th/18th century as a rationalisation for domination and exploitation. Further, this fed the emergence of nationalism which, he claims, denied the class identity of different national bourgeoisie classes which then oppose each other as 'national' enemies(59).

If Robinson's historical analysis is correct then a central part of Marxism's traditional explanation of racism and racial stratification needs to be revised. It appears that although the concept of race emerged with the advent of capitalism, the antagonisms and perceived differences on which it was based pre-dated capitalism and helped to determine the form that capitalist development took. This means that the use that has been made of racism and racial stratification in the reproduction and re-structuring of contemporary capitalism depends not only on its functional utility but also on its position at the root of European capitalism.

Robinson's argument(60) involves the further claim that "critiques of capitalism" i.e. Marxism,

"...to the extent that its protagonists have based their analyses upon the presumption of a determinant economic rationality in the development and expansion of capitalism, has been characterised by an incapacity to come to terms with the world system's direction of development."(61)

This criticism goes to the heart of Marxist social analysis. It opposes the idea that the contradiction between the working class and the ruling class has to be resolved in a given direction with the inevitable result being the collapse of capitalism. It denies that class contradictions are necessarily the primary contradictions of the social formation and refutes the idea that they determine all other oppositions and conflicts. It argues for an analytic approach which does not ignore class but neither does it a priori, relate all political forms of expression and organisation to class antagonisms.

An approach is suggested that unifies aspects of the economic and sociological tendencies. One that utilises Rex's descriptive insights and places them within a materialist framework. A materialist framework founded on a view of material conditions that goes beyond simple and broad relations to the means of production. Within this it should be possible to outline a structural concept of race that acknowledges its specificity and its 'internal' relation to class, one that recognises racism and racial antagonisms as real and material.

It appears that far from racial differentiation and conflict being products of class antagonisms, race and class are 'mutually structuring'. The form that each takes depends on the other. The dominance of the social formation by capital depends contingently on racial antagonisms, but, the particular organisation of the capitalist mode of production, as it is currently manifest, is integrally bound to race. By implication, this questions the idea that racism is a product of the structure of the social formation rather than an integral part of it. It questions an assumption at the centre of both Marxist accounts and Rex's Weberian one: that racism is a question only of beliefs and attitudes, of ideologies and cultures.

Race, Racism and Reductionism.

As a theory of class based exploitation and oppression, Manifesto Marxism assumed a direct link between exploitation and oppression, the latter securing the reproduction of the former with both necessary to the maintenance of class society. Manifesto Marxism involved the idea that 'the position of the proletariat' was 'unoccupiable' and that it necessarily produced it as a revolutionary class. Exploitation was accompanied by a level of oppression that demanded opposition and revolt. The theoretical transformations represented by the work of Gramsci has severed that immediate link between exploitation and oppression but can it then be assumed that a revised class analysis can simply be extended to explain not

only the particular level of exploitation of black workers but also the racially based oppression that black people suffer? If race is acknowledged as having its own specificity can the analysis of class merely have a 'race dimension' added to it?. Is Marxism an adequate basis for a general theory of oppression or have the particular features of class exploitation and oppression been generalised beyond their applicability?

Racism is identified, within the Marxist tradition, as a question of ideas,² attitudes and prejudices through being allocated to the ideological and cultural levels of the social formation(62). If a structural model of society, depending on the difference between economic base and a superstructure made up of political, cultural and ideological 'levels' is employed, then racism understood as ideas etc. must be allocated to the superstructure.

The analysis of racism as a part or product of a ruling ideology uses the Leninist concept of ideology(63) discussed earlier and stresses its role in securing the reproduction of the capitalist social formation. Ideology is seen to help the ruling class to dominate the working class by mis-representing and obscuring the true nature of capitalist domination. It constitutes an illusion which attempts to justify and explain inequalities of political and economic power and of income and standard of living.

This concept of ideology has the advantage of clarity but its clarity depends upon the simplifications inherent in the base-superstructure metaphor. As that metaphor has been criticised and modified a more sophisticated concept of ideology has emerged. Ideology may now refer not only to beliefs but common-sense(64), theories, practices and institutions(65).

Abandoning the idea of ideology as illusion raises the central question of the source and nature of the "reality" of ideology. From the "reality" of ideology stems its materiality and effectivity but given that "material" is often seen as

equivalent to 'the economic'(66), how can ideology be said to be material? Further, if a theory maintaining the specificity of race is to be developed how can one, in Althusser's terms, "hold onto both ends of the chain" at once, that is, assert the relative autonomy of ideology and its determination in the last instance by the economic?(67)

Many 'non-reductionist' accounts of general social structure and of racial stratification are available which employ Althusserian terms but these often seem to overuse them and so misapply the concepts which they represent. The usual emphasis is on avoiding the reduction of 'non-economic' levels to 'the economic' whilst holding on to a materialist base. Consequently, the problem is to explain the "relative autonomy" of ideology, from economic relations, of ideological production from economic production.

Ben-Tovim, for example, argues that,

"... racist theories and ideologies have their own relatively autonomous determinations, they are the result of theoretical and ideological practices which cannot be collapsed into their economic basis or seen in terms of their class functions alone."(68)

He claims that economic, political and ideological structures provide the conditions under which racist ideologies and practices have been reproduced(69). But the question is how has this occurred and what does it indicate about the relation between different types of determinant?

Ben-Tovim takes the argument a little further when he argues that,

"Structural factors...have certainly underpinned the development of ideological and cultural racism in this period but legal transformations in the position of black people has been fought out on the terrain of a specific ideological and political discourse...which has had its own independent effects and its own internal determinants".(70)

But this is no more than a statement of the problem, given the broad lines of the Marxist problematic. What it means and

how much is being said depends on the meaning of key concepts and the nature of the processes to which the metaphors of 'linkage' refer.

Miles attempts both to distance himself from reductionist accounts and to maintain a structural model of the social formation. He claims that the expression of racism and nationalism within the working class is not a result of brainwashing but is a result of independent economic, political and cultural processes which structure working class political processes(71). This locates the author with respect to his intellectual antecedents but again really only states the problem, it does not increase our knowledge of how the process referred to takes place.

Miles bases his analysis on a critique of the concept of race and of race relations in general. He criticises the everyday use of "race", saying that it refers to phenotypical variation on the basis of which discrete races can be identified. Such a usage, he argues, is not biologically valid,

"The formation and maintenance of (these) interbreeding populations are not due to genetic or other biological factors. The determining factors are geographical and socio-economic."(72)

Miles argues that,

"The basis of racism is to be found not in the attribution of meaning to phenotypical difference but in identifying the economic, political and ideological conditions that allow the attribution of meaning to phenotypical difference."(73)

Miles establishes that "races" are socially constructed not biologically given but uses this fact to argue that race relations are different to other social relations only in that they are so defined(74). Race relations should not be divorced from other social relations but the concept of race is not fully explained by calling it a "common-sense" category. Miles' project, to understand the social construction of race, is a valid one but, as Cashmore and Troyna(75) have argued, Miles'

hard distinction between 'common-sense categories' and 'structural realities' is extremely problematic.

Miles would argue that the first includes race whereas the latter refers to class and relations of production. On the contrary, the racial organisation of the occupational structure shows that racial differentiation is a structural reality even though it may be expressed in thought through common-sense categories. Once again the problems of seeing racism as beliefs, attitudes and prejudices arise. Miles' approach shows what happens when economic reductionism is replaced but class remains unchallenged as the primary structural category: the reality of race, of racial differentiation and hence of racism, is assigned to be a contingent feature of Britain's capitalist social formation rather than one of its defining features.

A structural approach to racism should avoid the problems in viewing racism as ideology but it should not deny the materiality and effectivity of ideas. Miles attempts to acknowledge this and account for structural racism by saying that,

"The extent of racial discrimination is an important determinant of the economic and political circumstances of those subject to it...Consequently, groups of people come to share structurally determined interests."(76)

Miles explains the effectivity of ideas or beliefs about race (and nation) by claiming that,

"We can view the articulation of racism and nationalism as having real effects at two levels: first, historically in having assisted in the social construction of current realities; and second, in being available as a means of interpreting that reality and structuring subsequent political action."(77)

If one considers these quotes in conjunction with Miles' view of racial categories as "common-sense" two main problems appear. First, Miles refers to racial discrimination - by which I take him to mean individual actions arising out of prejudice - but it is not discrimination that leads to structurally

determined interests, it is the other way around. Secondly, and underlaying the first problem, Miles views racism as 'about reality' rather than as a part of reality. This springs from the idea that racism is a question of ideology and ideas, that its reality derives only from its effects on reality not from being a structured part of the social formation.

It appears that there are two main problems with Marxist attempts to avoid the pitfalls of economic reductionism. First, the over-application of a too simple structural model of the social formation. Secondly, the unquestioning use of a concept of class that re-introduces many of the problems of economic reductionism. It is important to free non-economic 'levels' from being determined by the economic if race and racism are to be understood. Classes are constituted through each of the levels of the social formation but if that is conceptualised without reference to any other source of conflict or opposition - especially race - then class reductionism remains even if economic reductionism has been superceded. The problem of theorising racism on a Marxist basis depends not only upon how economic relations are related to political forms and to the content of ideology and culture, but also derives from the a priori prioritisation of class relations.

"Race" and "Class"

In using the problematic of Marxist Culturalism as a basis for discussing class, I have suggested that a range of interactive processes - economic, political, cultural and ideological - are involved in its constitution. Consequently, the hard distinction between objective and subjective class has been blurred and how the working class becomes organised in politics is not derivative but constitutive of class.

A similar re-evaluation of the concept of race is necessary. One must consider the economic constitution of black people as a social 'group' but also the processes through which they may become a cohesive political 'group'. "Race" has meaning within

scientific as well as social scientific discourse. It is, as Miles has pointed out(78), a "common-sense" category found in both popular and political discourse. Miles' argument is useful to the extent that it shows that the uses of "race" in both popular and social scientific discourse refers to a system of categorisation that has no basis in biological science but should that lead to the abandonment of the concept altogether?

Miles(79) argues that "races" are socially constructed but what does this imply for "racial stratification"? Miles' notion of racial groups having "structurally determined interests" is, as I have mentioned, based on the fact of racial discrimination but one must ask what this implies for the structure of the social formation. Race cannot be treated as merely a "common-sense" category. If racial groups share structurally determined interests then what[^] it is about structural relations that determines those interests? This suggests that a structural concept of race is needed. One which can ground a concept of "structural racism", the latter being the discriminatory effects of the former.

These considerations suggest a problematic within which the question of the relation between race and class can be addressed without simplifying or 'reducing' either to the processes and structures of one level of the social formation. A problematic which, because of the 'structural' nature of both, does not attempt to reduce one to the other.

Different attempts to relate race and class have concentrated on identifying the position of black people in 'class society'. How this has been approached is indicated by the different terms that have been used to convey a sense of that position. For example, Hall et al use the term "sub-proletariat"(80), Rex refers to an "under-class"(81), Miles and Phizackalea prefer "class-fraction"(82).

Each term reveals something of how each theorist attempts to conceptualise black people as in some ways a section of the working class and in other ways set apart, exploited and oppressed to a greater degree. Earlier comments on Miles and

Phizacklea showed how they view the position of black people as a question of intra-class stratification. The primacy of class is upheld and the political task is to unite the various "class fractions"(83). The demand that one avoids 'class reductionism' and develop a 'structural' concept of race renders Miles and Phizackles's formulation inadequate.

Rex's concept is primarily descriptive but he does offer an explicit political strategy which makes use of that concept. The concept of the "under-class" is dependent on two contentions that are used to elaborate Rex's concept of class. First, that "truce" between antagonistic classes(84) is possible for fairly prolonged periods and secondly, that class struggle expresses itself in a number of different struggles over resources(85). Within this schema, Rex offers "under-class" as an "ideal type" and defines it as,

"...minorities systematically at a disadvantage to working class whites, outside working class culture, community and politics, having their own organisations."(86)

From this definition Rex argues that the position of the under-class should be compared with that of the working class incorporated in the welfare state. He says that it has the potential to become an "under-class for itself" i.e. to organise both culturally and for political action(87). Rex's emphasis means that he can point to important differences between the political and cultural formation of black people as a 'social group' or 'class', and of differences between their social location, and that of their white working-class peers.

However, the significance of this Rex leaves under-theorised. It is symptomatic that Rex places black people outside of the stratification system, because they are not seen to be 'assimilated', even though the concept of "under-class" is clearly designed to indicate a sub-ordinate position within a system of stratification. "Under-class" appears as a structural concept but because "class" focuses on access and consumption the former concept does not in fact relate to a structural position. One is left with no way ordering or relating the

various bases upon which antagonistic 'groups' may come into conflict(88).

The approach preferred by Hall et al, in opposition to Miles and Phizacklea and to Rex, views racial structures and processes as internal to the social formation. They claim that,

"The constitution of this class fraction (black labour) as a class, and the class relations that inscribe it, function as race relations. The two are inseparable. Race is the modality in which class is lived. It is also the medium in which class relations are experienced."(89)

The key to this picture is the meaning of the concept of "modality". Hall et al are arguing that black members of the working class experience their class position as a race and through their race. To the extent that class is defined in terms of economic relations this formulation is adequate but how can the role of politics in the formation and definition of class be accommodated?

Hall et al are clearly concerned to stress the 'relative autonomy' of the levels of the social formation and the lack of a necessary correspondance between them(90). They claim that,

"Race is intrinsic to the manner in which black labouring classes are complexly constituted at each of those levels."(91)

This would appear to be consistent with the view of class, and race, formation² which I have begun to develop in this chapter. It is unclear at the moment where such an approach leads in relating race and class but it does highlight the importance of the politics of race and how black people are politically constituted as a group.

If the active and constitutive role of 'the political' is maintained then one channel for exploring the relation between race and class is through asking about the 'class significance' of black struggles, i.e. about the relation between class struggles and black struggles.

In general, the problem is how to maintain the primacy of the 'anti-capitalist struggle' whilst asserting the specificity

of black oppression and struggle. Sivanandan resolves this partly through inconsistency and partly through the mythologisation of past struggles(92). He seems to generalise from that mythological past to assert the class nature of all black struggles but elsewhere(93) he recognises that this is only a potential, something to be accomplished through politics.

Hall et al take up this problem and claim that,

"The white working class...fundamentally mistakes itself and its position when it extends itself, out of fellow feeling or fraternal solidarity, to struggle against racism on behalf of 'our black brothers'; just as black organisations misrecognise the nature of their own struggle when they debate whether or not to form tactical alliances with their white comrades...(however)...at every critical moment in the post-war history of the class in advanced capitalism, the struggle has necessarily divided into its strategic separate parts. But the analysis has a certain logic, which must drive through to its conclusion...Each section of the class requires to confront capital as a class, not out of solidarity with others, but for itself."(94)

This position emphasises the political division of the working class into racially specific sections and how this allows capital to divide and hence defeat the class. Hall et al are specific that they are not presenting a tactical call for unity but it is clear that although disunity has a real basis, unity is a political pre-requisite for change.

Gilroy adopts a slightly different approach, taking up Hall's argument and stressing the role of struggle and politics in class formation. He uses Hall et al's 'modality argument' to equate 'struggle for the race' and 'struggle for the class'. He claims that,

"The consciousness of exploitation provoked in the experience of racial oppression is not some preliminary phase in the development of a mythically complete class consciousness sometime in the future."(95)

"The class character of black struggle is not a result of the fact that blacks are predominantly proletarian though this is true. It is established in the fact that their struggles for 'civil rights', for freedom from state harassment or as waged workers are instances of the process by which the working class is constituted, is organised in politics."(96)

Gilroy distinguishes between exploitation and oppression but he assumes that consciousness of the latter necessarily involves consciousness of the former. He leaves himself open to the problems associated with a 'black nationalist' position, which as Henderson has pointed out, is a theoretical orientation necessary to consciousness but insufficient for practice(97). It mis-recognises the relationship between the exploitation of the white working class and that suffered by their black counter-parts.

Gilroy's approach is interesting because it stresses that black struggles play a part in class (re-)formation. But much more needs to be said about the relation between the object of those struggles, the object of the struggles of the white working class, and the possible contradictions between them. The emphasis on class formation as opposed to class position is clearly consistent with the general lines of my argument. He uses the idea of class constitution through politics, through struggle to advance what might be termed an 'activist Marxism'. An approach which will remedy many of the problems of reductionist Marxism but it will however, court the danger of becoming a purely pragmatic and voluntarist view of politics, a view shorn of its basic materialism.

This is a problem for Gilroy because he explicitly states his desire "to restore some of the determinacy which class struggle has lost in much recent Marxist writing"(98). He argues that,

"We must re-draw the boundaries of the concept 'class struggle' so that it includes the relentless process by

which classes are constituted - organised and disorganised in politics."(99)

There seem to be two main flaws in Gilroy's approach to the question of class constitution. First, his idea of a 'relentless process' is too abstract, true only as a limiting case(100). It blurs all distinctions between periods of crisis and periods of "truce", between 'revolutionary' or 'normal' conjunctures and in the end far from 'restoring determinacy' it invites a purely contingent account of class formation.

Secondly, Gilroy's concept of class struggle covers different types of social conflict. It is important to distinguish, and analyse differently, different types of struggle. He says that his concept includes not only processes by which classes are constituted but also the struggles between them once formed(101). But the specific features of these two types of struggle should be drawn out and analysed. Gilroy obscures the differences between them and is led to equating all types of interests and identifications. Conflicts over consumption, conflicts between non-class groups - both of which are relevant to the politics of race - cannot be accommodated in Gilroy's schema.

These conflicts are of central importance for race because they represent major forms in which people experience structural discrimination. Also, to the extent that the institutions of working class life contribute to structural discrimination, it is necessary to change those institutions. That would constitute a process of class re-constitution but would it be reasonable to call it class struggle? Such struggles 'for the race' may in the long term be 'for the class' because they try to re-constitute it in a unified form but they maintain important differences to those struggles which oppose the structures and institutions which exploit and oppress the white, as well as the black, working class.

The problem of relating race and class is clearly one of trying to isolate the exploitation and oppression that black people suffer over and above that suffered by white members of

the working class. However, so far the approaches that I have discussed founder on the need to acknowledge the importance of political, cultural and ideological processes in class formation whilst retaining a 'structural' and non-voluntaristic position.

Rex and Gilroy fail, in very different ways, to satisfy the second requirement. Miles and Phizacklea pay lip service to non-economic processes but ultimately their complex class reductionism leaves them unable to cope with the 'structural' nature of race. The contributions of Hall et al appear to offer the greatest chance for moving towards relating structural, non-reductionist concepts of race and class. But the problems in that approach seem to stem from problems of expressing structural relations per se. The concept of 'modality' could be useful but to what extent is it another structural metaphor trying to express the inexpressible? This is not to say that the relation between race and class cannot be talked about but that the emphasis throughout this chapter on the constitutive role of a range of processes - economic, political, cultural and ideological - suggests a different approach. To attempt to express the relation in structural terms alone, without reference to the processes through which each has been defined and through which they have interacted, may be to miss the significance each has for the other. That possibility will be examined in some detail in the next chapter.

Conclusion.

This chapter has focused on three issues of relevance to understanding the specificity of racial stratification. Three particular foci have been used. First, I examined the question of the relation between the economic and political in class formation. This suggested a concept of class in which class formation is a process involving all the 'levels' of the social formation. It showed that political differences and antagonisms between the white and black working class were not

representative of 'a divided class' but were part of the process through which 'the class' is re-constituted.

The second issue was the question of racism. How should it be conceptualised, what does it refer to, what are its origins? I demonstrated that an exclusive focus on attitudes or on 'structure' was not adequate for the analysis of racism. I showed that both approaches treated racism as a question of beliefs, attitudes and prejudices whereas chapter one has suggested that a structural concept of racism was required.

In the third section I examined how race and class can be viewed as structural concepts formed through complex interactions of the levels of the social formation. Such is a pre-requisite for developing a structural concept of race and hence for grounding a concept of structural racism. But attempts to analyse a structured relation between race and class and hence to locate the 'position' of black people have each been shown to be lacking. What then is the way forward?

The emphasis on class formation rather than class position is clearly important. It is re-inforced by the critique of existing structural metaphors for the relation between race and class. Together they point to an examination of the historical processes through which race and class have interacted. In the next chapter I intend² to demonstrate that the structural legacy of colonialism offers a key to how race and class are intrinsically bound together by the processes of their formation.

Chapter Two. Notes and References.

- 1) See for example Davis A. (1982), Carby (1982b) or James S. (1975)
- 2) See Solomos (1982), Hall et al (1978) for an elaboration of the relationship between race and a structural crisis.
- 3) See for example, Miles (1982a), Gilroy's work and Hall et al (1978). Each of these will be discussed in detail later in this and other chapters.
- 4) This term corresponds to what Johnson has called "Manifesto Marx-ism". See Johnson (1979).
- 5) This debate has been extensive and many have made contributions. Two main themes can be identified within this. One centres on who currently comprises the 'working class', for commentary on some of the relevant issues and problems see Hunt (1978). The other theme is the relation between economic class and political forces and political interests. The position that there is no link between them is argued in Hindess (1983), see pp.34-42 in particular. More complex and more interesting has been recent work in the Gramscian tradition of which Laclau and Mouffe (1984) is possibly the most developed and comprehensive.
- 6) See for example, Hartman (1979) and Eisenstein (1979), especially the introduction and chapter one.
- 7) See Gilroy (1981) p.211.
- 8) See Johnson (1976) pp.203-208.
- 9) Structuralism, Marxist or otherwise, is as Williams (1983) pp.303-308 points out, complex and difficult to define. I use the term in a broad sense to refer to those strands of Marxist thought, primarily associated with Althusser, which emphasise the determinant relations between the economic, culture, politics and ideology as a product of deep permanent structures of the social formation.
- 10) Again a broad body of thought is referred to but the key point is an emphasis on the active role of subjects in the determination of events and the lack of any fixed or constitutive relation between 'levels' of the social formation. Johnson, whose work provides a useful starting point in this chapter should also be viewed as a proponent of this approach.
- 11) Op.cit. p.203.
- 12) Op.cit. p.204.
- 13) Op.cit. p.206.
- 14) Op.cit. pp.207-8.
- 15) See Johnson Op.cit. p.208
- 16) Op.cit. p.209.
- 17) Rex and Tomlinson (1979) pp.2-3.
- 18) See the outline of black post-war experience of working class political institutions given in chapter one.
- 19) Op.cit. p.237.
- 20) See Clarke et al (1976) p.29.
- 21) Op.cit. p.302.
- 22) Op.cit. p.301.
- 23) See Hall (1980a) pp.337-339.

- 24) Barkers' work on whether racist beliefs and theories necessarily involve notions of superiority will be discussed later in this chapter and chapter six will consider the relevance of this to education.
- 25) See chapter six for a discussion of these relations with reference to educational institutions.
- 26) Ben-Tovim (1978) p.208.
- 27) This is particularly the case in the context of debates around racism in education. See chapter six for a full discussion of this issue.
- 28) Williams R. (1983) p.169.
- 29) Ben-Tovim (1978) p.208.
- 30) See in particular chapters three and six.
- 31) See chapter six.
- 32) Rex (1983) p.9.
- 33) This will be more fully discussed in chapter three.
- 34) Rex (1983) p.11.
- 35) Op.cit. p.12.
- 36) See Hall (1980a).
- 37) Hall (1980a) pp.306-307.
- 38) Op.cit. p.307.
- 39) Rex (1983) p.105.
- 40) This point will be covered in detail in chapter three.
- 41) This refers to values which Rex sees as dominant during times of truce between the major antagonistic classes. For further discussion of this see chapter three.
- 42) See Rex (1983) p.91.
- 43) Ibid.
- 44) When talking about the difference between the social status of black people in Protestant societies and in Roman Catholic countries Rex attributes greater tolerance to the latter and claims that this is caused by its adherence to Catholicism. This claim is however a totally unsubstantiated and anecdotally based generalisation.
- 45) Op.cit. p.108.
- 46) Op.cit. p.110.
- 47) Rex (1983) p.42.
- 48) Op.cit. p.106.
- 49) Ibid.
- 50) For further comments on the difficulties with the concept of structure see chapters three and four.
- 51) O. C. Cox is seen as the major proponent of this view. In Cox (1972) he states that "racial exploitation and race prejudice developed among Europeans with the rise of capitalism and nationalism" (p.322). It is also a thesis that has often been implicit in how the politics of race has been approached within the organised labour movement.
- 52) Hall (1980) p.306.
- 53) Cashmore and Troyna (1982) p.32.
- 54) See Husband (1982) pp.12-13 for an outline of the emergence of the idea of race and its development as a scientific concept in the late 18th/early 19th century.
- 55) Robinson (1979) p.145 & (1983) p.9.
- 56) Robinson (1979) p.146 & (1983) p.10.

- 57) Robinson (1983) pp.26-27.
- 58) Robinson (1983) p.27.
- 59) Robinson (1983) p.28.
- 60) Hall (1980a) p.317 makes a similar point when discussing Rex's work. He refers to the absence of any tendency to move to "the more rational form of free labour".
- 61) Robinson (1979) p.145.
- 62) See for example, Tierney (1981b), Miles (1982a).
- 63) See note 16 above.
- 64) An idea associated with the Gramscian legacy. See Gramsci (1971), especially pp.321-330.
- 65) See Althusser (1981).
- 66) See Hall (1977) p.30.
- 67) Hall (1977) pp.29-30.
- 68) Ben-Tovim (1978) p.204.
- 69) Op.cit. p.205.
- 70) Op.cit. pp.207-208.
- 71) Miles (1982b) p.288.
- 72) Miles (1982a) p.17.
- 73) Miles (1982a) p.64.
- 74) Miles (1982b) p.282.
- 75) Cashmore and Troyna (1983) p.11.
- 76) Miles (1982a) p.63.
- 77) Miles (1982b) p.286.
- 78) See Miles (1982a) p.280.
- 79) See Miles (1982a) p.20.
- 80) Hall et al (1978).
- 81) Rex (1983).
- 82) Miles and Phizacklea (1980).
- 83) For further discussion of different political processes through which 'black interests' may be expressed see chapters one and three.
- 84) This will be discussed in some detail in chapter three.
- 85) See Rex (1983) p.XIV.
- 86) See Rex and Tomlinson (1979) p.275.
- 87) Rex (1983) p.XV.
- 88) This, as an element of a critique of Rex's concept of class will be developed in chapter three.
- 89) Hall et al (1978) p.394.
- 90) Op.cit.
- 91) Hall et al (1978) p.394.
- 92) See Sivanandan (1981) p.138. Also see chapter one.
- 93) See Sivanandan (1976) p.336.
- 94) Hall et al (1978) p.395.
- 95) Gilroy (1981) p.219.
- 96) Gilroy (1981) p.219.
- 97) Henderson (1978) p.159.
- 98) Gilroy (1981) p.211.
- 99) Ibid.
- 100) Gilroy's contention is true in a sense but the scale of the re-formation is negligible in most cases, having little effect on the organisation, institutions and political forms of the working class.
- 101) See Gilroy (1982) p.284.

Chapter Three. The Historical Specificity of Black Oppression.

Introduction.

The processes of class formation in Britain over the last hundred years or so are inextricably bound to the history of British colonialism and imperialism. Consequently, the current relations between black and white members of 'the working class' are underpinned by relations between European ex-colonial powers and their erstwhile colonies. I will attempt to demonstrate that the historical relation between European countries and their colonies is not only the background to contemporary race relations but represents an earlier form of structural racism which has helped to shape and structure the current form.

A model of the structure of the social formation that identifies the particular 'locations' occupied by black workers should include an historical outline of the exploitation of black people and the nature of oppression under colonialism. Both have implications for how British society is racially structured and hence for the operation of structural racism.

I have discussed in the previous two chapters how the 'position' of black labour depends in part on the racial organisation of the occupational structure. I have also illustrated the problems of Rex's Weberian approach and of the major Marxist ones, in explaining and conceptualising the particular nature of the exploitation of black people. I have emphasised the importance of not conflating that problem with the question of the specificity of black oppression. Together these issues and problems delineate the problem of analysing the specific and particular nature of the 'position' of black people under capitalism.

This is the central problem of relevance to understanding the assumptive and conceptual basis for educational interventions around race. Two major areas are significant for educational theory, policy and practice. First, is the form in which a colonial legacy remains in the contemporary social

structure. It will be explored through an examination of, on the one hand, the effects and legacy of slavery and on the other, the processes of class formation under colonialism. This will prescribe whether the emphasis placed by educational initiatives will be on residual attitudes or on structural relations which have their origins in colonialism.

Secondly, the structural legacy of colonialism will be used to examine the structural position of black labour. This largely determines the life chances of black students and hence profoundly affects the limits of educational initiatives in effecting change. It also makes possible a potential role for education in managing the effects of structural racism through ignoring its existence and helping to establish alternative explanations of racial inequality(1).

Throughout the previous chapter, two levels of the social formation were of primary significance for the analysis of the relation of race to the processes and structures of the capitalist mode of production: the economic and the political. Focusing on colonial relations will help to sketch some of the lines of connection between the two.

I have referred to how black labour has played a central role in the development of metropolitan capitalist economies(2). The exploitation of black labour power has been secured on the basis of inequalities and relations of dominance rooted in colonialism. The higher rate of exploitation of black labour, the patterns of their employment, and their structural disadvantage with respect to their white peers, have led to the effects of economic and political re-structuring, or 'crisis', falling heavily on black people in general.

As mentioned in chapter one, some recent Marxist analyses have sought to identify the political role of race within a contemporary economic and political crisis. This has included a consideration of the economic position of black workers and how that is affected by crisis but the emphasis is on policing and managing the political effects of crisis and of state managed racism.

An exploration of the continuing significance of colonialism should inform and underpin an analysis of the significance of race during crisis. Consequently, I seek to extend the analysis of colonialism beyond identifying its contribution to the comparative prosperity of ex-colonial nations and of the working classes in those countries. Colonial exploitation helped to make prosperity and expansion possible but one needs also to ask: what is the significance for contemporary economic and political structures and institutions of the role of black labour in the development of the capitalist mode of production? In particular, what effect has the colonial basis of capitalist expansion had on class constitution and class identity?

A materialist analysis of the current situation requires a historical materialist analysis of the development of two relations: between black labour and British capital; between black labour and white labour. If racial segmentation in employment and residence are to be 'located' it would be an inadequate explanation that ignored economic and political restructuring but other aspects of the current situation, for example, the post-migration struggle of black workers for parity and equality with white workers, demand that further elements are included.

The historical legacy of class formation and relative prosperity from colonialism continues to form part of the fabric and structure of racism. The form of that legacy is crucial. Residual colonial prejudice supplies much of the content of current racist attitudes, it helps to explain the availability of racist categories and explanations but my main concern with colonialism is its role in the formation of contemporary structures and institutions through which such attitudes derive their materiality and power.

Colonialism: Processes of Class formation.

The question of the relations between black people and white people has become visible in the last thirty years or so but it is a relation that has a much longer history. Hall points out that the fates of the "two labouring classes" have long been indissolubly linked but that only recently have they had to face each other(3). Gilroy suggests that the relation of black workers to white workers is through "discontinuous but related histories"(4). However, the issue is what form that link has taken, the source of the discontinuities and their implications for post-migration class formation and politics.

Two aspects of the development of the structural relation between black and white workers need to be based on a firm historical-analytical foundation. First, the relative economic positions of the two groups: the economic relations between them and their different relations to white metropolitan capital. Secondly, the general importance of 'the political' in processes of class formation(5) and the relevance of political relations and political forms to structural relations.

In laying down the framework for considering economic relations, Hall paints a clear picture when he points out that Britain's relationship with the Caribbean and the Indian sub-continent have been,

"...central features in the formation of Britain's material prosperity and dominance, as they are now central themes in English culture and in popular and official ideologies."(6)

He adds that mercantile dominance and the production of surplus wealth which powered economic development was founded on the slave trade and plantation system in the Americas in the 17th. century. India was the basis of empire in the 18th. century and trade with Latin America and the Far East was the centre piece of industrial and imperial hegemony in the 19th. century(7).

Rex and Tomlinson argue a similar position, that racism, and any analysis of it, must be located within class formation

under 400 years of imperialism(8). They identify the advances of the white working class as having been paid for by unequal trade between Britain and the rest of the world(9). The comparative prosperity, security and power of the organised working class in Britain has been formed by British capital's exploitation of colonial possessions.

They claim that the relative prosperity of the indigenous British working class has led it to develop a "stake" in production in Britain. This, Rex and Tomlinson suggest, has been the basis of a "truce" between British capital and British labour(10). Advances were made in job conditions, pay and benefits and most significantly, in the degree of control over the process of production. They were achieved through the formal institutions of strong trade unions and links with other workers, and through informal controls: restricted access to skilled or "well paid" jobs e.g. the use of "tickets" in the docks, restrictive shop floor practices and job demarcation. All contributed to the development of a collective strength, to an element of control but they also represented a stake in the form and organisation of production, a relatively privileged position that was to be defended if and when necessary.

This benefit from colonialism constitutes an 'internal' relation to the form in which capital, and the organisation of production developed. Class formation under colonialism has also profoundly affected the political form and organisation of the white working class. This allows one to agree with Rex (although I shall make different use of the insight(11)) when he says that it is,

"...not profitable to talk about societies in general, about their value systems and their stratification systems, unless we look first at the institutions around which the larger social order is built...Before talking about the stratification of plural societies, it is necessary to look at the basic political and economic institutions of colonialism."(12)

Rex claims that this would describe the social structure of empire and within this,

"...the basis of class formation of both immigrant and native metropolitan worker could be located."(13)

He emphasises the distinction between centre and periphery(14) and claims that there are,

"...differences between social structure, institutions of production and forms of labour discipline at the periphery and at the centre."(15)

Both sets of institutions were, according to Rex(16), produced by capitalism and race relations situations in the metropolis arise out of interactions between centre and periphery through migration. Race relations problems are,

"...problems relating to the transfer of different groups, whose structural position has previously been defined in colonial terms to some kind of position as workers or traders in metropolitan society itself."(17)

Black and white working classes have developed within the same system of colonial capitalism but the difference between centre and periphery mean that they have occupied different locations within it. Rex is offering a framework of historical structuring but this is not developed in his work into a full theoretical framework. The extent to which Rex can pursue his insights through to the structure of the social formation, is restricted by his concept of class(18), by consequent understandings of what "class formation" involves and by his vague, ambiguous notion of "structure"(19).

If a single, unequivocal view can be ascribed to Rex, he appears to say that structures arise from beliefs and values. On the contrary, I would argue that the relation of white working class beliefs, values and cultures to structures is mediated and given form in the institutions through which the white working class has become organised and is represented. Beliefs, values and cultures represent in its complexity, the relation of the class to capital and to black workers. A shared, but subjective, concept of the working class is

institutionalised in the organisations of working class political life. They are an expression, and one of the bases, for the relative prosperity of the white working class. But they are also the material form, the channel for the effectivity of subjective images of who comprises "the working class". They express a meaning for "working classness" which has traditionally, to differing degrees, excluded not only blacks but women, the unemployed, the unskilled and others marginalised from the mainstream of production.

If the "working class" has been constituted, at a subjective level, in this way, it ceases to be surprising that the record(20) of the white labour movement in defending and supporting black workers is far from exemplary. Notions of solidarity and common interests which attempt to unite white and black workers not only conflict with material differences but they actually attempt to re-define who makes up the "working class".

A particular subjective image, a particular political concept of the working class has been used to represent 'the class' as a whole. The section of 'the class' to which it corresponds has enjoyed a hegemonic relation to other sections of 'the working class'. It is predominantly this section that has directly benefited from the truce to which Rex refers. But although Rex's concept of truce suggests a political and economic 'dominance' for one section of the class, it ignores the heterogeneity of the working class, and the marginalisation of other sections on bases other than race(21). In the working class as a political force, a mythologised image has been accepted which identifies exactly with this 'privileged' section of the working class. An image which has justified, and helps to explain, the unwillingness of the 'organised working class' to intervene on behalf of marginalised workers and the unemployed.

Subjective images and economic relations are bound together in the institutional form that the working class has taken, dominated by the development of capitalism within colonialism.

There is, therefore, an internal relation for the privileged white section to the black members of the working class, a structural relation determined both economically and politically.

Rex's analysis of the processes of class formation within colonialism has, paradoxically, great significance within a problematic that seeks to resolve the problems that derive from the distinction between political forms and forces and economic relations. Rex uses a plural model of stratification which allows class to refer to consumption as well as production. Hence, for Rex, the necessity to understand the 'objective' structural significance of the processes he describes does not arise. But if one asks what the above analysis implies for the meaning of class, what it says about the relationship between race and class encapsulated in that meaning, then it becomes clear that "the working class", both as a concept and in its institutional form, has been historically constituted without blacks.

Colonialism: The Legacy of Slavery.

Analyses of contemporary race relations, of the particular features of black political cultures and traditions and generally, of the 'legacy' of colonialism, all have as an important focus, the question of the lasting effects of slavery.

Two broad sets of questions about the legacy of slavery need to be posed. The first concerns the relation between the development of the capitalist mode of production and the institution of slavery. It is important to question the idea that slavery can be understood solely as an extension of the logic of capitalism. This is so not only for historical and analytical accuracy but also as an aspect of the relation between race and capital. The relation that emerges will raise questions about the necessity of the wage form for capitalism and so highlights the significance of the 'conditions of entry into production' for understanding class position. These

questions will broaden the relevance of the discussion to include Asian people as well as Afro-Caribbean. It will open the way for considering the importance of the way in which black labour, both Afro-Caribbean and Asian, is sold not as 'free' labour, but is constrained in ways that 'free' white labour is not.

The second set of questions concerns the continued cultural impact of slavery both for black people with a history of enslavement and for the white people whose nations' prosperity was built on enslavement. This is particularly relevant to educational questions in two ways: because of the centrality of the history of colonial oppression and slavery in explanations of under-achievement(22) and secondly, because of the role, that certain theorists have suggested(23), that black political traditions, grounded in opposition to slavery, have in contemporary political forms.

Slavery and Capitalism.

The importance of the atlantic slave trade to the development of European capitalism is well established(24). As Robinson points out, historically slavery was a critical foundation for capitalism(25). But does this imply that there is some form of 'necessary' link between capitalism and slavery? The use made of slavery by a developing capitalism poses questions about the relationship between them and how pre-capitalist and capitalist forms have differed.

Robinson emphasises that the history of slavery starts many centuries before the advent of capitalism. He claims that it was common for Europeans, prior to the 11th century, to view all non-Europeans as "barbarians" and argues that there was a continuity of slavery, mainly of "barbarians", from the 5th century to the 20th(26). He concludes that, although slavery was vital to the development of the capitalist mode of production, it was taken up and developed not originated by it(27).

The continuity of slavery that Robinson identifies also means that slave labour persisted 300 years into the capitalist era alongside wage labour, peonage and serfdom. His argument therefore supports his main contention that the class dialectic does not provide a sufficient analysis of the capitalist mode of production. The existence of forms of 'unfree' labour under capitalism implies that wage labour is not a necessary form, the capitalist mode of production cannot be characterised as the extraction of surplus value via wage labour. Further, there is no demonstrable tendency to move towards wage labour as the most "rational form" for the extraction of surplus value(28).

So, the relation between slavery and the capitalist mode of production does not lend itself to narrowly economic explanations, thus emphasising that the basis of racism cannot be located in the economic rationality of capitalism(29). The contention that race cuts across and may undermine lines of development based on a purely economic rationality is reinforced. But the most important point is that slavery under capitalism shows that the conditions of entry into the production process affect the relation to the means of production and hence "class" relations. In Hall's terms, slavery is "formally capitalist" because it excludes 'free labour' even though those who deal in slaves are capitalists(30).

The conditions associated with slavery might not appear to be relevant to the current racial structure of society but slavery and "free" labour are not just two opposed alternatives, they represent the two extremes on a continuum of "degrees of unfreedom". Under the heading of slavery one can identify peonage, indenture and chattel slavery but contract labour, casual labour and "illegal" working will also involve different levels of control or freedom affecting the conditions of entry into employment. Hence, the question of the 'degrees of unfreedom' and its effects on the position of different groups in a system of stratification, is of central importance to Asian workers in Britain as well as Afro-Caribbean.

The characteristics of slavery raise questions about the significance of the form in which surplus value is extracted. The dominant form and organisation of production under capitalism - the use of "free" labour - can be stressed but if the conditions of entry into the production process affect relations to the means of production then they may represent, or underpin, different structural locations or 'positions'. This is clearly going to have implications for how one specifies the class position of black workers in Britain because they do not generally sell their labour under exactly the same conditions as white workers.

Slavery and Culture.

A second side to the significance of slavery for contemporary class and race relations is to be found in the 'cultural' legacy it provides for both white and black people. Slavery is invoked in explanations of racial discrimination and statification(31) but it also features in characterisations of black political forms and traditions where, it may be argued, it provides a distinctive legacy of strength(32).

Each of the explanatory uses made of the cultural legacy of slavery depends upon an interpretation of the black experience of slavery. Wilson identifies the main alternatives when he inquires into the psychological effects of slavery - was it 'devastation' or were there strategies to preserve humanity, to find a 'breathing space' and resist degradation?(33)

Wilson considers the particular example of "Southern paternalism" in the USA and argues(34) that slaves turned acquiescence in paternalism into a rejection of slavery. Following Gutman(35), he claims that the development of an Afro-American slave culture, which was not perceived by white planters, subsequently provided the basis for the creation of Afro-American communities(36).

Rex(37), on the other hand, refers to "Elkin's six shocks": capture, march to the sea, being sold, the middle passage, re-sale and the seasoning period. He argues that, each was

fundamental to the experience of slavery and consequently affected its lasting significance but even that applies only to the survivors, two-thirds of the captives died.

Rex stresses a particular feature of slavery: the lasting impact of the experience of violence(38):

"...the violence used by those who ran the slave trade, is the most important factor in the structure of race relations situations."(39)

He adds that the fact of enslavement is most important to subsequent race relations patterns:

"...in being recruited as a slave, the negro was not merely severed from his own culture, he was psychologically shocked by the process, so he was bound to become dependent upon his master, and his master's culture and social system in every possible way...being pathetically grateful for any kindness, and not even aspiring to any kind of independent life."(40)

Rex is ignoring the evidence that many slaves escaped and set up independent communities, that they adopted a range of forms of resistance and refusal(41). Even if his account were historically accurate, to explain the "low status" of blacks in metropolitan societies he would have to demonstrate the process or mechanism by which these experiences were transmitted and re-produced with their original significance. He would also have to explain why Asian people in Britain also suffer discrimination and have 'low status' when, although they were subjected to colonial oppression, they were not enslaved in the same way. Rex's position is not, however, just historically inaccurate, it helps to underpin influential arguments in the sociology of race relations which employ "black pathology" and "deficit" models to explain racial inequality(42).

Rex and Tomlinson's view of the form of the colonial legacy underpins their analysis of the sources of racial tension. They claim(43) that immigration produced responses "latent in the structure of British society". The question is, how is it that colonial relations can be 'latent' in the social structure?

According to Rex and Tomlinson, belief systems, grounded in colonialism, cause fears and anxieties leading to hostility and aggression and finally to new justificatory beliefs based on obvious cultural and physical differences. But racism is not just a question of beliefs and one must identify how beliefs, and structures, have been perpetuated. It follows from my approach to the processes of class formation that a colonial legacy has its effects through the structural relations between black workers and British capital on the one hand, and through their relation to the 'white working class' on the other.

In stark opposition to Rex's approach, Gilroy argues that, "...the accumulated histories of (blacks') far-flung resistance have brought a distinct quality to struggle at the cultural level in their metropolitan home."(43)

"The lingering bile of slavery, indenture and colonialism remains...in the forms of struggle, political philosophy, and revolutionary perspectives of non-European radical traditions and the 'good sense' of their practical ideologies."(44)

Gilroy's and Sivanandan's history of slavery and its effects is clearly very different to Rex's. They use it primarily to ground a particular reading of Britain's urban 'riots', of the political significance of Black youth's 'refusal', and of the potential for the production of a black political culture.

Traditions and shared histories are incorporated as major themes in the development of contemporary cultures and politics. They combine with, and build upon, the legacy of black resistance drawn from black experiences of colonialism and slavery. Further, the forms of resistance associated with slavery underpin the contention that black culture is political and that black politics necessarily involves a cultural dimension. Gilroy argues that black people,

"...brought with them legacies of their political, ideological and economic struggles in Africa, the Caribbean and the Indian sub-continent as well as the scars of imperialist violence."(45)

He quotes Cabral:

"If imperialist domination has the vital need to practice cultural oppression, national liberation is necessarily an act of culture."(46)

Sivanandan argues similarly that black culture is necessarily political, that it must in fact be revolutionary because it has to supplant racist white culture(47). He claims that through opposing white culture and the particulars of white cultural superiority, the black person,

"...engenders perhaps not revolutionary culture, but certainly a revolutionary practice within that (white) culture."(48)

If one examines Gilroy's and Sivanandan's claims, certain empirical issues are raised about the existence of a unifying black political culture. But some of their statements appear to be rhetorical and designed to aid their own becoming true. As such, they perform a function in the constitution of black people as a political force that unifies different ethnic groups. The identification of black political traditions is central to the political meaning of the term "black" and to the political project of 'unifying the race'. But still, if culture is central to black politics, if black culture is political what are its organising features and principles?

The work of Willis(49) on the limits and contradictions of sub-cultural forms offer certain insights. Willis argues that 'cultural penetrations' such as those he found in the counter-school sub-cultures that he studied, fall short of 'transformative political activity' as a result of their partiality(50).

Willis bases this claim on the informality of the sub-culture studied. He argues that those cultural penetrations are not a basis for struggle nor a direct political resource. They are ill-formed and unspoken and this is their greatest weakness(51). In this sub-culture,

"The analysis of the world which actually directs its distinctively cultural responses remains silent. It is into

this silence that ideology strides.. Powerful ideologies.. always have the gift of formality, publicness and explicit statement. They can work within the scope of consensus and consent because nothing in oppositional cultural processes can displace their level of action and effectiveness."(52)

A political culture has to oppose the dominant ideology and contest political hegemony by building on the 'good sense' of 'the community' in order to break the grip of 'common sense'. Consequently a central component of political culture is formality and organisation for which institutions are necessary. This is illustrated by the ways in which the white working class in Britain has consolidated and built its organisations and institutions over the last century. It showed that the development and sustenance of a political culture as a basis for contesting meanings and values i.e. for contesting hegemony depended on the development of supportive institutions.

Like Rex, Gilroy and Sivanandan put great store by the continued cultural significance of slavery and the resistance to it. The competing claims will inform and depend upon the concept of culture employed, and hence both will pose problems for educational interventions which attempt to make the cultures of black people in Britain the starting point of their promotion of racial equality.

But if Gilroy and Sivanandan are correct then they also must meet the requirement placed on Rex to demonstrate the processes and mechanisms through which culture - particularly that based in the experience of slavery - is transmitted and reproduced and provides the basis for a distinctive black politics.

I have identified possible components of a legacy from colonialism and considered competing claims made for the content of the cultural legacy for the victims of slavery and for white metropolitan workers. But this is just one component of the legacy. It relates to the relative position of white and black workers constituted within the relations of colonialism

and to different material conditions that belie the apparent uniformity of interests between white and black members of the working class.

But more than this, the form in which 'the working class' is politically represented in Britain has also been shaped within the relations of colonialism. The "truce" and "stake" that Rex and Tomlinson(53) identify is part of the foundation of the institutions of the organised working class and so the meaning of "working class" depends on racially exclusive conceptions of "working-classness" and working class membership. The fact that class is not only economically but politically constituted gives this argument even more force. It means that the particular form in which the working class becomes organised cannot be seen to fall short of expressing objective interests through the obscuring action of ideology. The political form of the working class is just as real, if not more so, than that dictated by an abstract notion of shared economic relations.

Robinson's(54) contention that Marxism is "Eurocentric" is therefore corroborated to the extent that the political and economic forms of the working class have been theorised without reference to its genesis within the relations of colonialism. The problems of accounting, within a Marxist problematic, for the lack of unity between white and black members of 'the working class' spring from the limits and application of that concept of class.

The two forms of the colonial legacy cover the four levels of racism identified at the beginning of chapter two. Rex and Tomlinson's emphasis, and the structural one that I have attempted to develop in opposition to it, re-poses the problem of the relation between the level of beliefs and the level of structure. In my prioritisation of 'structure' I have sought to re-locate the problem of their relation in the role of institutions. Institutions through which one part of the structural location of black labour, its relation to white labour, is secured. Institutions in which practices give force

and effect to beliefs about race and about class and hence about the relation between white and black.

The discussion in this section although concentrating on the question of slavery and the form of a colonial legacy, draws on two broader areas of inquiry. The discussion of slavery highlights the issue of the relation between politics and culture for black people in Britain but so far, there is no clear picture of what that relation is nor of what it implies for black political forms and ways of organising. That will be the subject of the next section.

The second area concerns the implications of the form of the colonial legacy for how one conceptualises the structural position of black labour. Two main theoretical consequences can at this point be drawn out. First, that in discussing race and racial stratification one is discussing a structural phenomenon, but although the meaning of "structural" is crucial, it is by no means clear. Secondly, that structural relationships have been historically determined and hence, that an analysis of the structural position of black labour should start from the relationships formed within colonialism.

An analysis of the structural position of black labour should be based upon the identification of a structured relation of black labour to white metropolitan capital and to organised white labour. A structured relation based on the economic and political processes of class formation. Through this both economic and political relations are grounded in and derive their form from colonial relations. The structural relation between white and black labour depends not only on their different economic relations to white metropolitan capital, it is also constituted through the virtual exclusion of black workers from the political organisations, from the institutional form, of the working class(55). This is the dominant feature of the political relation between white and black labour. These issues will be further developed following a brief discussion of black political forms.

Forms of Struggle and the Struggle over Political Forms.

The concentration of black people in certain types of employment, high rates of unemployment, limited influence in the institutions of the working class, little protection or support from those institutions and different relations to community bases from other sections of the working class, all indicate that neither theoretically nor politically can race be subsumed under class. Economic and political processes of class formation underlay the specificity of the exploitation and oppression of black labour but the particular links between black cultures and black political forms raise further questions about the relation between race and class. They pose questions about the significance of 'black' struggles for class struggles and about the forms of organisation and struggle which are most likely to further the cause of black equality.

Miles and Phizacklea approach these issues by considering three alternative forms of organisation: the class unity process, the black unity process and the ethnic unity process(56). They begin by trying to explain low levels of black participation in what they call the 'formal political process' by referring to black resistance to, and "ignorance" of, white political traditions. They claim there is an 'immigrant ideology' through which black people view themselves as temporary migrants who have left their home country to improve their economic position and consequently see no importance in involvement in British politics(57).

The immigrant ideology would clearly be better called a 'migrant ideology', if it exists. But one must question the extent to which this is still an important factor given the end of primary immigration and the move to family reunification through settlement in Britain rather than through 'returning home'(58).

Miles and Phizacklea also argue(59) that for Indians and Pakistanis there is a strong relation between politics and religion and that political activity in the UK is related to

political parties, structures and developments in the Indian sub-continent. Ignoring these factors would seem to simplify and mis-represent the patterns and forms of 'Asian' political activity in the UK.

It is also necessary, as Miles and Phizacklea point out(60), to take account of class position prior to migration but the caricature of that position that they offer does little to further understanding. They claim that a majority of migrants are from the petit-bourgeois or peasant classes with very few from an emergent working class which means they have little experience of trades unions or "the political structure and process of an advanced capitalist form"(61).

Such a lack of experience Miles and Phizacklea see as important because they believe that the "class unity process" is dependant on the policy and practice of the Labour party and the trades unions(62). Class unity is therefore dependant on organisations, the overwhelming black experience of which has been negative. Miles and Phizacklea thereby limit the significance of that experience to purely contingent features of those organisations. Through that focus they ignore black political traditions and the growing strength and importance of non-workplace struggles. On the basis of their observations, Miles and Phizacklea conclude that the class unity process is not a likely way forward for black political interests at the present time. But class unity, in their view, can only be secured on the basis of white political traditions, a view with which many black writers have taken issue(63). It ignores the history of various forms of black resistance and refusal, and it continues to emphasise forms of political organisation centred on the workplace when many of the black struggles in this country have been located more in 'the community'(64).

Sivanandan has argued(65) that a wide variety of Afro-Caribbean, Asian and some joint organisations have been formed and dissolved over the last thirty years. It appears from his account that the watershed for the form that black organisations have taken was in 1971 when the Immigration

Act(66) restricted right of abode to 'patrials' and limited the entry of dependents. The major effect of this was to focus the "Asian community's" concerns and efforts on securing family reunification and defending members from deportation for illegal entry or settlement. This development, Sivanandan counterposes against an earlier period, predominantly in the 1950's, when he claims that there was a common struggle against a more diffuse and unstructured prejudice and discrimination(67).

It is clear that the 1971 act and subsequent legislation has affected Afro-Caribbeans and Asians differently. Each has been subjected to a strategy which criminalises the "whole community" but this has taken distinct forms for each group. However, Sivanandan does not demonstrate that this amounts to the division of a once cohesive "black community". The details he offers of how workplace struggles were sustained by community support generally refer to factories etc. where either Afro-Caribbeans or Asians predominated and hence they do not substantiate his claims for "cross-ethnic unity".

Although it seems that some, particularly inter-island, animosities and prejudices have been broken down in Britain and new identities and identifications forged, stronger antipathy can exist between some Asians and some Afro-Caribbeans. One root of this is the history of seperateness of Afro-Caribbeans and Asian workers used in the Caribbean as indentured labourers after the abolition of slavery(68). Other roots and causes almost certainly operate but it is clear that significant differences exist in priorities, concerns and self-perceptions(69).

Historical and continuing differences, especially of ethnicity and culture must however be placed within the framework of structural racism. I have suggested that the analysis and argument that Sivanandan and Gilroy offer should be related to the political project of constituting a 'unified race' across ethnic lines.

These divisions do still raise major problems for Gilroy, Sivanandan and others who seem not only to wish to promote

what Miles and Phizacklea have labelled the "black unity" process but also to argue that the consciousness and unity which is integral to that process is already present, albeit possibly in an embryonic form.

Miles and Phizacklea claim(70) that the most likely method of securing political influence is the the "ethnic unity" process. They argue that,

"...a fundamental ethnic group attribute is 'corporate organisation around beliefs and values sufficiently coherent to enable collective orientation towards common goals to take place', hence...political mobilisation is an inherent possibility."(71)

They identify processes of consolidation of 'ethnic attributes' for Afro-Caribbeans which may not have been recognised as such prior to migration. This they refer to as an "emergent ethnicity"(72). Similarly they point to the importance of community support for work place struggles involving Asian workers(73).

While this is a description of some processes of organisation in the 'formal' and 'informal' political sphere, it obscures many complexities and problems and hence is severely limited as a political strategy. Miles and Phizacklea take the visible concentration of Afro-Caribbeans or Asians in certain inner city areas to mean that "community" refers simply to an area and its inhabitants. The full picture is one of localised groups, many but not all, sharing similar i.e. inner city situations, but they are still potentially isolated from each other. This would seem to indicate that a more political notion of 'community', not dependant on proximity and shared lives or employment is necessary.

Secondly, the term "Asian community" masks a wealth of differences of religion, caste, class, sect etc. As I will show in chapter five(74), these differences can be as significant as similarities of position and experience in Britain.

Thirdly, as Gilroy points out(75), Miles and Phizacklea put their emphasis on the formal political sphere and although

they do not ignore the support drawn from the 'surrounding black community' as Gilroy(76) claims, they do restrict that support to struggles originating in the workplace.

Fourthly, the notion of "ethnic unity" itself is extremely problematic. It implicitly employs a common-sense concept of ethnicity which is not defined and it connects with definitions of black experience which obscure the common experiences of racism and focuses on the particularities of culture.

These problems cast severe doubt on the way in which Miles and Phizacklea seek to establish their contention that the ethnic unity process is more likely than the black unity process. They lend some support to the position of Gilroy, Lawrence(77) and Sivanandan. Each lays great stress on distinctive black political traditions which they see as informing and structuring contemporary black struggle. Black cultures are located in black opposition, in black history. It is clear that this is also the case for the white working class: current labour movement institutions are the embodiment of that tradition and the material life of oppositional cultures and ideologies. Hence it is not difficult to understand how working class opposition has been passed down and has been reproduced. It is far more difficult to identify comparable structures for the black radical tradition. If some vague and "idealist" notion of racial history or collective psychology is to be avoided Gilroy and the others must specify the forms and processes which transmit and reproduce that radical tradition.

No clear conclusion is possible at this stage about the relative likelihood of the three alternatives that are offered as models of political organisation and process, however certain elements of a framework can be identified and certain questions posed in relation to the observations that have been made. First, the political and cultural constitution of classes becomes particularly significant in the light of the 'cultural' basis of black political traditions. The over-representation of black people in the ranks of the unemployed and the focus of a process of criminalisation on where black people live both

mean that the sites and locations of struggles by the white and black working class must include, as a central component, where people live as well as where they work. Sivanandan(78) claims that as a consequence of the economics and politics of "Thatcherism" the site of struggle has moved from the economic to the political and the ideological, the locale of struggle has moved from the factory floor to the streets. Consequently, culture as well as production becomes significant for the class. This has profound implications for how one conceptualises class and for how the processes of class formation are understood. Gilroy quotes Katznelson that,

"The making of classes at work is complemented by the making of classes where people live; in both spheres adaptive and rebellious responses to the class situation are inevitably interlinked."(79)

But given the changes that Sivanandan has identified race and race struggles take on a new significance for the re-constitution of 'the class'. One needs to ask whether the possibility is being offered of new relations between white and black members of the class, of new cultures and new political forms being evolved; to ask whether there is a potential for a re-making of the English working class.

The meaning of class and the processes through which the structure of the working class and the forms in which class position receive political expression are rendered problematic by these realisations. Their most fundamental implication is that because the meaning and form of the working class is questioned, the whole theoretical problematic of relating race and class must be doubted. Showing that Eurocentric assumptions about political forms have been made indicates that, far from needing to be related to race, the concept of class employed already involves understandings about race defined by exclusion, by a lack of an explicit relation to black members of the working class.

The form that any re-making of the working class takes will depend not only on economic relations both to capital and between sections of the working class but also on opposed cultural legacies and political traditions. The 'black' components of this will be made through working with a cultural legacy and hence it is a legacy to be made, to be re-discovered and generalised. But the experiences, cultures and traditions of Afro-Caribbean and Asian people are very different. Even though both have their radical traditions, the cohesive force will have to be the elements of a shared position in Britain, and the shared experiences of racism, discrimination and exclusion that that position involves.

This is a structural concept of race but one constituted in politics, through shared experiences of the racial structure of the social formation, as well as through shared economic interests which cross ethnic boundaries. But, like class, the constitution of black people as a cohesive political force is not determined by 'the structure' it is contingent, open to contestation and open to being formed in ways which might allow the cultural concept of ethnicity to dominate the structural concept of race.

Black struggles are clearly 'for the race' whether they are about defending economic position, are a fight for equal economic position with white labour, or are in defense of culture or community i.e. against oppression. They are also 'for the class' to the extent that they attempt to re-constitute 'the class' in a unified form but that is not the same as a call for class unity, that unity has to be made through transforming the material differences on which disunity are built and through transforming the political expressions of those real differences.

Structural Racism: the Structural Position of Black Labour

Understanding the relationships forged within colonialism provides a framework for analysing the complicity of the white working class in the exploitation and oppression of black people in Britain. The defensiveness of the white working class towards black people is a direct product of the stake it has in the social organisation of production. This "stake" is encapsulated in the "welfare truce" that depended for its formation on black and white workers having different relations to the metropolitan mode of production. The white working class's comparative prosperity was secured at the expense of their black counterparts.

The stake is both material and ideological. The relations of colonialism have structured the mode of production, different relations to it, the institutions and organisations of the white working class and concomitant subjective images and understandings of who and what the "working class" is. The institutions and organisations give meaning and substance to the images and understandings. Through them the colonial legacy of a mythologised class and race are given material and structural form.

The historical constitution of the working class in Britain underpins the cultural and structural exclusion of blacks from the working class and so provides a basis for conceptualising the structural position of black labour. If it is accepted that race has been central to class formation in Britain then analytically and politically it becomes conceptually contradictory to talk of a divided class. This has implications for calls for political unity between white and black, for notions of objective interests underpinning the shape of political forms and forces and hence for how one understands the structural position of black labour.

The difficulties associated with specifying the structural location of black labour derive in part from terminological disputes but the conceptual differences that different terms

represent depend to a large degree on the model of structure that is being employed, on what "structure" means.

In arguing against Marxist class analysis Rex and Tomlinson claim that,

"...there has to be a theory of the interpretation, overlap and conflict between class structures and race relations structures."(80)

They argue(81) that there are "structural differences" between the working class and ethnic minorities and they cite as examples of this, housing, position in the labour market and educational differences. These differences clearly exist but from Rex and Tomlinson's account it is unclear in what sense they are 'structural'. In particular they need to specify what relation they bear to the organisation of production and the legal and political structure of the social formation i.e. to other elements of 'structure'.

Rex and Tomlinson claim to use Keat and Urry's 'correction' of Weber's view of ideal types as fictions(82). "Race", "race relations", "race structures" and "class" are examples of 'structural ideal types'. They assert that 'structural ideal types' are neither fictions nor just descriptions, they are 'yardsticks'. They are ambiguous and have wide generality but still have "a relation to reality". But what is their relation to reality? It appears that Rex and Tomlinson sacrifice the possibility of understanding the 'structural position' of black people because of their unwillingness to entertain any concept of an objective 'deep structure'. This is shown clearly when they attempt to summarise their methodology and approach:

"We do attempt to make a structural analysis of tendencies to the formation of classes and similar groups, and these are derived in part from systematic sociology and not simply in terms of structures that we see as relevant to ends which we or some of our respondents happen to value."(83)

In their approach they are over-correcting for the manifest problems of many Marxist formulations which a priori

privilege structural relations within the social formation over any information that may come from substantive research. In so doing, Rex and Tomlinson both mis-represent their method and leave themselves pray to the uncritical application of common-sense categories.

The fundamental problem is that once the tendencies to class formation have been analysed how are the economic and other relations that underpin them to be related? What is the structural relation between the structures that Rex and Tomlinson identify? I contend that answering such questions depends on some form of analysis of 'deep structure' but Rex and Tomlinson specifically refuse to engage in such "systems analysis".

Problems with the concept of structure are not confined to Rex and Tomlinson's work. Within Marxist approaches(84) it is equally ambiguous and problematic. It is used variably to refer either to the "underlying structure" i.e. the "economic base" that determines the content and form of the levels of the superstructure(85), or it may refer to the structure of the social formation as a whole i.e. to the determinate relationships between the different levels including the dominant economic level(86).

The first usage is open to all the problems of economic reductionism: structure is counter-posed to culture, ideology and politics(87). The second Althusserian alternative corresponds more closely to the relation between levels that I have been attempting to outline. Politics and culture have contributed to determining the structural position of black workers. It is not only their relatively weak economic position that governs their subordinate position with respect to the white working class, but also their exclusion from political and cultural institutions.

In Althusser's conception however, although the non-economic levels are accorded a 'relative autonomy' one is led back to his assertion of their 'determination in the last instance' by the economic. As Hall(88) has pointed out Althusser's

'structure' is a formalist one. Althusser copes with securing a 'material base' through considering ahistorical structural relations between levels whereas the approach I have attempted to outline emphasises contingent relations between processes. 'Structure' therefore comes to represent the outcome of those interacting processes but should not be read in rigid and fixed terms because that would deny the ways in which class and hence structure is made and re-made.

The concept of class, constituted by each 'level' of the social formation implies that "structure" cannot be counter-posed to "culture" or to other non-economic levels of the social formation. Similarly, the concept of class implies a view of 'material conditions' or 'materiality' which is not restricted to the economic level but again is constituted at all levels of the social formation.

This means that the economic, political and cultural relations which affect the conditions under which black labour is sold all affect the structural position of that labour. Different conditions of entry into production amounts, to use Hall's term, to the "racially segmentary insertion" (89) of labour into the production process.

Hall, in his analysis of the structure of South African society uses Rex's work to point to,

"...pertinent differences in the conditions affecting the entry into the labour market of 'black' and 'white' labour." (90)

I would argue that making full use of Hall's insights and Rex's distinction between "free" and "unfree" labour depends upon embracing an approach to the structural determination of racial inequality involving political, cultural and economic processes. Without this, the general importance for racial stratification of the conditions under which labour is entered into cannot be recognised. Different degrees of freedom or constraint in the selling of ones labour power, differences in choice and in the extent of control over the production process affect life chances and are therefore materially significant.

Further, they constitute a significant difference in a relation to the means of production and hence for a materialist analysis necessarily represent a basis for different interests.

Hall uses the notion of 'differential entry' to argue for the existence of an,

"...articulation between different modes of production structured in some relation of dominance."(91)

If the theoretical advances derived from this are to be applied to Britain, then certain clarification is needed of the difference between having more than one mode of production, characterised by different degrees of freedom and different amounts of choice or coercion, i.e. different organisation and relations of production and having different relations within 'one' mode of production.

In societies such as South Africa the apartheid system constitutes identifiable modes of production using 'free' white labour and 'unfree' black labour and consequently, a good case could be made for the existence of two (or more) different modes of production. The relation between the modes is structured and the capitalist mode is dominant, hence Hall's notion of "formally capitalist" modes of production, such as slavery could be applied to the dominated modes of production.

In Britain on the other hand, although structural racism may have similar effects to the apartheid system, to make such a case is more difficult and complex. The existence of contract labour, the use of work permits and the effects of 'illegal immigrant' status may suggest the operation of marginal and dominated modes of production. However, the lack of any formal and legally sanctioned definition of black labour as "unfree", as exists in South Africa, plus some degree of integration in work and residence, point to Britain being better understood through the idea of different relations to the one mode of production.

Deciding on the above point depends on what constitutes a particular mode of production as opposed to another. There is a tension between using "mode of production" in order for example

to distinguish between capitalism and feudalism, using it to sketch a broad periodisation of the forms of organisation of production and the application of what Hall(92) identifies as Marx's principal criteria for defining a 'mode', the relations of production. Unfortunately, a concept adequate for the task of revealing crucial but none-the-less broad, historical shifts is not necessarily suited to the analysis of the finer lines of contemporary stratification. In fact, the central dispute I have with prioritising class and economically defined class relations, is that the broad features of the 'mode of production', the 'lowest common denominator' of relations of production, are emphasised to the detriment of the finer lines when the latter are often the more politically significant.

A third aspect is what counts as different relation of production. If the contradiction between labour and capital is not necessarily the major contradiction in all societies nor does it determine all others then a more 'finely calibrated' range of relations must be employed if race and other conflicts are to be understood. This is not to follow Rex and regard all oppositions and conflicts as having theoretical parity, but he is correct to the extent that he would raise the above question as an empirical one, not to be decided in advance of substantive analysis.

I raise these issues in order to show the limitations of concepts commonly used in analysing 'racially plural' societies. Deciding upon them is not necessary for my project but being aware of their relevance is. 'Segmentary insertion' may in extreme conditions become better conceptualised through positing 'different modes of production' rather than different relations to 'one mode'. In that case the relations between white and black members of 'the working class' will become qualitatively different.

Notwithstanding the above difficulties, the emphasis that Hall et al put on the conditions of entry into the production process is important. They claim that in Britain the,

"...racially segmentary insertion of black labour into the production relations of metropolitan capital (and therefore its position as a sub-proletariat to the white working class) is the central feature with respect to how capital now exploits black labour power...This 'structural position' accounts both for the structured relation to capital and for the internally contradictory relation to other sections of the proletariat."(93)

This identification of a 'structural position' is based on a re-assertion of the Marxist materialist premise, it attempts to 'ground' racial conflicts and oppositions. But how does it account for the 'structured relations' of black labour, how is the materialist premise is secured?

It is unclear in Hall's writings whether the racially segmentary insertion of black labour determines an internally contradictory relation to other sections of the proletariat or that an internally contradictory relation is at least in part leads to segmentary insertion. Earlier arguments suggest that both happen. This would be consistent with Hall's work but it is not explicitly argued. To have the first without the second would amount to a complex economic reductionism because the political form of the working class would be excluded from affecting the structural position of black labour.

This follows from the idea that "class position" does not refer to economic relations alone. Consequently, 'conditions of entry' are materially important but do not of themselves constitute a different class position. If black workers are to be considered in any way as a separate class then that will have to be based upon both economic and political processes of class formation. It is those processes that underlay the differences in structural relations that have been identified.

But given the emphasis I have placed on class formation rather than class position, the question of the class position of black labour becomes very difficult to pose. I have argued that more specific economic relations are important for racial segmentation and for race and class politics.

The structural position of black labour involves both relations to capital and to other sections of the proletariat. These relations are both economic and political. Economic, not just through relations to the means of production but also through 'segmentary insertion', through the conditions of entry into production. Political, because both types of economic relation are established, secured and reproduced through political processes of class formation and organisation. Political processes help to determine material conditions and hence structural relations to both capital and white labour.

To assert that black and white workers share a class position is correct to the extent that one emphasises an abstract relation to capital alone. However, it implicitly denies, on the one hand, that the complexity of economic relations to capital constitute 'segmentary insertion' and on the other hand, the structural nature of the economic and political relations between black workers and other workers.

Conclusion

The emphasis I have placed on the historical determination of economic and political relations in this and the previous chapter does not 'solve' the problems of the relation between 'levels' of the social formation but that has not been my purpose. The point has been to develop some theoretical tools more adequate to the task of understanding racial stratification. This has had two major components. First, a more 'finely' defined notion of economic relations. Secondly, a view of political relations, given material force and seen as 'structural' through the emphasis on institutions. Together with the cultural processes of class formation these two sets of processes constitute the dominant lines of racial stratification in a 'class society'.

A view of the structural location of black labour is taken which involves outlining the specificity of black exploitation and its relation to black oppression. This structural location

is founded on colonial relations and hence it encompasses and rests on class forms, on the results of class formation within colonialism. It is not however a structural location in the sense of a 'position' because that would not convey the historical and contingent model on which it is based. Nor would it reveal that the current 'race' and 'class' struggles are not divided parts of the 'same' struggle but are part of a process of class (re-)constitution.

The struggle over the composition of the surplus population is currently a key part of that process of re-constitution. It involves formal and informal methods of excluding black people from certain types of employment, and from economic power, which have become increasingly relevant to the racial segmentation of the working class. Exclusion from labour is a particular relation to the means of production, a form of marginality and subordination and hence these struggles, and their outcomes, have become part of the differential insertion of black people into the relations of production. They contribute to defining the structural position of black people.

In a sense this struggle epitomises how black labour is opposed to both capital and organised white labour because it is a struggle for access to the working class, access to its institutions, its legitimation and strength, access secured through work. But these struggles must be put in the context of other processes of class formation, of other black struggles, particularly in defense of 'communities' and black cultures. Each poses fundamental questions of the nature of "black struggles", their relation to "class struggles" and their significance for the 'class as a whole'.

On the question of the relation between exploitation and oppression of black labour, one can suggest that the specific form of racial oppression is based not only on the higher rate of exploitation but also on the underlying racial and national basis of European metropolitan capitalism. This fact has been reflected in the way in which the structural position of black labour depends on economic relations between white workers,

black workers and white capital and on the political and institutional forms of the white working class.

The concerns of this and the previous chapter cover different aspects of racial stratification and racism. These are major theoretical issues for the thesis as a whole and they inform the discussions of racialised forms of education which follow. How one views the racial structure of the social formation is a major issue in all racialised forms of education. They may not be expressed in racially explicit terms but the object, context and meaning of those interventions is race and even if it is absent, that constitutes an 'explanation' of racism and racial disadvantage.

Each of the various issues within racial stratification has implications for how one approaches race and racism within education. Most generally it is important to understand differences as totally integrated into the structure of the social formation. Racial discrimination and disadvantage are not contingent outcomes of individual prejudice, they emanate from the very basis of British society. To recognise this within education is vital if one is to understand the context and object of educational initiatives and what their limits are likely to be.

A racial structure is not only a context for education, one also has to ask what role education plays in its reproduction. It will become clear in the following chapters that the critical analysis of education and of interventions such as MCE depend upon the role of education in social reproduction. Outlining the major relations and formative processes for a racial structure lays a foundation for examining the function of education and for asking how educational processes interact with their racial context. It is crucial if one is to progress beyond a loose and general concept of structural racism to the model of institutional racism in education in chapter six.

A framework for understanding racial structure will generally inform anti-racist educational interventions by showing, in broad terms, the nature of the problem. How the

'disadvantage' suffered by black students differs from that suffered by working class students and girls. What the priorities should be, what the major barriers to change will be, what the limitations are for educational action. What other types of action are required.

Specific aspects of the discussion of racial stratification have been the relation between white and black labour, the specificity of black exploitation and oppression and the nature of racism. The first two of these are vital if one is to provide a firm foundation for educational initiatives focused exclusively on black students, their achievements and experiences. Policy and practice depend on where white working class students share these and where there are fundamental differences or differences of degree. Chapters five and six will show that there is still little clarity on this issue.

The nature of racism in a sense connects all of the aspects of racial stratification. It is a major object of educational initiatives. What it is, how it originates, how it is perpetuated all affect how 'the problem' is framed and what policies and strategies are adopted. This points will be taken up in some detail in chapter six

Finally, it is important to recognise how the issues of black oppression, culture and slavery are not only context but also the specific concern and content of many educational initiatives. The comments on the cultural legacy of slavery suggests that culture is dynamic and is a site of struggle. It cannot be equated to a fixed notion of ethnicity, to rituals, artefacts and 'background' or heritage. Black cultures are based on their heritages but they also act consciously to rediscover lost or suppressed aspects of that heritage. They respond to a particular contemporary British problematic, material conditions pose problems, cultures and sub-cultures offer the 'solutions'. Opposed readings of the cultural legacy of slavery and colonialism offer different views of what education has to respond to, to value and legitimate: whether it is deculturation, cultural maintenance, or 'cultures of resistance'.

Attempts to recognise and incorporate elements of black cultures in the curriculum mean that educationalists have to grapple with complex problems in this area.

Multiculturalists and anti-racists must recognise the significance of black struggle and black political culture. If black culture is of political importance then educational interventions must understand that in order to contribute to racial equality. But further, the politics of black culture involves profound implications for racialised forms of education which work almost exclusively on the terrain of culture.

Chapter Three. Notes and References.

- 1) For a detailed discussion of this see chapter six.
- 2) See chapters one and two.
- 3) Hall (1978) p.25.
- 4) Gilroy (1982) p.284.
- 5) See chapter two.
- 6) Hall (1978) p.25.
- 7) Ibid.
- 8) Rex and Tomlinson (1979) p.286.
- 9) Ibid.
- 10) Op.cit.
- 11) Rex uses this to ground a legacy of attitudes but I will attempt to show that the legacy is structural.
- 12) Rex (1983) p.31.
- 13) Rex (1983) p.166.
- 14) See for example Rex (1983) p.165.
- 15) Rex (1983) p.167.
- 16) Op.cit. p168.
- 17) Op.cit. p.189.
- 18) For an elaboration of this point see chapter two.
- 19) See chapter two for a discussion of these problems.
- 20) For a summary of this see chapter one.
- 21) For example on the basis of gender, possession of manual skills or employment status.
- 22) See chapter four.
- 23) For example see Gilroy (1981), Lawrence (1981).
- 24) See for example, Williams (1966), Robinson (1983) pp.145-164.
- 25) Robinson (1983) p.160.
- 26) Robinson (1979) p.148, Robinson (1983) p.11.
- 27) See Robinson (1983) p.16.
- 28) See Robinson (1979) p.145.
- 29) See the discussion in chapter one concerning the reasons for the development of immigration controls in Britain.
- 30) Hall (1980a) p.320.
- 31) For example, see Rex (1983) p.43.
- 32) This is a point made by among others, Robinson (1983) and Gilroy (1982).
- 33) Wilson (1978) p.33.
- 34) Op.cit. p.34.
- 35) Ibid.
- 36) Ibid.
- 37) Rex (1983) p.43.
- 38) See the discussion in chapter two.
- 39) Rex (1983) p.43.
- 40) Ibid.
- 41) For evidence of this see Genovese (1976).
- 42) See Lawrence (1981) for a critical account of this.
- 43) Gilroy (1982) p.285.
- 44) Ibid.
- 45) Gilroy (1981) p.209.
- 46) Ibid.
- 47) Sivanandan (1977) p.340.

- 48) Op.cit. p.341
- 49) Willis (1977).
- 50) Op.cit. p.145.
- 51) Op.cit. p.166.
- 52) Ibid.
- 53) Op.cit.
- 54) Op.cit.
- 55) As shown by the post-migration experiences of black workers outlined in chapter one.
- 56) Miles and Phizacklea (1977)
- 57) Op.cit. p.505.
- 58) See chapter one.
- 59) Op.cit. p.505.
- 60) Ibid.
- 61) Ibid.
- 62) Op.cit. p.506.
- 63) See for example Robinson (1983) or Gilroy (1982)
- 64) See Sivanandan (1981).
- 65) See Sivanandan (1981).
- 66) Op.cit.
- 67) Sivanandan (1983) p.2.
- 68) See Parry and Sherlock (1971) pp.203-4.
- 69) See Sivanandan (1983) pp.3-4 where he argues that the 1971 Immigration Act led to separate priorities for Afro-Caribbeans and Asians in Britain. See the Caribbean Times June 1987 for evidence of diverging voting patterns.
- 70) Miles and Phizacklea (1977) pp.495-500.
- 71) Op.cit. p.495.
- 72) Ibid.
- 73) Op.cit. p.499.
- 74) These differences bedeviled Berkshire LEA's attempts to set up consultative structures for policy development.
- 75) Gilroy (1981) p.212
- 76) Ibid.
- 77) Lawrence (1982).
- 78) Sivanandan (1983) p.6.
- 79) Gilroy (1981) p.213.
- 80) Op.cit. p.299.
- 81) Op.cit. p.317.
- 82) Op.cit. p.306.
- 83) Op.cit. p.317.
- 84) This point will be underlined when Mullard's use of the term is considered in chapter four.
- 85) This usage would most easily be associated with the 'Manifesto Marxism' discussed in chapter two.
- 86) See Hall (1980a) pp.326-329 where Althusser's concept of determination is summarised as 'a structural causality'.
- 87) See chapter two.
- 88) Hall (1980a) p.329.
- 89) See Hall et al (1978) p.392.
- 90) Hall (1980) p.316.
- 91) Hall (1980) p.320.
- 92) Hall (1980a) p.319.
- 93) Hall et al (1978) p.392.

Chapter Four. The Development of Racialised Forms of Education.

Introduction.

The general discussion of racial structure, racism and the development of black-white relations that has occupied the first three chapters provides the historical and analytic context for the analysis of racialised forms of education that will take up the remainder of the thesis. The main themes explored and summarised at the end of the last chapter will inform the assessment of the opposed approaches of multicultural education (MCE) and anti-racist education (ARE). But that assessment will depend on an understanding of how that current opposition is founded on a succession of different racialised policies and practices in education.

The development of racialised forms of education(1) in Britain spans the last twenty-five years. From the earliest ad hoc responses to the needs of "immigrants" to the complex and increasingly systematic initiatives found in certain LEA's, policy makers and educational practitioners have responded to what they have perceived as the particular problems of black children in white schools. The history of the educational response has shaped the forms of intervention currently employed and it contributes to the determination of their meaning. This chapter will trace that development through to the contemporary debate between "multicultural education" (MCE) and "anti-racist education" (ARE).

Understanding the development of racialised forms of education involves tracing how successive approaches have been dominant and officially sanctioned and how they have affected practice. It will become clear in this and the following two chapters that that is not a straight-forward task. Identifying a particular racialised form is difficult because no approach is totally separate from those that precede or follow. Even if it is clearly dominant at a particular time, other forms will also be operating, affecting and shaping it. Also, the notion of dominance is itself problematic because, as this chapter will

show, it may refer to the official status and legitimacy of a form which is not particularly widespread nor common in practice. Frameworks, official rhetorics and school practices may have contradictory dominant forms at different times.

Two inter-related tasks present themselves. First, the identification of changes in approach to the issues and problems raised by the interaction of race and education. Secondly, analysing the reasons and motives behind those changes. Three considerations will be relevant here: the contexts for change, the levels at which change has taken place and the sites for change.

Four broad contexts need to be recognised: economic, political, social and educational. Many of the most important aspects of the first three have been identified in chapter one. Where there are clear links between them they will be used to explain shifts in educational policy and provision but I hope to demonstrate that there is no simple nor determining link between economic, political and social changes pertinent to race and the form in which race and education have interacted. That is not to say that changes in these contexts do not profoundly affect the meaning and the significance of educational changes. However, such effects are not directly determined, they are mediated by the general structure of educational provision and by the complex relations between different sites and between different levels.

Each racialised form of education, if distinct forms can be distinguished, has been specified at three levels and developed on three sites. The three levels are theory, policy and practice. Each of these will be seen to be far more complex than the terms used to denote them would suggest. The role of theory in a racialised form and its relation to policy and practice have been presented in the critical literature as simple and unproblematic(2). Also, "policy" and "practice" do not refer to products and activities that are easily identified or analysed.

I will argue that the meaning of a racialised form is to be sought in the relationship between these levels and that racialised forms are constructed through their interaction. But that is not an interaction between separate entities, each level can be seen to be operating, as having a role, in each of the others.

The relationship between levels is organised through activity on three sites: national, local and school. Again, it is the relationship between them that is of central importance in identifying racialised forms and in understanding their development. Critical analyses of national state policy on race and education(3) have tended to assume that, at any given time, a framework and general assumptive base discernable in national policy inscribes LEA, school policies and practices.

The first part of this chapter concentrates on the development of policy at a national level. A preliminary to this will be a clarification of the sense in which 'national policies' can be said to have existed. The central focus of analyses of policy(4) has been the body of reports, documents and circulars produced at a national level which have been taken to represent different stages of official "policy". I will summarise those reports etc. and outline their content in terms of key issues and concerns and through examining official explanations of 'black underachievement'. Using the issues and concerns identified I will re-consider the question of the nature of 'national policy' and examine the ways in which it may be said to have evolved over the last twenty five years, and illustrate the areas of continuity and constancy.

Secondly, the developments at a national level will be considered in relation to successive forms of LEA initiative and school based practice. Within this, two issues will be raised. First, whether sufficient consistency can be identified between activity on the three sites in order to justify periodising 'the educational response' to black children in white schools i.e. to support the contention that different racialised forms have dominated at different times. Secondly,

given that significant change has taken place, even if it is not uniform nor between 'different' racialised forms, what has been the major dynamic and impetus for change?

The Development of National State Policy.

A National Policy?

For the purposes of educational policy making "the national state" comprises primarily the Department of Education and Science (DES) but many reports have been produced by other departments, semi-autonomous bodies, House of Commons committees and special investigative committees. A prima facie conclusion that may be drawn from this complex construction of 'official policy' is that there has been no nationally co-ordinated approach to race and education in Britain, i.e. that no national policy exists. A variety of bodies have produced reports on different aspects of "the problem" which have functioned as position papers with respect to different approaches and explanations. However, Hatcher and Shallice are correct to point out that,

"...state policy is not reducible to explicit policy statements"(5).

A range of national and local agencies, state apparatuses, and autonomous and quasi-autonomous bodies are all involved in the production, dissemination, and legitimation of what comes to be seen as "state policy". If one attempts to relate these "parts of the state" and to show the processes by which they constitute policy it is not sufficient to claim that

"The priorities and parameters of state education policy are complexly constituted through the cumulative "bids" of various apparatuses of the state (e.g. Rampton, the Schools Council, the C.R.E. etc.), private institutions allied with the state and individuals whose views achieve official sponsorship."(6).

This formulation at best states the problem to be solved, i.e. how those cumulative "bids" take place, but the

conceptualisation of these agencies as merely "apparatuses of the state", makes even that unlikely. One needs to account for the apparent cohesiveness of "state policy" given its production by formally autonomous bodies. Many reports have contained sets of recommendations but few if any have been acted upon(7). In particular, recommendations that a national lead be given through central provision or specific resource allocation have been steadfastly resisted by the DES(8). This is curious for two main reasons: first, the national state appears to be sanctioning uneven development on an issue which it claims to view as important; secondly, this is happening when the DES, and central government in general, is drawing more power and control into itself than ever before.

The DES claims that its failure and its unwillingness to set down a central strategy is not a question of commitment but a product of the structure of the education system. It refers to its "lack of authority in a de-centralised education system"(9), in which the balance of responsibilities is encapsulated by the provision of non-specific grant through the RSG(10). But that relationship is changing rapidly with the DES being eager to enhance its authority in other policy areas(11). It appears that the underlying cause is structural but not in the sense that the DES means because,

"...discussion and research on MRE continue to be farmed out on an ad hoc basis to organisations whose relationship to the decision making structure is nebulous and whose direct influence is marginal."(12)

If this is an accurate description of the Schools Council, the APU, the Rampton/Swann committee, the CRE etc. then what is the significance or meaning of the documents they produce? They do not seem to be producing policy as such so what is the role and function of the reports with respect to educational provision and practice? If they do, in some sense, constitute 'state policy', how do they do that and what does this mean for how one should conceptualise the role of the state in educational policy making on race?(13)

The Key Reports and Documents(14)

Since the publication of the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council's (CIAC) second report in 1964(15), many "official" publications on "immigrants" and education have considered 'the problem' of black children in British schools. It has been a frequent theme of DES reports, Green papers and circulars, of Home Office reports, of Select Committee reports and most recently of the 'S. rman'(16), 'Rampton'(17) and 'Swann'(18) reports.

The development of an 'official position' has been organised around a number of key concerns, explanations and concepts. The major overt concern in educational terms has been "black underachievement". This has been linked to the educational and socio-political aim of "equality of opportunity" and has underpinned a political concern with social cohesion and racial harmony. The development of a 'position' can be traced first, in terms of changes in explanations of underachievement and secondly, through related changes in the terms and concepts through which the aim of social cohesion has been expressed.

In approaches taken in reports etc, it appears that there has been a movement through three main stages, three broad analytical frameworks and conceptual lexicons. These, Mullard has identified as having been organised around the concepts of assimilation, integration and cultural diversity(19). However, it is important to establish the degree to which a change in conceptual language and in apparent approach represents a change of stance or aims and values. I hope to demonstrate that while changes in the 'official position' have taken place there are also significant continuities.

The first stage in the development of an official position occurred in July 1965 when the DES issued circular 7/65. It was sent to all LEA's and its main purpose was, in the light of increasing numbers of "immigrant" pupils in some schools,

"...to consider the nature of the educational problems that arise and to give advice and assistance as is possible."(20)

The circular advocated that LEA's adopt a policy of dispersal in order to ensure that no school had more than 30% 'immigrant children'. This approach was founded, as Tomlinson points out(21), in the second report of the CIAC(22) which had been drafted at the same time as a political crisis concerning 'immigrant children' in schools. In particular, 'large numbers' of 'immigrant children' in two Southall primary schools had led to white parents' protests and a visit from an education minister. On this basis he told the House of Commons that in future, a 30% limit would be suggested to LEA's(23).

As a number of commentators(24) have pointed out, the problems that are being addressed in this measure are problems for the broad social aim of that time: assimilation. So although the problems were educationally located - both practically and in the official discourse - they were as much social problems as educational ones.

In the view of the circular the major barrier to assimilation and to academic achievement was seen as the teaching of English. But, as Tomlinson argues, although the 1965 white paper (incorporating circular 7/65),

"...appeared to suggest that only non-English-speaking children should be dispersed, in practice all immigrant children were."(25)

In circular 7/65 the DES generalises linguistic and cultural problems to all "immigrant children"(26). It thereby laid the foundations for two central components of racist discourse and ideology: the use of "immigrant" to mean "black"; the idea that black pupils in schools necessarily present a problem for teachers and for the educational system in general. This is the result of what Green has called,

"The critical slippage from 'the problems encountered by' to 'the problems of'."(27)

In educational discourse, as in the wider political and social discourse, blacks are seen as a problem and that 'fact' is communicated by a variety of common phrases: "problems of children from other cultures", "problems of low-achieving black

children", "problems of black crime" and "problems of negative self-image"(28). The strategy of dispersal that the circular advises LEA's to pursue, re-inforces the belief that a black community necessarily means a large or compounded problem.

The concern over 'numbers' under-pins the definition of the educational problem but it also connects powerfully with the concerns and justifications of the 1962 Immigration Act(29) which was designed to directly limit the numbers of black people entering Britain. It is not so much that the 1962 Act led to the dispersal policies of 1965 onwards, but they both expressed governmental concern about the consequences of political opposition to the presence of black people in Britain.

The particular emphasis on language in the mid to late 1960's communicated to both LEA's and to teachers that the major concern of education should be to equip black children with the linguistic competence to compete on 'equal' terms with their white counter-parts i.e. to be assimilated into a meritocratic system. This is a defining characteristic of the 'assimilationist' phase but it is also a major concern of all subsequent phases.

In 1973 the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration published its report for 1972-73 which focused on education(30). By then in all but a few die-hard LEA's the policy of dispersal had been abandoned because of practical difficulties and widespread opposition(31). It is clear in the report that the assumption that all black pupils are de facto problems has been weakened in the intervening period but only formally so. The report asserts that "immigrant children" are not simply a source of problems, they also bring "rich cultural variety". This indicates that the assimilationist aims of the mid-1960's had been replaced, or were giving way to securing social cohesion and 'unity' through "cultural diversity".

The report implicitly criticises previous approaches and assumptions when it claims that,

"It is not easy to separate the handicaps of immigrant children from those of others."(32)

It pursues this by asking whether "immigrants" do have special educational difficulties and therefore pose special problems. However, it speculates that the problems could be rooted in living in the decaying inner city. Unfortunately, the report construes this dichotomy not as a problem about how government policy approaches and conceptualises the needs of black children in schools but as a problem about information and statistics(33).

The concept of "needs" has played an important part in the articulation of 'the problem'. The question of black pupils having particular educational needs is clearly a central one but to assume, on the one hand, that these needs are homogeneous and peculiar to black pupils and, on the other hand, that they can be understood largely through non-racial categories such as urban decay, sustains the view of black pupils as problems per se and excuses the lack of specific action to combat racial inequality. This contradiction is at the heart of the strategy and discourse of 'inexplicitness'(34) characteristic of the policy of this period.

The report follows up its speculation about the source of problems with a, by then familiar, emphasis on language(35) and a whole host of 'common-sense' assertions about the problems with black children, black parents and the black community. The report thereby makes assumptions about that of which it acknowledges a lack of certainty or clarity.

In the late 1970's and early 1980's the problem has moved on but there are still echoes of earlier priorities. In the 1977 Green Paper(36) the DES published its summary of the various "consultations", that is, of the "Great Debate", that followed James Callaghan's Ruskin speech(37) in 1976. In this paper, clear indication is given that assimilation is no longer the aim. The terms and objectives focus on "cultural diversity" and the foundation is being laid for "multiculturalism", a pluralism emphasising racial tolerance and harmony, built on an acknowledgement of cultural difference.

The Green paper advocates that schools aim,
"...to instill respect for moral values, for other people and
for oneself, and tolerance of other race, religions and ways
of life."(38)

It adds in its list of recommendations that,
"...the curriculum should reflect a sympathetic understanding
of the different cultures and races that now make up our
society."(39)

The Green paper also re-affirms the formal aim of "equal"
academic progress for "immigrant" children. It thereby
implicitly acknowledges the failure of the previous decade's
attempts to achieve this. It also offers a glimmer of an
explanation of that failure when the general theme of the paper
- the inappropriate, out-dated nature of the curriculum - is
affirmed in this specific area. It asserts that,

"...talents and abilities in all spheres need to be developed
and respected; the education appropriate to our imperial
past cannot meet the requirements of modern Britain."(40)

In 1977 the Select Committee reported on "The West Indian
Community"(41). In the section of the report which deals with
education, the central concern is the "underachievement of West
Indian pupils". It re-iterates the call for a special fund for
LEA initiatives but its most important recommendation was that
the DES should set up a committee of inquiry into the
achievement of West Indian pupils. The then Secretary of State
for Education, Shirley Williams acted upon this and set up the
committee. Its terms of reference were subsequently widened to
include "all ethnic minority groups" but it was asked to
produce an interim report as soon as possible on West Indian
pupils. Consequently, in 1981 it produced the "Rampton
Report"(42) and after a change of chairman, in 1985 the "Swann
Report"(43) was produced.

In the same year as the Rampton report, the Parliamentary
Home Affairs Committee reported on "Racial Disadvantage"(44).
It noted that disadvantage in education and employment are
crucial to racial disadvantage in general and that they are

connected. It further lamented inconclusive results from research in this area, echoing the words of the Select Committee report eight years earlier(45). It claimed that there had been little change in the situation and there was a lack of certainty as to the nature of educational disadvantage specific to "ethnic minority children"(46).

The Rampton Report represented a departure from previous concerns and approaches because of its explicit focus on the causes of underachievement and because in this report, racism enters the official vocabulary for the first time. But, as I will show(47), that concept is allied to a range of other explanations and is seriously under-developed(48). This report also stresses earlier views(49) of the curricula changes necessitated by the changing ethnic composition of schools. It argues that MCE is appropriate to all children and is necessary in all schools, not just those with a high percentage of ethnic minority pupils(50).

The Swann Report, "Education For All"(51), was published in March 1985, six years after the committee of inquiry was established. Many of the themes of this report echo the concerns and the explanations of the Rampton report but it is most note-worthy for its equivocal conclusions on all the major issues that it considers(52). This lack of conclusion, of direction and resolve means that it operates as a review of policies and practices rather than a framework and strategy for change. Its major impact arose from the conflict over its successive drafts, two members of the committee resigned in November 1984 and a number of others threatened to do so because of objections to draft reports(53). This controversy continued when the official rejection of four of its major proposals followed immediately on its publication. On the day the report was published, the Education Secretary, Sir Keith Joseph, told the House of Commons that,

"He had no intention of changing the statutory requirements for daily collective worship and religious education in maintained schools. The government would not call into

question the present dual system of county and voluntary schools, change the policy on mandatory awards, nor would it amend Section 11 of the 1966 Local Government Act."(54)

The key theme of explaining underachievement is continued in the Swann report, as is the general social analysis and framework characteristic of the recent period. It also echoes the Rampton Report on racism(55) and its effects on achievement but no significant advances are apparent(56).

It is clear that the twenty years between circular 7/65 to the Swann report have witnessed some significant changes in the pre-occupations, aims, explanations and prescriptions to be found in 'official policy' documents but equally clear is continuity, or at least contiguity, in each of these facets. But how significant are the changes given an underlying consistency? Answering this question bears on how one periodises 'official policy', and hence on the identification of significant shifts. Relating change to continuity in official policy is a pre-requisite for relating changes at the levels of official rhetoric and official 'policy' to those in LEA and school policy and practice.

Explanations of Underachievement.

Explanations of underachievement have been a key element in how different 'official positions' have been articulated. They have been a major pre-occupation of official statements on race and education and have reflected changes in the framework and conceptual language of national policy. A concern with underachievement has expressed fears about the social impact of consequent disaffection(57) as well as the more liberal worries of policy makers and teachers that the principle of 'equality of opportunity' is not being achieved(58).

Tomlinson has identified three types of focus in official explanations of black underachievement: extra-school factors, individual pupil characteristics and school processes(59). She argues that in the 1960's the extra-school factors were, the migration process, family background and cultural differences.

In the 1970's, disadvantage, racism and discrimination had come to the fore(60). But this latter shift was accompanied by a growing rejection by black parents of 'home background' explanations and a new focus on school processes: curriculum processes, examinations, teachers and their training(61).

The third focus, on pupil characteristics, refers particularly to language problems and self-concept or self-esteem(62). But this does not feature as an alternative to 'extra-school factors', the two, in conjunction, make up what has been characterised as a 'black pathology'(63) account of underachievement. Through this, 'the problem' has been located in the black child, in the black family, community and culture.

Early documents tended not to address the question explicitly but the emphasis on language as a barrier to progress(64) and concerns with the 'handicaps'(65) and 'disadvantage'(66) of black pupils all served to convey and legitimate what has become a mainstay of the received wisdom: the underachieving black child.

The apparent changes in social and educational goals from assimilation to cultural diversity, changes in terms and concepts, have been accompanied by changes in explanations of black underachievement. One can trace shifts from assumptions about language difficulties, culture shock and culture clash, through to more explicit concerns with barriers to equality of opportunity in the Select Committee's 1973-4 report where it discusses the needs and the 'handicaps of immigrants', and the impact of urban decay and deprivation(67) and then on to 1977 where official documents start to address the problem explicitly(68).

The Select Committee report of 1977(69) refers to the general view of the West Indian community and organisations that Afro-Caribbean children were underachieving in schools. It notes that the DES and the CRC accept the 'fact' of West Indian underachievement and that it seriously affects employment prospects(70). However, the report laments the lack of comprehensive research evidence of underachievement and it was

this that prompted it to call for the governmental enquiry which finally produced the Rampton and Swann reports(71).

In the "Interim" report, the Rampton report, published four years later, and in the subsequent Swann report, there is an explicit concern with the 'facts', with 'proving' underachievement and providing adequate explanations of why it occurs. In these reports, the relationship between research and officially sanctioned explanations reaches its most explicit stage. The conclusions of general summaries of research(72) and particular studies or arguments find their way into the main body of the reports and become the official truth, even if it is often a vague and non-committal truth.

Rampton and Swann, like other reports of the late 1970's and 1980's accept the 'fact' of underachievement: that children of Afro-Caribbean 'origin' generally underachieve relative to their white peers, and that children of Asian 'origin' achieve at a comparable standard to their white peers(73). But this acceptance makes a number of assumptions and begs a number of questions.

Parekh(74) has identified some of these problems in Swann and Rampton. For example, he argues that although the research shows that as a group Afro-Caribbean children underachieve, some achieve on par with white and Asian children. In some respects, in some subjects, Asian children also underachieve, and although bright Asian children generally do well, the rest do only a fraction better than their Afro-Caribbean counterparts. Generally, he identifies great differences within the Asian community with children of Bangladeshi origin doing particularly badly(75).

Parekh takes up further points concerning the received view. He claims that many reports and studies, the Rampton report in particular, employ the "fallacy of the single factor": assuming the simplicity of an explanation for a complex phenomenon(76). He also takes up an argument which has formed a crucial part of official refusal of explanations based on racism and discrimination. This argument suggests that racism cannot

account for underachievement because both Afro-Caribbeans and Asians must face racism but only the former group under-achieve so cultural and other differences must be contributory causes(77). Parekh responds that not all Afro-Caribbeans fail, nor do all Asians succeed but all are subjected to racism. It is fallacious, Parekh argues, to assume that "the same factor must always produce the same results"(78).

The 'facts' of underachievement must also be considered in the context of the problems with measurement, of what one uses to gauge pupil 'achievement'(79). The perceived need for detailed information, for statistics, is not as unproblematic as it might appear.

The Home Affairs committee sought more determination by the DES to collect statistics about the achievement levels of Afro-Caribbean children in the face of opposition from teacher unions, LEA's and Afro-Caribbean organisations. It does not however consider the reasons for that opposition.

The Rampton report gives more detail of the evidence of "West Indian underachievement"(80) and refers to "widespread concern" about the apparent failure of West Indian children but it recognises, to an extent that the Home Affairs Committee report does not, that fully substantiating and explaining underachievement is much more than a technical problem. It notes that official attempts to 'support' black people's concern about underachievement with 'hard facts' have met with "suspicion and cynicism"(81). Suspicion about the reasons for focusing on West Indian children and cynicism about action being likely to result from any official research or fact gathering exercise.

The point is further emphasised by the NAME response to the Swann report(82) which argues that not only will statistics divide 'the black community', Asians against others, it will confirm the racist stereotypes of teachers. Reliance on statistics exaggerates perceptions and definitions of what counts as legitimate knowledge and through legitimating that type of knowledge at the expense of black peoples' knowledge

re-inforces power relations between black people and white policy makers and researchers.

In recent reports, the 'Swann' Report for example, explanations based on 'defects' in black communities or in the black child have receded from view. Links between disadvantages characteristic of the inner-city and the position of minority groups are also questioned. However, no alternative explanation is unequivocally supported and earlier official doubts about racism as a fundamental cause of black underachievement are re-emphasised(83).

Overall, one finds, an unwillingness to seek the source or cause of underachievement in the structure and institutions of our society. The absence from official explanations of the question of the contribution of racism is characteristic of the general framework, concepts and values found in all reports up to the Rampton report. But even when racism does start to be acknowledged as a possible factor, the concept employed leads to cultural and psychological factors being re-introduced to explain(84) differences in achievement between black ethnic groups 'caused' by different responses to racism(85).

From Assimilation to Cultural Diversity?

It is clear in all of the reports and documents mentioned, that a central concern is to specify and prioritise aims and objectives. I have referred to how the central motif has moved from assimilation, through a notion of integration which allowed the retention and development of cultural identity, arriving most recently at "cultural diversity". This tri-partite phasing of official policy and approaches is supported by a range of theorists(86) and has in the Swann Report been made the official history. But whilst those terms and concepts offer a rough guide to the phases of national 'policy', certain difficulties do arise if one attempts to define them more accurately or show where one phase ended and another began. The difficulties arise not only because of the degree of overlap and continuity between the three phases but also

because it is by no means clear whether a 'phase' should be identified in national 'policy', national rhetoric, in LEA or school, policy and practice or in some combination of these.

If one uses official statements to reveal the phases of official policy and approaches sanctioned at a given time, assimilation appears to have given way completely by the early 1970's. However, the full picture is considerably more complex. The first suggestion of an alternative to assimilation from an official source was Roy Jenkins much quoted speech of 1966. He claimed that the aim of policy should be,

"...not a flattening process of assimilation but an equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance."(87)

But this did not herald an immediate change of approach. As Tomlinson(88), and Troyna and Williams(89) have pointed out, the late 1960's saw a protracted debate between assimilation and pluralist integration. The continuation of dispersal policies by some LEA's(90) until the early 1970's bears witness to this. This contradicts Mullard's location of the assimilationist perspective in the period between the late 1940's and the early/mid 1960's(91). Therefore, even if one concentrates solely on the development of what Troyna has called "official rhetoric", there is no easy consensus about the content of that rhetoric at any one time.

The integrationist period is similarly difficult to place accurately. Jenkin's speech in a sense launched it but it merges at the levels of rhetoric and practice into both the preceding phase of assimilation and the subsequent one of cultural diversity. Troyna and Williams(92) suggest that integrationism involves some criticism of school and a concern with black disaffection, but that these became official themes because the compliance of black students was seen to be necessary for assimilation to be successful(93). The change in rhetoric is not matched by changes in the ultimate social goal of policy, that remains the same, integration is just a different approach to assimilation(94).

Mullard's argument that the phases of policy exhibit an underlying continuity makes a similar point but it is founded on an analysis of the social and political meaning of state 'policy' on race and education. Mullard claims that the three approaches are related, that MCE founded on "cultural diversity" is linked in its "construction, presentation and social orientation"(95) to the other two. He argues that all three have,

"...a set of theoretically constructed interpretations about the nature of the dominant political, ideological and economic order."(96)

Each aims for the protection of that social order. There is no shift in intent or direction, the difference lies in social presentation not in social construction(97).

Having identified a continuity Mullard then links the different expressions of social and political aims to a periodisation of post-war economic activity, of requirements for black labour and the regulation of black migration through anti-immigration legislation(98). I have demonstrated the problems of proving a tight correspondance between economic periods, needs for black labour and its regulation through anti-immigration legislation(99). Consequently, attempts to relate phases of official approaches to race and education to developments in economic activity, labour requirements and immigration control become problematic.

But two crucial developments in political and social history seem to have corresponded to water-sheds in the content and articulation of educational policy. First, in 1962 legislation restricting black immigration was introduced based on justifications which linked numbers of immigrants to social problems and to good race relations(100). Secondly, 1981 when race, youth and the social and political costs of economic restructuring were vividly conjoined in widespread urban riots. This has formed one of the major national contexts for the growth in LEA policies and in their increasingly explicit racial expression and focus(101).

Returning to Mullard's point, if one accepts that the broad social aim of policy continues to be social cohesion secured through the assimilation of black people into white social and political structures, then the basis for assimilation has changed, so has the way that aim has been expressed and the method through which it is to be achieved. This does not contradict the idea that each social objective addresses the same social problem but it shows that there are different types of assimilation, that it can be broken down into its component parts of political, economic (occupational) and cultural assimilation. In the first phase, these converged and were largely indistinguishable but increasingly, political assimilation i.e. acceptance of existing channels for opposition, has been secured through promoting cultural diversity not cultural assimilation. It remains to be seen whether the continued lack of assimilation into the economic structure will undermine that 'state strategy'.

Underlying this movement is the constant theme of social and political harmony which each set of aims have sought to interpret and achieve. Since the late 1970's this has meant a two pronged strategy: equal opportunities and achievement for ethnic minorities, countering prejudice for the white majority. Beneath this unity can be found different approaches to race relations and hence to race. The shift is crucially from a concept of racial superiority which implied that assimilation was desirable to a concept of difference and diversity but this justifies ethnic 'seperateness' and hence may re-inforce particular cultural forms of racism(102).

Certain tensions derive from the above analysis. Changes in the explicit concerns and rhetoric of policy have been identified but within a framework of consistent dominant themes and pre-occupations. Clear social goals recur but they are not the explicit subject or object of policy. They address practice and provision but do not prescribe solutions. This suggests a particular but indirect and heavily mediated relation between 'policy' activity at a national level and

changes at a LEA and school level. But what is that relation, how has 'policy' been communicated? What are the changes that have taken place and do they follow the officially sanctioned lines of development? Is the dominance, found at a national level, of continuity over change, of meaning over rhetoric, reproduced at LEA level?

The Local Impact of National 'Policy'.

I have argued that the lack of central provision of extra funds to meet stated aims and objectives, lack of leadership about how they should be achieved and the refusal to adopt the recommendations of a succession of reports, amounts to not having a policy as such. But does that mean that there has been no nationally determined direction for local initiatives? Often a direct link is presumed to exist between intention and effect, between national stance and local action(103) but that would seem to be contradicted by the status of nationally produced documents, by the process of their production and by the lack of nationally co-ordinated action.

Questions can be raised about the validity of arguing that there is a clear-cut relation between developments at an international and national level and the form taken by local policies and practices(104). But as Troyna and Williams point out, processes of change are mediated by the state and,

"This determines the structural, political and ideological parameters within which local politicians and bureaucrats operate."(105)

But for LEA's there are further determinants, LEA's are sites of struggle in which there is a complex relation between constraints. This is an assertion of their "relative autonomy" but Troyna and Williams are correct that it is difficult to give real meaning to this except in the context of a detailed empirical study(106).

Recent years have witnessed a rapid growth in the number of U.K. LEA's adopting policies on aspects or issues of race in

education. This, as Dorn & Troyna(107) point out, has occurred in the context, from 1971, of stated DES commitment but without any coherent framework for policy as such, despite pressure from "state" bodies(108) and "autonomous" organisations(109). It appears therefore, that to some extent, LEA's have been taking the initiative in responding to pressures and demands for action in the broad field of race and education.

In the initiatives taken by LEA's there is no homogeneity over time or between LEA's. Research in the early 1970's(110) revealed that LEA provision which addressed problems identified in central policy statements was patchy and uneven. This situation persisted to the late 1970's when Little and Willey(111) reported similar findings in their 1980 survey. But it is the late 1970's which Tomlinson(112) identifies as the beginning of the growth in LEA policies following the lead of the ILEA in 1977(113). Similarly, Troyna and Williams claim that the early 1980's saw the beginning of the development of formal policy by a significant number of LEA's(114). One sign of this growth was that by 1981 about 25 LEA's had appointed 'multicultural advisers'(115).

The number of LEA's who have adopted policies is still increasing and hence is difficult to identify exactly. However, recent research does offer some guide to the approximate number. Dorn's research in 1983(116) claimed that some 20 LEA's had policies but it is unclear whether this referred to the U.K. or to England and Wales only. Mullard et al using a more systematic survey identify 36 U.K. LEA's which had developed policy(117).

Mullard et al also inquire into the number of LEA's which were either pursuing a racial policy without supporting policy documents or were actively considering developments of racial policy and practice(118). Combining these three categories shows that the following percentages(119) of LEA's had or were developing policy and/or practice:

Greater London	77.8%
Metropolitan Districts	66.7%
Non-metropolitan Districts	47.4%

This data appears to indicate that although metropolitan LEA's (including London) are clearly more actively pursuing policies and practices, the overall level of development is much higher than previous research had indicated. However, the level of policy activity, whether supported by policy (position) documents or not is not necessarily indicative of the level of practical innovation.

The lack of practical innovation to accompany LEA statements and the terms many LEA's have used to express their policy position have led many to criticise LEA policies. ALTARF claim that the period 1978-1984,

"...witnessed the growing acceptance by LEA's of a bland and totally de-politicised form of MCE alongside the intensification of state racism."(120)

LEA policies are criticised for being superficial and hence for having little chance of success(121). Policy development, because of the lack of a coherent national policy, is uneven in both its spread and in its scope where it exists. Where policy has been developed, the many contradictions, problems and continuing conflicts which remain have led to the growth of a critique of the purpose and content of policy(122) and of the contradictions between policy and practice(123). Such a critique will be shown to connect with and complement a more general "radical critique" of MCE(124).

Within this general context of policy document production and critique the policy statements of a small number of LEA's are worth noting not only because of their content but also in some cases because of the process by which they were produced(125). Mullard et al found in their survey that 10% of their survey population of 110 LEA's had engaged with the question of racism(126). That engagement is a crucial aspect of the few LEA policy statements which have begun, at least on paper, to meet objections leveled at earlier policies(127).

Troyna and Williams argue that certain LEA's have produced policies which do not reproduce national patterns and trends(128) They claim that the ILEA, in 1977, and Manchester, in 1980, produced policy statements conceived of, by those who drafted them, as change agents. Their aim was:

"...to provide a reconstituted conceptual framework for curricular, organisational and pedagogic procedures."(129)

In terms of the relation between the national and local educational apparatuses, this suggests that 'key' LEA's are in fact 'making the pace' for national policy statements. It also re-inforces the idea that the political meaning and significance of local policy statements cannot be 'read off' national statements and developments.

Some elements of a 'national lead' can be found. The Home Office has, through Section 11 of the 1965 Local Government Act(130) financed projects and appointments specifically aimed at black school children and the black population in general. But two problems stop this contributing to a national policy or practice. First, its origin in the Home Office means it cannot be part of an education policy orchestrated by the DES. Secondly, this provision is always for projects initiated by the LEA and until recently was not even monitored after being agreed(131).

There is some legislative back-up for the aims and objectives outlined by central government in addition to the Section 11 provision but it has not seriously affected the relationship between the national and the local educational apparatus. The 1976 Race Relations Act(132) is the principal piece of legislation here. In sections 17 to 20 it proscribes certain actions but as Dorn and Troyna(133) point out, no alternatives are prescribed. Section 35 provides the possibility of compensatory provision but it is permissive, no compulsion is involved. Section 71 is possibly the most important section because it lays a statutory duty on LEA's to,

"...eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunities and good relations."(134)

But as Dorn and Troyna show(135), again that duty is "persuasive rather than obligatory". It is also, as will become clear(136), open to interpretation when that duty has or has not, been fulfilled.

Both ways of providing extra funds have been criticised over how they are administered and allocated(137). Severe doubt has been cast upon whether they actually benefit those on whose behalf the funds have been claimed. Recommendations to establish a central, special fund were twice turned down in the 1970's by the DES(138). Consequently, the policy statements stand alone as national policy and their impact and meaning for practice is mediated by existing central-local relations, LEA interpretations and initiatives and general racial structures and ideologies. These mediations have given an increasingly specific form to the effects of national policy.

The uneven development of policy has partly depended upon the dominance of a view held by LEA's where there were few non-white pupils, that MCE was not relevant to them because of the absence of black pupils. Respondents to Little and Willey's survey also felt that to instigate multicultural initiatives would only create hostility and be divisive(139). If this opinion is compared with the central strategy of both meeting the needs of black pupils and educating white pupils for living in a multicultural society, it is clear that the over-arching aims of racial harmony and tolerance relates primarily to multi-racial areas.

This might seem a proper or practical view of where harmony etc. is a priority but it contradicts a prominent official claim that MCE is for all, that a multiracial Britain demands a new type of education(140). It appears that the official positions, although not linked to an overt central strategy, do convey to LEA's which of them should be listening, thinking and acting in this area. They also convey a set of concepts, problems and measures which 'targetted' LEA's can then utilise. In this way the effective relationship between

national policy positions and local initiatives and policies starts to become clear.

The racial inexplicitness of terms, concepts and explanations point to non-racial roots for racial disadvantage. It denies the need for any analysis of the racial structure of British society and hence allows an official silence on (structural) racism. But this is combined with a racially specific target for official documents and reports. The message is that black children are 'the problem' and schools and that LEA's which have a 'concentration' of black people have the largest problem, they are the target.

Race Relations legislation, reports, documents and other pronouncements on race and education form a permissive framework which has shaped LEA thinking and action without requiring any action at all. For LEA's 'targetted' by national pronouncements, official policy is connected to the processes of local policy and decision making through sanctioning and focusing on certain issues. Power and influence is exercised not through compelling certain types of action but,

"...through the neutralisation and marginalisation of potentially contentious issues."(141)

How it does that is centrally concerned with the development of an agenda of issues for policy. Dominant conceptualisations are constructed which offer ways of thinking through the agenda items. The dynamics of the former and the functioning of the latter within the specific discourse of "race and education" will both be explored in some detail in the following chapters(142). It is clear however, that each is linked by the role of silences and omissions within policy which in turn contributes to a dynamic relationship between action and inaction by state educational apparatuses.

The lack of national state action is justified through the racial inexplicitness of policies and explanations for black disadvantage. But the 'noise' of research and the production of reports creates the appearance of activity and concern. Whilst 'black underachievement' is a central concern of officially

sponsored and sanctioned research, no policy has been adopted at a national or local level which will alleviate it(143).

Action and Inaction.

The 'action and inaction' of LEA's is not just a matter of what is done or what is not. Through action and inaction, educational policy is related to general racial structures, ideologies and discourses(144). If the state is viewed as playing a central role in the structuring and managing of racism through its social, immigration and criminal policies then educational policy can be located not only as another contributor to that role but also as a primary means for handling its effects, for managing its contradictions and conflicts. Therefore, as Dorn and Troyna observe(145), terms of reference, unchallenged assumptions and the institution-alisation of conflict are all important and highlight a concern with the problem of legitimation.

If one now uses this as a framework for re-examining the national-local relation, certain aspects of the role and effects of policy statements can be identified: they offer the appearance of producing policy, they connect with the dominant racial definitions and discourse, they communicate an agenda to LEA's and legitimate LEA concerns about black pupils in their schools, they help to identify which schools and areas need to act to change their organisation and curriculum.

These processes overcomes the "formal autonomy" of LEA's and the de-centralised nature of the education system. Through these relationships, "state policy" may cohere, but it clearly does not cohere as policy as such. It offers an ideological framework for policy and practice at a local and school level.

But the framework may be refused. If state policy is not cohesive as policy, LEA's may offer alternative approaches to race and education. But if they do, one needs to know the process by which alternative approaches are constituted. If space is created in certain LEA's, is it merely provided by the local state or is it won through opposition and pressure?(146)

Answering these questions not only demands a more detailed understanding of the relation between national and local policy making but also of the process by which MCE is produced, disseminated and legitimated(147). It should point to further understanding of how "official discourse" should be interpreted and evaluated.

Given this broad ideological role with an audience of educationalists, LEA's and the black communities, one needs to know in detail the extent to which the themes of central policy are necessarily reproduced at a local level. It is also important to find out the extent to which LEA's adopt 'policies' with a similar role in mind but with schools, teachers and local black communities as the audience.

Dorn in his review of LEA policies on MRE claims that, "Though policy statements frequently commit themselves to "promoting equality" and "combatting racism" these concepts are rarely defined in terms of educational practices and tend to float rather uncomfortably on a sea of "harmony", "respect" and "tolerance"."(148)

Given their emphasis on general social goals, Dorn concludes that most policies are affirmations or statements of position, not programmes for action. As such, a policy is more a reaction to local pressures than a 'real contribution' to MCE and that,

"...probably derives from the perception that race relations is essentially a moral issue...one takes a stand rather than makes provision."(149)

It is in the few isolated cases where an LEA does not follow this pattern, as arguably Berkshire(150), the ILEA(151) and one or two others do not that the dynamic of official racial discourse on education becomes more complex and problematic. Alternative positions such as these which emphasise structural concerns both in their analysis and in their proposed implementation, may oppose both the content and the role of policy represented by national statements. Hence attempts to portray the current racialised forms of education

as being of one type only, albeit with variations, are shown to over simplify and over-generalise complex processes.

The Development of Practice.

Largely as a consequence of the absence of a national strategy towards MCE and because of the form and intent of LEA policies referred to above, MCE barely exists in schools(152). In Green's view MCE is not an accomplished fact but an agenda of reforms and is a struggle,

"...waged on the grounds marked out by this agenda."(153)

Green claims that reforms issue in part from LEA's, from the DES, the Schools Council and in part from 'progressive teachers' who are 'forced to work on the terrain determined by the state'.

"All are a response to the struggle of black parents and students over the miseducation of black children in schools."(154)

If one accepts that claim, then one needs to know how these different responses are related and particularly whether they in any way correspond to each other.

During the period when the assimilationist paradigm was in the ascendancy within national policy it is clear that the emphasis on language needs was met with a similar emphasis both within LEA structure and in the classroom. Between 1960 and 1965 teachers and LEA's with growing numbers of 'immigrant children' developed practices which centred on the provision of English as a second language(155). But this was as much a product of LEA and school interpretations of pupils' needs as an outcome of officially sponsored emphasis on language.

The dispersal policies sanctioned in 1965 were the culmination of a technical crisis perceived within some classes and schools but were closely linked to governmental fear of a white backlash(156). Both were under-pinned in official discourse and in ideologies of practice by the notion that black children were a problem per se. The issue for teachers

was one of expertise and of the demands on that expertise, it was a technical problem(157).

The failure of this paradigm, which Mullard has labelled "immigrant education", began in the late 1960's because of resistance pre-dominantly by black parents and students but by some white teachers also(158). The assumed superiority of white culture that characterised the assimilationist paradigm was superceded by attempts to 're-habilitate' black culture and religion and, through this, to combat perceived problems of black self-identity and self-esteem(159).

In the late 1960's, Tomlinson argues, poor achievement began to be linked, in some schools,

"... to poor self-image and a lack of cultural identity and hence began their own attempts to change the curriculum to give minority cultures more recognition...Policies for curriculum change in multiracial schools thus quite clearly began at school level and filtered upwards".(160)

These problems were interpreted through a psychological notion of racial identity in conjunction with a concept of shared culture. That concept involved seeing culture as artefacts and rites rather than lived experience(161). This motivated a particular type of tokenism within primary schools which not only 'answered' criticisms of "immigrant education" from the black communities but also connected with the influential practical ideologies of "child-centred", "progressive" and "relevant" education(162).

This approach to the education of black children has been variously characterised as a "Steel-band and Divali" approach or as "the Three S's": Steel-bands, Saris and Samosas(163). Both epithets encapsulate the severe limitations of such an approach and indicate how the rest of the curriculum and the formal and informal life of the school were largely unaffected.

A slightly developed form of this approach had its hey-day in the 1970's in secondary schools. Courses in 'Black Studies', 'A' levels in Black History etc. were developed in order to placate students and parents angry at their under-

representation in the formal curriculum(164). These courses fought for academic respectability but their continuing low or 'different' status(165) bears witness to their marginality.

The demand for these courses were the seeds of a critique of the existing 'mono-cultural' curriculum. As Davis(166) points out, the curriculum is written in terms of a specified content which represents a selection from knowledge and conveys what counts as valuable knowledge. That content finds its basis, meaning and validity in white British culture and experience and hence is a racist selection from the 'available' knowledge.

Such an analysis, linked to a growing awareness of the importance of the everyday procedures of the school, underlays the move towards 'whole school' approaches and policies. A change identified by Little and Willey in their 1980 survey(167). They refer to a shift from insertions or additions to a re-evaluation of the curriculum as a whole. They report that heads of department,

"...recognise the need to undertake appropriate curriculum development but constraints of time and resources and in some cases uncertainty as to what action to take, severely limited the progress they had been able to make."(168)

A 'whole school' approach was endorsed by the Rampton Report(169) which it linked to an aim for the curriculum: it should broaden the cultural horizon of every child. MCE is therefore appropriate to all children and reflects the multi-racial composition of our society. This a version of the whole school approach which tacitly accepts the criticisms leveled at a 'mono-cultural' approach. However, 'whole school' approaches may take a variety of forms, they do not necessarily involve a systematic overhaul of the formal curriculum.

Willey, for example, gives his support to particular approaches, emergent in the last two or three years, which specifically focus on equality and employ the aim of combatting racism as a core around which to develop responses to diversity(170). He claims that such school policies are opposing racism, or more accurately, racist ideology based on

the assumption that black people are inferior to white people. He adds that,

"Such notions are deeply imbedded in the procedures, practices and structures of institutions."(171)

This involves a much wider concept of the curriculum of the school and points to the limitations of the Rampton version of a whole school approach. It also begins to elaborate a concept of institutional racism which is sorely lacking from the Rampton Report. The only gesture in that direction is the 'individual' racism 'unintentionally' perpetrated by particular teachers(172).

Rex(173) is correct that a 'whole curriculum' approach may just be a cover for doing nothing. General entreaties may reproduce at the school level, the national and local tendencies to adopt a position without necessarily adopting a strategy. If a school adopts a policy without a commitment to a systematic analysis of all aspects of the life of the school then it is likely to be superficial and cosmetic. It will function primarily as a palliative: to black parents and pupils, to anti-racist teachers and to 'progressive' local authorities pressing schools to make their position clear.

Other pitfalls await a school even if it does undertake a 'systematic analysis'. It still has to avoid cultural tokenism within the formal or overt curriculum and cope with the dangers of reproducing hegemonic relations between cultures through white teachers re-interpreting 'black cultures' and then relaying them to black pupils(174). This raises the question of who has legitimate rights to be involved in the development and implementation of school policies. Mullard, for example claims that,

"...individual school policies and practices are developed by white teachers without, in most cases, any reference at all to black advisory, parental or community groups.. (consequently)..these policies and practices have helped to institutionalise racism."(175)

To emphasise a slightly different aspect of this:

"Anti-racist teaching that stops at the classroom door cannot truly be described as anti-racist."(176)

These issues mark out some of the often implicit points of contention between MCE and ARE. A possible shift of emphasis is to a curriculum designed to nurture not "existing" ethnically defined cultures but a critical, conscious and "political" culture which takes as its starting point a critical appraisal of a variety of cultures. This would allow the possibility of tackling the experiential and structural realities of race in an explicit way.

These considerations begin to raise specific questions about the form that policies and practices, whether 'multicultural' or 'anti-racist', should take. They also raise serious doubts about the usual audience and content of school policies. It is becoming the accepted pattern(177) to start with a statement of aims and objectives but it could be argued that a statement of what is wrong, of what needs changing and the barriers to this would be more appropriate. This could be a systematic analysis of the school and its effects or it could be an outline of the overall social context and role of the school, or both. Either would begin to reveal that an anti-racist stance, or a multicultural one worth that title, is necessarily critical and oppositional.

The complexity and unevenness of changes in practice make any periodisation of practice quite broad and general. Clear movement is apparent in those schools and LEA's which are leading the practical critique of past orthodoxies but still developments in most 'all white' schools are extremely limited. 'MCE' is viewed by many to be for black pupils only(178). In many racially mixed schools assimilationist perspectives are still prevalent and initiatives can be both tokenistic and paternalistic.

A picture of non-uniform change shows that any link with developments at LEA and national level is complex and varied. National reports and documents are a powerful context for LEA

and school policies and practices. They provide an analytic framework, preferred concepts and explanations but some schools and LEA's, under pressure from black pupils, black parents and anti-racist teachers have, through their practical critique of nationally sanctioned positions, affected those positions. They have made demands of future reports that bear directly on their legitimacy and credibility with black people and anti-racist whites.

In multiracial schools and areas a struggle is being waged over a general framework, over values, aims, explanations and solutions. Opposition to officially sanctioned approaches is affecting the content and expression of those approaches. However, key concepts and terms of official discourse are being modified rather than abandoned in favour of more 'radical' ones. Also, despite claims that 'MCE' is for all, the message is unequivocally that predominantly white schools and areas have 'no racial problem' and that no change is necessary.

Analysing Racialised Forms

In the preceding sections I have outlined the development of 'the educational response' on three different sites: national, LEA and school. On each of these sites, different 'approaches', or "racialised forms of education" have been defined and expressed through theory, policy and practice. The first two sites have been dominated by theoretical and policy expressions of an "approach" even though both have attempted in different ways to address and affect practice. The school site is largely synonymous with practice but policies have been produced (179) and theory has played a part.

The complex links between developments on the three sites make it problematic to sustain simple periodisations of 'the educational response' into identifiable racialised forms with national, local and school components and expressed and articulated through theory, policy and practice. The preceding discussion therefore contradicts the tight linkage between

educational developments and economic, political and legislative contexts which is characteristic of the radical critique.

One of the key arguments or contentions, and one of the central analytic methodologies within the racial critique of MCE concerns the identification of what Mullard calls "racial forms of education"(180). It rests on a usually implicit view of the relation between theory, policy and practice. Analyses of MCE have considered each of these levels but the emphasis of the radical critique has predominantly been on policy. Theories, concepts and frameworks have been "read from" policy documents and taken to represent an underlying rationale or basis for that policy(181). Practice has then been assumed or claimed to 'correspond' to policy so that it represents simply the implementation and operationalisation of that policy.

The relationship between developments in policy, practice and theoretical frameworks is crucial for specifying a racialised form, its content and definitive characteristics. Through this competing claims for the "true" meaning or significance of racialised forms of education can be assessed, attempts at periodising the educational response can be evaluated and it should become possible to make distinctions within the broad set of policies, practices and frameworks currently employed and all referred to as MCE.

The distinction² between assimilation, integration and cultural diversity is valuable especially if, as Mullard claims(182), significant aspects of the officially preferred model of society have not changed. However, as I have argued, it only tells of the explicit changes in national state position, of changes in the national rhetoric. It does not prove that an approach based upon cultural diversity is now dominant nor that those based on integration and assimilation were previously so.

Differentiating between social aims and showing how these have been officially sanctioned at different times helps to periodise the educational response to black students in British

schools. But in the current situation, one has to decide whether merely to acknowledge the breadth and confusion covered by the term "MCE"(183) or to recognise that a number of racialised forms of education are being practised. If we accept the latter then we must discover the relationship between these forms. Are some dominant and legitimated, others dominated and oppositional or residual but with continuing influence, yet others, dominated but oppositional. Before these questions can be answered a basis must be established for specifying and identifying different racialised forms.

When considering issues concerned with race and education one of the first sources of confusion and difficulty is that terms are used inter-changably and loosely to refer to a broad body of practices and policies. These terms are "multicultural education"(MCE), "multiracial education"(MRE), and "multi-ethnic education"(MEE). Further, "immigrant education", and "anti-racist education"(ARE) are used to refer to similar but more specific sets of practices and policies. This situation means that one must decide whether a particular usage is significant or not. Whether it merely reveals a personal preference, or whether it depends on different terms having different connotations(184) or actually signifies a different set of educational and social values, different practices and a different framework.

One approach to identifying and differentiating between 'approaches' has taken practice as its primary focus. This is the approach Willey adopts in his discussion of contemporary developments(185). Davis(186) also concentrates on practice. He distinguishes four approaches to meeting the educational needs of black pupils: a 'colour blind' approach which claims that no conscious discrimination occurs, it advocates 'treating them all the same' but effectively means 'treat them as if they were all the same'; a 'special needs' approach which emphasises general remedial and E2L needs; a compensatory-appeasement model, based on a 'special needs' approach but including black studies for black pupils; a curriculum with 'multicultural'

aspects which Davis argues is effectively 'cultural apartheid', a tokenistic approach focusing on food and festivals(187).

This schema refers to sets of practices which can easily be found operating in schools. It may be descriptively useful but it has two main problems. First, Davis's emphasis on practice over-compensates for the usual critical focus on policy. His four approaches are unrelated to dominant values and conceptualisations to be found in official policy documents.

Secondly, he confuses three sets of things which impinge upon multiculturalism. First, justificatory ideologies within multiculturalism - compensation, cultural maintenance, cultural relevance. Secondly, mode of provision - special needs, remedial and language provision. Thirdly, forms of practice and justification which actually refuse and oppose any amendment to practice, for example the 'colour blind ' approach.

To make sense of the alternative responses to black pupils, one has to ask how practices and modes of provision relate to justificatory ideologies, to values, aims and concepts, and to the content and context of official pronouncements on race and education. A narrow focus on what is being practised neither poses that question nor takes one closer to an answer.

If one examines an opposite approach, the most well developed classification of different racialised forms of education by theoretical framework is found in Mullard's recent work. He argues that the debate between MCE and ARE,

"...possesses all the features of a debate or rather contest over competing perspectives and definitions of socio-educational reality and objectives."(188)

This contention he extends to each of the six 'racial forms of education' - immigrant, MRE, MEE, poly-ethnic, MCE and ARE - that he identifies. Each involves preferred social and educational objectives(189).

Having specified his six racial forms Mullard sets three objectives: to identify them historically; to set out their characteristics and contexts; to establish the relations between them(190). The first is achieved through focusing primarily on

MRE, MEE, MCE and ARE which he argues occurred in their main expressions in that order. Each of the first three is seen as emerging at a particular time and for particular reasons.

MRE, Mullard argues, resulted partly from white teacher's and black parents' and childrens' resistance to immigrant education, and partly,

"...from the requirements of the political state...MRE socially surfaced in the mid-1960's to counter not racism per se but the culturally exclusive and race discriminatory educational policies and practices of the 50's and 60's."(191)

Similarly, MEE which Mullard refers to as the 'primary ethnic form of MCE' arose in the late 1970's partly as the result of the resistances of white teachers and

"... 'black' (ethnicised) parents and children against the racially structured authority and legitimacy of MRE, and partly as the result of the requirements of the political state to re-align itself yet again in order to maintain control over and manage the rapidly changing social and economic realities of the late 1970's and early 1980's."(192)

This description of the genesis of MRE and MEE is useful in a number of respects. It provides more detail of different periods of 'the educational response' and shows how particular forms are predominantly but not exclusively linked to particular historical periods. It therefore allows the location of these forms to be explored, it allows the significance and role of a whole range of contexts to be evaluated. Further, it brings into the argument not only developments in the social and economic order but shows how racialised forms of education can only be fully understood in relation to others, particularly those that they attempt to supercede and oppose.

Problems arise with the assumed nature of the state in Mullard's descriptions. He makes a similar assumption to Carby about the homogeneity of the state and its ability to impose its intentions(193). Also, although he cites black and white

teacher pressures for change these are not related to the requirements of the state, so the relationship between different pressures for change which gave each racialised form its distinctive characteristics is not explored.

Mullard's historical identification of MCE and ARE is more limited than for the above two racialised forms. MCE is characterised as a reaction to and development from MEE which makes it a phenomenon of the late 1970's and 1980's but his usage here restricts "MCE" to a more developed, specific and increasingly complexly institutionalised form of a more broadly understood MCE. His claim that MCE constitutes a cultural form of racism - ethnicism - rests on that usage.

ARE is characterised in the following way:

"...from its formal emergence in the early 1960's as a reaction to the structural racism built into immigrant education to its educational efflorescence in the 1980's as a largely 'Black' response to the ethnicism of MCE, this dominated form addresses the central problem of White racism."(195)

This representation of MCE and ARE depends upon the theoretical and political opposition between them. That opposition is specified in some detail but as with MRE and MEE the major way in which they are defined is through the theoretical frameworks identified with these different approaches. It is a problematic approach because the 'content' of racialised forms in the sense of practices engaged in, is not specified nor related to theory. However, Mullard is correct to challenge the lack of theoretical clarity in the debate between ARE and MCE and he does attempt to specify the 'content' of ARE in later papers(196).

The main theoretical opposition utilised by Mullard in analysing the four main racialised forms is between "structure" and "culture". It is crucial to the differences between ARE and MCE and between MRE and MEE.

Mullard claims that MCE,

"...both attempts to incorporate the significances attached to culture and ethnicity and to bridge the theoretical chasm between culture and structure via a re-articulation of structure (multiracial education) in terms of culture."(196)

"It re-interprets and re-locates the structural significance of race (multiracial education) in terms of the broader cultural as opposed to strictly ethnic significance of ethnicity (multi-ethnic education and poly-ethnic education) within a multicultural framework."(197)

Mullard seeks to make complex use of the structure-culture relation but without offering any definition or discussion of the difficulty of either term. His categorisation sees immigrant education and MRE as 'structural forms and expressions', they encapsulate understandings of racial stratification and racism and emanate from the structure of the social formation as a whole. MEE and MCE are 'cultural forms and expressions', they embody an essentially cultural basis for racial stratification and racism. The distinction between structure and culture is both the main theoretical opposition and the main dynamic for change from one form to another. But according to Mullard, ARE is different, although it has been primarily generated in opposition to MCE, it has been a dominated oppositional form since the early 1960's and so has a relation to each of the other three major forms, and is therefore located within the structure-culture opposition:

"ARE, because it evolved in part as a reaction to both structural and cultural racial forms and hence made quite different connections between structure and culture, then appeared to astride both structure and culture though its actual social derivation was structural."(198)

Mullard's account represents, as I have said, the most detailed analysis of the theoretical and assumptive frameworks associated with various racialised forms of education. But the use which Mullard makes of theory, and the form of argument that he employs, result in an approach to theorisation and

explanation which restricts the levels at which racialised forms are determined and hence with reference to which they are to be analysed. If distinct racialised forms can be identified then each will develop through an inter-play between the three levels of policy, practice and theory. A racialised form is constituted through the relationship between those levels. Any developing form will be in part a reaction to what has gone before but this will involve not just the preceding theory or framework, change can also be stimulated through debates and conflicts at the level of policy and practice.

The major problems with Mullard's account rest on the nature and role of theory with respect to the racialised forms. Mullard is clearly concerned to establish a theoretical basis for ARE which is a pressing problem for its adherents, but that is different to attempting a theoretical characterisation of all racial forms via largely implicit conceptual and theoretical frameworks. That approach he takes to represent an historical identification of those racial forms. For this to be the case the reading of an implicit framework and assumptive base would have to be accompanied by and related to accounts of the development of both policy and practice.

The relationship of theories and concepts to policies and practices within a racialised form is not made explicit. Where one is offered metaphors of linkage(199) they indicate a relation which is problematic because it is too simple. Mullard views racialised forms of education as derivative from their largely implicit theoretical framework. He effectively equates that implicit framework with origin or explicit analysis. He therefore provides a useful guide to the analytical shortcomings of a racialised form of education (and therefore its likely practical limits) but that is not an historical account of the relation between forms, it is a logico-conceptual deconstruction that tells little of the processes involved.

Although the above discussion of Mullard's work and of other contributors to specifying different racialised forms is concerned with the 'content' of the different forms, it is the

methodological argument and conclusions that have the greatest implications. These can be summarised in the question, how should one analyse a racialised form of education? A question most pertinent when that racialised form is an LEA's specific set of policies and practices.

Conclusion

The meaning and origin of the opposition between MCE and ARE depends, in part, upon its historical antecedents. This chapter has sought to provide an outline of that history and the main issues around which different racialised forms of education have been organised. But this is not just background or context. An accurate picture of the broad lines of development is essential if one is to explain the form and content of racialised forms of education.

I have suggested that a major barrier to the development of a framework for anti-racist policy and practice has been the dominance, within the radical critique, of a particular approach to the analysis of state sanctioned racialised forms of education. In this chapter I have attempted to describe and explore it and point to some of its weakness.

This has been accomplished through an analysis of tensions and contradictions between national, local and school sites on which theory, policy and practice have been developed. I have sought to use the disjunctions between sites and levels to problematise the processes which have led to the overall convergence of developments in each. This focus suggests that racialised forms of education are not generated at one level or on one site alone. Consequently, one has to re-pose major questions: What determines the form that LEA policies take? Why should some adopt the values and framework of national reports and documents and others explicitly refuse and oppose them? How is one to decide when a policy is oppositional or anti-racist? In general, how should one read LEA policy documents?

Chapter Four. Notes and References.

- 1) As explained in the introductory chapter, the phrase 'racialised form of education' is used as a generic term for various types of policy and practice which have developed since the late 1940's as a response to the presence of black children in British schools.
- 2) This point will be expanded as a major theme of this and the following two chapters.
- 3) See for example the work of Mullard (1980b) & (1981a), Carby (1980) & (1982) and Dhondy et al (1981).
- 4) See note 3.
- 5) Hatcher and Shallice (1983) p.4.
- 6) Ibid.
- 7) Tomlinson (1983) pp.21-22, refers to a total of 228 recommendations, very few of which the DES has taken up.
- 8) See Department of Education and Science (1974), Department of the Environment (1977).
- 9) See Dorn and Troyna (1982) p.177.
- 10) The RSG (Rate Support Grant) is the major mechanism through which central government finances local government spending. It does not specify how much should be spent on what. Each council is expected, within a framework of statutory duties to decide on its own priorities.
- 11) This is seen in a range of initiatives and developments such as the formation of the APU, the use of Education Support Grants, changes in the maintenance of polytechnics, and new arrangements for teachers Inservice Education and Training.
- 12) Dorn & Troyna (1982) p.178.
- 13) These questions provide one backdrop to the discussions in chapters four to six. My emphasis will be on exploring what constitutes policy and how it is produced. This involves revealing processes and relationships of which any adequate conceptualisation of the state would have to take account.
- 14) This section is necessarily a brief summary. For a fuller account see Tomlinson (1983).
- 15) Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council (1964).
- 16) Scarman (1981).
- 17) Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (1981).
- 18) Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (1985).
- 19) See Mullard (1982a).
- 20) DES (1965) para.2.
- 21) See Tomlinson (1983) p.16.
- 22) CIAC (1964a).
- 23) See Tomlinson (1983) p.17.
- 24) See for example, Carby (1982) pp.184-190 & Mullard (1981a) pp.120-123.
- 25) Tomlinson (1983) p.17

- 26) Tomlinson (1983) p.17. claims that at this time just 30% of 'immigrant' pupils need special language teaching. This is supported by the DES itself in its 1967 Annual Report where it claims that of the 130,000 'immigrant' pupils in schools with 10 or more such pupils, one quarter had language difficulties. This substantiates doubts about the appropriateness of a language based strategy. The 'Rampton Report' (p.26) later emphasised this point and argued that such an approach leads to neglect and avoidance of underlying issues.
- 27) Green (1982) p.23.
- 28) See Carby (1980a) p.65.
- 29) Commonwealth Immigrants Act (1962).
- 30) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973).
- 31) See Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.41.
- 32) Op.cit. p.3.
- 33) A theme re-iterated in DES (1977).
- 34) See Tomlinson (1981).
- 35) Op.cit. pp. 7-14.
- 36) DES (1977).
- 37) For the text of this see Callaghan (1976).
- 38) Op.cit. p.6.
- 39) Op.cit. p.40.
- 40) Op.cit. p.4.
- 41) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977).
- 42) Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minorities (1981).
- 43) Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minorities (1985).
- 44) House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1981).
- 45) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973)
- 46) Op.cit. p.54.
- 47) See chapter six.
- 48) In particular, where racism is recognised at all it is seen as solely a question of negative attitudes.
- 49) See for example DES (1977) pp.4 & 40.
- 50) Op.cit. p.27.
- 51) Op.cit.
- 52) Op.cit. For details see part V in particular.
- 53) For an indication of the major incidents and issues see the Times Education Supplement 29/6/84, 6/7/84, 23/11/84, 7/12/84 and 15/3/84.
- 54) Times Education Supplement 22/3/85.
- 55) See note 48.
- 56) See NAME (1985) p.1. where it is argued that the theory of racism in the Swann Report is no more than a collection of disjointed observations.
- 57) See for example, The Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977) p.XX.
- 58) See DES (1977) p.4.
- 59) Tomlinson (1983) p.4.

- 60) Op.cit. p.1
- 61) Op.cit. p.2.
- 62) For a detailed discussion of the issues of self-concept and self-esteem see Verma and Bagley (eds.) (1979).
- 63) For a critique of this in general see Lawrence (1981) and Parmar (1981). On pathology and educational policy see Carby (1982) pp.190-2.
- 64) See for example DES (1965), circular 7/65.
- 65) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.3.
- 66) See for example, House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1981) p.55.
- 67) Op.cit. p.4.
- 68) See Select committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977).
- 69) Op.cit.
- 70) Op.cit. para. XX.
- 71) Op.cit.
- 72) See for example, the Swann Report pp.68-70 an extensive quote from Parekh (1983) is given.
- 73) See the Rampton Report p.3, Swann Report p.64.
- 74) Parekh (1985a)
- 75) Op.cit.
- 76) See Parekh (1983) p.113.
- 77) See House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1981) p.55.
- 78) Parekh (1983) p.114.
- 79) For a recent interesting discussion of the problems of measuring standards and the levels of school outcomes see chapter five of Barrow et al (1986).
- 80) Op.cit. pp.6-10.
- 81) Op.cit. p.3.
- 82) NAME (1985) p.2.
- 83) This is one of the effects of the Reports' acceptance of Parekh's argument about the "fallacy of the single factor".
- 84) See House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1981) p.55.
- 85) This is one of the main arguments of the radical critique and it will be discussed more fully later in this chapter and in chapter six.
- 86) For example Mullard (1981a), Troyna (1982).
- 87) Quoted by Willey (1984) p.17.
- 88) Tomlinson (1983) p.11.
- 89) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.21.
- 90) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.41
- 91) Mullard (1981a) pp.120-121 & 127.
- 92) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.22.
- 93) Ibid.
- 94) Op.cit. pp.21 & 24.
- 95) Mullard (1981a) p.121.
- 96) Op.cit. p.122.
- 97) Mullard (1980) p.17.
- 98) See discussion on the social and political aims of MCE in chapter six.
- 99) See chapter one.

- 100) See the account of this in chapter one.
- 101) See chapter five.
- 102) Barker (1981) argues that in recent years a 'new racism' has developed based on the idea of irreconcilable racial differences rather than racial superiority. This is discussed in more detail in chapter one.
- 103) See for example Mullard (1982), Carby (1982) and Hatcher and Shallice (1983).
- 104) A point emphasised by Troyna and Williams (1986) p.5.
- 105) Ibid.
- 106) Ibid.
- 107) Dorn and Troyna (1982) p.175.
- 108) For example, the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977).
- 109) For example, see Commission for Racial Equality (1977) p.3. and (1978) p.7.
- 110) See Townsend (1971).
- 111) Little and Willey (1981) pp.9-10.
- 112) Tomlinson (1983) p.23.
- 113) ILEA (1977)
- 114) See Troyna and Williams (1986) p.2.
- 115) See Tomlinson (1983) p.23.
- 116) Dorn (1983) p.3.
- 117) Mullard et al (1983) p.12.
- 118) This represents a total of 64 out of 110 respondents.
- 119) Op.cit. p. 14, table 6.
- 120) ALTARF (1984) p.1.
- 121) See Laurie Lax (1984) pp.208 & 209.
- 122) See for example Hatcher and Shallice (1983).
- 123) See Menter (1984)
- 124) What this comprises will be discussed in detail in the last sections of this chapter and in chapter six.
- 125) This is particularly true of the Berkshire policy considered in chapter five.
- 126) Op.cit. p.23.
- 127) For further details of the failure of policies to engage with racism see chapter six.
- 128) Op.cit. p.27.
- 129) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.28.
- 130) For a critical evaluation of the workings of Section 11 and an account of the revised regulations see Hibbett (1982) and (1983).
- 131) This has been changed by recent rule changes outlined in circular No. 72/1986, Home Office (1986).
- 132) For an account of this see Tomlinson (1983) p.20.
- 133) Op.cit. p.180.
- 134) 1976 Race Relations Act, quoted by Dorn and Troyna (1982) p.180
- 135) Op.cit. p.180.
- 136) See discussion of the Berkshire policy in chapter five.
- 137) See Hibbert (1982) and (1983).
- 138) See note 9.
- 139) Op.cit. p.21.

- 140) An approach grounded in DES (1977) but most fully elaborated in the Swann Report.
- 141) Dorn and Troyna (1982) p.175.
- 142) See particularly chapters five and six.
- 143) See Tomlinson (1983) p.21.
- 144) See chapter one for a detailed consideration of these as both background and context.
- 145) Op.cit. p.177.
- 146) It is interesting to note that Robin Richardson, at that time the Adviser for MCE in Berkshire, suggests in a letter to Richard Hatcher, that space is in fact won through opposition and pressure whereas, Richardson argues, Hatcher assumes it is merely provided by the local state.
- 147) This issue will be discussed later in the chapter.
- 148) Op.cit. p.3.
- 149) Dorn, op.cit. p.5.
- 150) See Berkshire Education Committee (1983a)
- 151) See ILEA (1983a)
- 152) See Green (1982), Little and Willey (1981) and Troyna and Ball (1985b).
- 153) Green (1982) p.19.
- 154) Ibid.
- 155) See Tomlinson (1983) p.18.
- 156) This formed the subtext of DES (1965), circular 7/65 where concerns about effects on standards were expressed and white parents asked to monitor whether LEA's were responding to the circulars' recommendations.
- 157) This has been labelled by Williams (1979) as a 'technicist' approach.
- 158) One significant group of white teachers were the Association of Teachers of Pupils From Overseas (ATEPO) who first expressed their changing emphasis through changing the name of their journal from "English For Immigrants" to Multiracial Education in 1971 and then by becoming The National Association for Multiracial Education (NAME) in 1973. More recently, NAME has come to stand for The National Anti-Racist Movement in Education and indicates a move to an explicitly anti-racist stance.
- 159) For an overview of some of the issues centring on questions of identity and esteem see Verma and Bagley (eds) (1979).
- 160) Op.cit. p.21.
- 161) Further comments on concepts of culture in state sanctioned racialised forms will be made in chapter six.
- 162) These connections will be examined in detail in chapter seven.
- 163) See Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.13.
- 164) See Green (1982) p.20.
- 165) See Rex (1984) p.42.
- 166) Davis (1982) p.4.
- 167) Op.cit. p.20.
- 168) Ibid.
- 169) Op.cit. p.29.

- 170) Op.cit. p.7.
- 171) Ibid.
- 172) The notions of 'individual' and 'unintentional' racism will be discussed at length in chapter six.
- 173) Rex (1984) p.45.
- 174) For a discussion of this and related issues see chapter seven
- 175) Mullard (1982) p.29.
- 176) ALTARF (1984) p.2.
- 177) In LEA's such as the ILEA where all schools have been required to produce policies this is particularly the case. But it should be noted that there are counter-examples: see Inner London Education Authority (1982).
- 178) See Little and Willey (1981).
- 179) See for example the Swann Report, pp.380-381, Lindsay (1984).
- 180) See Mullard (1984).
- 181) See for example, Hatcher and Shallice (1983), Hatcher (1985).
- 182) See Mullard (1981a) p.121.
- 183) i.e. to accept it as a generic term.
- 184) See Hussey (1982) for a discussion of one aspect of this.
- 185) Willey (1984).
- 186) Davis (1982).
- 187) Op.cit. p.6.
- 188) Mullard (1984) p.7.
- 189) Ibid.
- 190) Mullard (1984) p.10.
- 191) Mullard (1984) pp.10-11.
- 192) Ibid.
- 193) See for example note 190 above.
- 194) Mullard (1984) p.12.
- 195) See for example. Mullard (1984).
- 196) Mullard (1984) p.11.
- 197) Mullard (1984) p.12.
- 198) Mullard (1984) p.16.
- 199) Mullard (1984) p.11.

Chapter Five. Reading Policies, Interpreting Initiatives.

Introduction.

In the 1980's, since the urban 'riots' of 1980 and 1981, a few LEA's have produced policy statements on race and education which have differed from their 'multicultural' predecessors through adopting an explicit focus on race. These are some of the policies which Troyna, with Ball and with Williams, has referred to as 'racialised' policies(1). They are not only explicit about their concern with the issues of racial equality but they also suggest that there are specific characteristics of racial inequality and disadvantage and that racism is a major factor in their perpetuation.

Policies from LEA's such as Brent(2), ILEA(3), Haringey(4), and Berkshire(5) can be viewed as representative of the current stage of development of an embryonic anti-racist approach. As such, if one wishes to assess the potential for policy and practice to surmount the problems endemic to MCE, then it is these policies which must be analysed. In this chapter I will examine in detail Berkshire's policy initiative, the contexts and processes of its production, the position it adopts and the strategy employed in its implementation(6). Such studies are fundamental if one is to discover the meaning and significance of LEA policies and hence learn how they should be 'read' or interpreted.

Berkshire's policy is particularly significant because when the discussion document on which it was based was published in June 1982 it received considerable attention from the press(7). The policy as finally adopted has been the object of critique by academics, teachers and other commentators(8). It was also included (but without acknowledgement) almost in its entirety by the ILEA in its revised policy of 1983(9). Consequently, the Berkshire policy may be viewed as a high-profile statement, representative of an alternative approach to race and education which seeks to gain more credibility and achieve greater and different success to the 'multicultural' policies of the past.

The 'radical' critics of MCE have argued(10) that the reasons and motives behind LEA policy making are the same as those of the national state: that they are concerned with managing the effects of racism and minimising disaffection and dissent. In chapter six I will examine how this 'functionalist' view confuses effects with intentions(11). I will also develop the idea, suggested in chapter four, that the 'radical critique' employs a monolithic theory of the state which drastically over-simplifies the relations between the national and the local state(12).

This chapter is concerned with exploring the processes through which the effects of local policy making are produced. Through this I hope to show that although the 'radical critique' offers a description of effects which is often accurate, the assumptions made about their cause are seriously mistaken. I intend also, through an emphasis on processes, to assess the extent to which the effects of avowedly 'anti-racist' policies are similar to those associated with 'multicultural' policies.

Attributing a political meaning and intent to LEA policies has been based not only on a view of the state but also on how LEA's are seen to interpret national events of significance for race and race relations. The urban 'riots' and the general racial structure of Britain outlined in chapter one, will provide important contexts for LEA policy making but how will they shape or influence the subject and object of policy? I intend in this chapter to illustrate the way in which, in one LEA, national policies, events and general trends and developments affect policies and policy makers. Through this, I hope to arrive at a more detailed idea of how national and local state concerns around race and education intersect, and hence discover whether LEA policy statements can or should be read in the same way as national documents.

I will demonstrate that problems arise if one takes an LEA's formal statement, their explicit policy position, as a privileged and accurate expression of policy. Such an approach

equates policy with official policy position, attempts to access the meaning and significance of policy via an emphasis on official discourse and applies a process of "symptomatic reading" to official documents(13). I will show that this approach misunderstands the nature of policy documents, their status, process of production and the role they have within the articulation of the policy as a whole.

How one should read LEA policy statements on race and education is a central concern of this chapter. One has to ask what policy is, and where in an LEA's structure, activities and system of provision the meaning of policy should be sought. A general answer to these questions is suggested through the approach to the analysis of Berkshire's policy. Four processes of policy articulation are identified: contexts and pressures for policy; the explicit position, perspective or framework; an agenda of issues and projects or measures; the strategy and structure of implementation.

I hope to demonstrate that through these processes policy is developed and its meaning articulated. Consequently, it is through an examination of these four processes that policy should be analysed and policy statements 'read'. From this it should be possible to provide a guide to the comparison of different LEA policies that recognises the complexity of LEA policy making, that acknowledges the significance of the process of policy production and the strategy for implementation as well as the 'position' publically endorsed.

Contexts and Pressures for Policy Making.

Since 1945 Berkshire, both as a county and as an LEA, has undergone many changes which have formed a general context for policy making on race and education.

This is particularly true in Reading(14) - until 1974 an LEA in its own right - where the system of schooling which developed in the late 1940's and 1950's was closely linked to the organisation of local industry. In keeping with the tri-

partite philosophy of the 1944 Education Act, schools were linked to specific sets of occupations which connected school organisation to the form of the industrial base. Since then changes in production and in the economy in general, comprehensivisation and the changing racial composition of the school population have combined to pose questions about the appropriateness of Reading's system of schooling.

The re-organisation of local government in 1974 took these problems to the new and larger Berkshire LEA which gained Slough as well as Reading. These two towns have the large majority of Berkshire's black people and their inclusion gave racial equality greater visibility and made it a likely issue for policy making(15).

In January 1983, the Education Committee of Berkshire County Council adopted a statement of policy for racial equality(16). This statement was the product of formal and informal meetings and consultations(17) during 1981 and 1982. It was the final form of a position on racial equality which had changed significantly during that period.

The responsibility for drafting a statement had been given to an Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education, a committee of representatives from black communities, teachers and head-teachers, local pressure groups, councillors from each party, officers and two outside consultants(18). They produced a discussion paper, 'Education For Equality'(19), in the summer of 1982. This was followed by extensive consultations up to the presentation of a report and the adoption of the formal statement by the Education Committee. Three policy papers(20) were then produced based on the Advisory Committee's report.

The process of its production reveals the policy document to be of a 'consultative-working group' type as opposed to an 'officer-member' type(21). As a description of the production process this is accurate, and it is an important fact in analysing the meaning and significance of the policy, but it does not reveal the context of its production. In other words,

we do not necessarily know why it was produced at the time it was, nor why it took the form it did.

To answer this, one has to look at pressures and motivations for producing a policy. One must ask whether a specific set of contexts or pressures leads to a specific type of policy. One has to decide on the relative influence of national and local events and the relation between them. Through this, one can see how local events and contexts give meaning to national events and contexts and explain why other LEA's subject to the 'same' events and contexts have no policy.

Further, if, as I shall argue, the process and context of policy production is an integral part of the meaning of that policy, it becomes clear that the same policy statement adopted by different LEA's will, if the local context and the process of policy production are different, form part of policies which need to be read differently.

Finally, one needs to know how the interaction of national and local trends and events become interpreted by key individuals in the LEA. Particular officers, and councillors, play a vital role in receiving pressure and converting it into action and direction in the LEA structure. Their aims and intentions therefore become extremely influential on the final shape and meaning of the policy. Their conceptions and understandings of what is being demanded and what it is possible for the LEA to deliver, will affect the emphasis and the limitations of the policy as a whole.

The "Zoning Campaign".

The demographic and other changes that have taken place in Berkshire provide the local general background for the development of the policy for racial equality. The history of black people's experience in Britain and the structural position they now occupy, form an overall framework for understanding particular responses such as Berkshire's Education for Racial Equality.

Within this framework, certain local events and developments help one to understand the significance of Berkshire's policy. Foremost amongst these was the campaign that arose in 1978 as a response to the Education Committee's proposal to introduce a new scheme to govern which children went to which schools in Reading. This scheme proposed to divide the city into five 'zones' with children in each zone being allocated to particular secondary schools(22). Members of the campaign(23) argued that the system of zoning discriminated against black and working-class pupils both by intention and in effect.

Two further 'campaigns' were significant in raising racial equality as an issue for the LEA. The first of these has been identified by one of the consultants(24) for the policy as a campaign against racism in Reading. It was symbolically represented by Berkshire's only black county councillor and meshed two political forces: the Labour Party and the black community, socialist principles and black politics. This was not a campaign in the sense that the zoning campaign was but it did have a central organising focus: youth provision.

"Youth" has often been a cipher for other issues and concerns and this appears to have been the case in Berkshire in 1980 & 1981. Two Reading youth clubs, the Appollo and Central, highlighted questions of LEA support and resourcing, of black identity and presence. In particular, when the Central club's lease was ending and there was no prospect of LEA support for new premises, black people started to sit in on council meetings, the beginning of a demand for a voice.

At this time "youth" had a wider significance. Black youth in particular raised issues of disaffection, protest and "riot". When "Education For Equality" was published in June 1982 the Director of Education for Berkshire told the T.E.S.(25) that that document was constructive, it was not drafted in response to riots, no problem of that kind had arisen in Berkshire. It appears that "riots were not a 'cause' of the policy but in interview(26) the DoE described "riots" as "part of the scene"

implying an awareness of the extent of the disaffection of black youth. But in terms of generating a concern to minimise conflict, they were as much a part of the local scene as of the national scene. The Chief Executive of Berkshire, in a letter to the secretary of the Association of County Councils in July 1980, reveals how much they were a part of the local scene. He mentions talk of sit-ins etc. over premises for Central club and refers to the fear by police that 'things might get out of hand'. He then adds that,

"Fortunately nothing untoward happened but having regard to the Bristol riots, authorities and the police are naturally handling any such incident however trivial, with the utmost tact, sensitivity, and urgency."(27)

The second campaign arose out of growing criticism by Slough Asian groups of the lack of opportunities and provision for their children and their communities. This has been linked by one commentator(28) to the increasing institutional influence of Asian communities in general and of particular members of those communities. In this 'campaign' lay the seeds of issues which continue to be relevant and largely unresolved: consultation and representation, resources and the structure of language provision in Slough.

Within these two 'campaigns' and the zoning campaign, growing awareness of the deficiencies of the system of provision, whether mainstream or special, and of the quality of provision, led many groups and individuals to start to bring pressure to bear for action and commitment from the LEA. This pressure was channeled through the Labour Party and in some ways through the other parties(29), through community organisations and Reading and Slough CRC's and also through informal and social contacts and levers.

The zoning campaign led, in August 1978, to the CRE being asked to investigate Reading's system of schooling. Troyna has suggested(30) that this provided a major impetus for the County Council to appoint an adviser for MCE and then start to develop an authority wide policy. However, the investigation

took until February 1983 to complete its report. By this time, the policy for racial equality had already been adopted and also the report said that,

"We do not conclude that the allocation arrangements were unlawfully discriminatory nor that the authority had devised them with the intention of discriminating".(31)

It has further been suggested(32) that the efficiency and the methodology of the investigation meant that it had marginal effect on policy. However, the campaign leading to the investigation is probably the most important single factor in the development of Reading's policy for racial equality. It raised, in particular, two major issues which featured centrally in the policy both in their own right and as aspects of other issues. These issues were consultation and resourcing.

The LEA's proposals on zoning and school allocation came at the end of discussions with parents, governors and head-teachers dating from the mid-1970's. In 1976 it had become necessary to re-organise Reading's secondary schools because of the dominance of "parental choice" causing large imbalances of intake. Consequently, the Education Committee set up a joint officer/head-teacher working party charged with the task of making specific proposals to the Education Committee. These proposals were published for consultation and received a large backing. However, when the council's proposals were finished, after a 'quiet' period, they had been modified apparently because of a few objections.

Campaign members saw these objections as emanating from the already privileged, from those who lived in pre-dominantly white and middle-class areas who through the existing arrangements had privileged access to the "better" non-selective schools. The working party's recommendations threatened that access and therefore were changed. Supporters of the working party's proposals were consequently natural supporters of the campaign.

The issues of consultation are clear but why was, and is, secondary allocation such an issue in itself? The answer to

this appears to lay in the relationship between the allocation of resources to secondary schools, perceptions about which schools offered "good education" and which children went to which schools.

The differences in the racial composition of different areas of Reading(33) makes it clear that any zoning of secondary schools is going to have implications for racial equality in education. However, it could be argued that given that racial distribution any "sensible" system of zoning will lead to a concentration of black pupils in certain schools. This may be the case but the campaign was not arguing that such a concentration was in itself a problem(34).

The campaign claimed that the 'principle of proximity' was not being adhered to, that pupils from certain primary schools in working-class and racially mixed areas were being refused access to close "good" secondary schools and sent to other schools further away. They concluded that the proposals were designed to advance some interests and to damage others. In these arguments race, was an issue but so was class and joining them, a demand for justice.

Part of the significance of the zoning campaign is that, through their involvement, campaign members found out a lot about what schools in Reading were like(35). They discovered inequalities and differences between schools far beyond those expected and also saw a close correlation between those inequalities and the class and race composition of the schools.

These observations and conclusions were based on two premises connected with questions of resources. The first concerns direct resourcing which seemed to privilege and protect particular interests through moving resources in their direction. Also, questions were raised about the allocation and use of Section 11 funds(36) and the operation of the language service. Both were supposed to benefit the black communities of Reading but were not seen to be doing so. These issues continued beyond the zoning campaign and are still relevant.

Secondly, the campaign argued from the, not always explicit, premise that the system for funding schools interacted with the operation of parental choice and with a wide variety of processes that determined whether or not a school was a "good" school, to produce a system of schooling that placed a disproportionate part of the available resources at the disposal of white and middle-class pupils(37).

To summarise, the zoning campaign raised a number of issues which were firmly placed on public, official and unofficial agendas. Generally, it made the crucial link between race and structural inequality in the system of education. The arguments put forward started to show how the organisation of the education system could cause indirect discrimination and undermine formal equality of opportunity. An interest in one aspect of structure led to asking questions about the education structure as a whole.

Pressures and Pressure Points.

The context and background to the development of a formal policy in Berkshire can be viewed as informal pressure for the LEA to take some visible action to promote racial equality. The beginning of the zoning campaign co-incided with the appointment in late 1978 of a new Director of Education (DoE) and in 1979 of an adviser for MCE. Also at this time formal pressure was growing from outside the LEA for a policy on racial equality. That started in July 1979 when Slough and Reading CRC's issued a joint statement arguing that Berkshire's Education Committee,

"...should develop an unequivocal statement on educational policy in the context of a multi-racial and multi-cultural British society."(38)

Later that year Slough CRC and the West Indian Parents Association (WIPA) held a joint conference out of which arose priorities for action. These formed the basis of a letter to the DoE in May 1980 which included the issue of a policy

statement as a first priority(39). The DoE replied that he saw no reason why this could not be done but claimed that,

"...other LEA's had had negative experiences with this, a policy statement is not necessarily a stimulus and may be counter-productive".(40)

However, following a meeting of Education Department officers with Reading CRC early in 1981, the adviser for MCE wrote in April to the DoE proposing that the department should in principle be interested in issuing an official statement on MCE(41). He further suggested that they begin by writing to the education committees of Slough and Reading CRC's to plan a process of consultation.

When an LEA decides to develop a formal policy on racial equality the question of the role envisaged for the policy statement is foremost. As Dorn has asked, is it merely an affirmation or does it have a role to play in action, in change, in the promotion of equality and justice?(42). This dichotomy was evident in the discussions held by the 'ad hoc working group'(43) in 1981. They identified both positive uses and reasons for caution. Of the former they saw that,

- more discussion by teachers about MCE will lead them to be more likely to implement the eventual proposals.

- there ought to be more teacher-parent discussion to clarify disagreements for example over the content of a multicultural curriculum.

- it would be useful for teachers and head-teachers in relationships with white parents.

- it would offer moral support for teachers, but would not actually build or inspire such commitment.

Caution was expressed because of,

- minority group scepticism about consultation and outcome.
- doubts about whether discussion in itself is a good thing.
- it possibly distracting attention from structural matters:
"Arguably the single most valuable decision, so far as the education of minority groups is concerned, would be to end

selection at 11+/12+. But this argument will presumably not be central in a consultation on MCE".(44)

"The statement will either be bland...or else it will be devisive".(45)

This tension between support and serious doubts provides a useful backdrop to the development of policy. It is noticeable that the positive aspects emphasise the concerns of teachers and schools and their relationship with parents whereas negative aspects more directly express concerns of the black community. This is not to say that the black community did not want the policy statement, in fact they exerted the major pressure for the policy, but it does show how subsequent disputes over the form and focus of the policy were pre-figured in early discussions.

The submissions and approaches referred to made up the formal pressure but the adviser for MCE claimed to have felt that pressure to be quite resistable(46). To have an effect on the LEA it required key individuals like the DoE and the adviser for MCE to be receptive to demands for formal policy. Understanding how pressures and demands were received within the LEA is of more than casual interest because of the key role that individuals played in guiding the policy through departmental and council structures. It is important because they acted as focal or pressure points for community and other demands. Demands have to be listened to and pressures felt, therefore the intentions, aims and understanding of these individuals all play a part in shaping the policy.

The DoE's receptiveness to pressures for a policy statement seems to have had three bases: moral, political, and institutional. Moral, because he claims that, soon after his appointment, he perceived that black children were 'not getting a fair deal'(47). Political, both because of the explicit approaches mentioned and because of mounting pressures around secondary allocation, selection and language provision in Slough. Institutional, because of the advantages for the LEA and the Education Department of having a "high profile" policy

on race and education(48). He suggested(49) that if one is looking for being ahead then one should pick a field that is important in the community. He also stated that,

"...I see the issue of racial equality becoming increasingly important over the next few years and I would like to see the department and if possible, the council, being somewhat in advance of the field."(50)

The DoE's motives and intentions are clearly varied and show that to attribute a simple meaning to his support for producing a policy misrepresents his personal, political and institutional location as an LEA officer. His receptiveness to the varied pressures² for a policy statement was an important factor in that pressure becoming expressed and supported within the Education Department.

The adviser for MCE saw producing a policy to be advantageous in two main ways: the process of consultation involved in the development of the statement would itself be useful in raising awareness and putting issues on a variety of agendas(51); the policy statement could sponsor, create and legitimate curricula change in schools and encourage general changes in educational provision. It would also, he explained, respond to pressures from community groups and NAME groups. He felt it necessary 'to live with himself', not to feel constantly criticised and to 'remain on good terms' with community and other activists(52).

This illustrates how national and local, social forces and contexts can rely on individual actors for the form in which they are articulated through a given structure. But realising this should not, as Troyna has pointed out(53), lead one to accept Young and Connelly's emphasis on the role of 'policy entrepreneurs'(54). To view the activities of key LEA officers as the cause of policy development would be, in Troyna's terms(55), to 'de-contextualise' their activities. The accounts of the zoning campaign, other campaigns, concerns about conflict and disaffection and formal pressure for policy, answer Troyna's question(56) about the events, locally and

nationally, that led to the development of individual commitment to change. When coupled to the motivations of the major actors, these events and contexts show how 'pressure' becomes translated into policy making.

If policy development were dependent primarily on 'policy entrepreneurs' then one would expect their role to be interpretive and their own conceptions to remain unchanged. But actors involved in the production of policy can be changed by their role within it. A number of interviewees referred(57) to how the two key officers started "really to listen" and how, during the production of the policy, they radically altered their approach.

For the adviser, important parts of that framework changed during the development of the policy statement and the approach that it endorsed. One interviewee pointed out that the adviser initially placed his emphasis on the curriculum but others, particularly those who had been involved in the zoning campaign, had argued that if all one considered was the curriculum, then that becomes part of the problem(58). Many pressures on the adviser led him later to look further: at structure, racism and resourcing. The success of this pressure was reflected in the changes in the framework of the policy and was essential if the concerns of black people were to be addressed. The movement in the adviser's approach was from a 'multicultural' one, interpreted primarily through the politics of underdevelopment or via a world studies emphasis, to a more 'anti-racist' one. This was important because of the adviser's role for both the LEA and for the perceptions of black people. He was an 'ideological broker'. The change in perspective was crucial to major concerns with communication, credibility and legitimation.

Although the adviser's perspective changed during the process of drafting a policy statement his identification(59) of the most useful "pressure points" and strategy as the internal organisation and curriculum of schools rather than secondary allocation and re-organisation was a crucial one. It

pre-figured the limitations of the perspective finally adopted by the Education Committee and diverted attention away from certain types of structural considerations. This was probably based on an accurate assessment of what was politically feasible at the time but it did justify fears expressed(60) about the dangers of adopting a policy statement.

This picture of the role and location of an individual within the LEA structure starts to show how pressures and demands are framed, interpreted and translated into moves or pressures within that structure. The importance of alternative ways of doing this is revealed through the foci and actions that different frameworks promote. The tension between structural and cultural considerations or determinants had started before even the informal stages of policy production had begun. This will be seen to permeate all stages of policy development. That tension provides the backdrop for the issues so far identified as they continue through the processes of development, statement and implementation.

As an account of the interaction between national and local events and individual motivations, the above is a contingent view of the production of a particular policy statement. I have attempted to show the fluidity of the interaction and indicate that the development² of a policy statement and position is a process of negotiation. This supports the approach to 'reading' policies referred to earlier. An approach that sees a policy statement as possibly internally contradictory and still an object of negotiation and struggle. That idea will be further born out in the following sections of the chapter.

The pressures and contexts for the production of a policy statement allow one to begin to understand the role of the policy statement. The policy statement is clearly an attempt to meet, respond to and reduce both formal and informal pressure. But that does not necessarily mean that changes in resourcing, systems of provision and in school practice cannot flow from it. Whether this is likely to happen will be discussed in detail in the section on implementation. But given that the policy

statement and position appear to have been objects of struggle, one clearly needs to know what they contain in order to understand the role envisaged for the specific statement and position adopted.

Position, Perspective and Framework

So far I have concentrated on describing and analysing the pressures for policy, the context of policy production, the mechanics of policy production and early aims and arguments. This is the first of three aspects necessary to the evaluation of policy statements. It is important to understand its stages, to read the significance of issues rejected as well as those included. This will become clearer when I examine the development of the policy agenda.

The second aspect is the overt content of the policy statement. This must be expected to be contradictory or at least open to different interpretations. This is a likely consequence of the negotiation and compromise that goes into the process of production but is also may become an asset given the politics of legitimating a policy.

This approach to policy statements, if coupled with an interpretive role for the third aspect, implementation, warns of the dangers of claiming that a particular LEA has a particular 'position' on race and education. A 'position', if it unequivocally exists will not be 'held' in a position statement but will be articulated through the process of development, the perspective adopted and the strategy for implementation.

LEA's do however produce different statements and Berkshire's policy statement has been widely seen as taking up an overtly 'anti-racist' position. In "Education for Equality"(61) the policy position is described as "emphasising primarily equality" and it criticises two alternative positions which emphasise integration and diversity.

"Education for Equality" claims that,

"The fundamental debate is to do with three main values: integration, diversity and equality. Most people support all three of these values. however, diferent people understand them in different ways, and combine them together into different overall outlooks."(62)

The distinction between the three approaches serves to identify the position endorsed in the policy statement and to locate the policy with respect to the dominant, multicultural themes of national documents and reports(63). Through refusing to emphasise diversity, Berkshire's policy breaks with the dominant conceptualisation of aims, value and remedies. This, was the result of a change in position during the drafting of the statement. A move from diversity to equality in which the need to speak to black people, the insights and demands born in the zoning campaign, and the conscious perspectives of Advisory Committee members, especially the two consultants, came together to produce an 'anti-racist' postion.

The significance of the presentation of the three frameworks goes beyond the promotion or emphasis of the value of equality over integration or diversity. Different overall perspectives involve,

"...different definitions of the problems to be solved, different understandings of the nature and role of racism, different proposals and prescriptions about what should be done in practice."(64)

Berkshire's policy has been described not only as an anti-racist one but also as a "black policy". This is true because of the involvement of black people in bringing pressure to bear, both formal and informal, which led to the policy and also through black involvement in the process of production. According to one of the consultants involved in the policy,

"Over a period of six months the committee moved from a wishy-washy white liberal view of the problems to a far more radical position which honestly attempts to engage with black definitions".(65)

This was view was also put forward by the DoE:

"...it is essentially a black perception of the problem - it says that Britain is a racist society. We have given the black community representatives a voice and some people will find this threatening".(66)

However, this does not fully represent the process of development of the document. It must be remembered that,

"This document does represent a black view of reality but not totally, it reflects a negotiation, a set of interactions between black and white."(67)

Submissions sent to the DoE during consultation and transcripts of consultative meetings reveal that many teachers and other did find this threatening(68). From the earliest discussions(69) about issuing a policy statement it was clear that a large difference existed between what teachers would want said and what black people might want. This dichotomy was clearly shown in how the existing level and type of provision was evaluated. The chairman of the Education Committee claimed that 'Education For Equality'

"...totally ignores all the good things already happening in Berkshire"(70).

When outlining guidelines on specific topics, there is a concession that,

"The guidelines will of course draw on the many examples of good practice which have been developed in recent years in Berkshire, by schools, by individual teachers and by communities."(71)

However, the earlier unequivocal characterisation of Britain as a racist society confines any concession to existing good practice to the background to the policy, it is not a part of the document's analysis. Interviewees offered little evidence of good practice, pockets of activity were to be found but these were of the "steel band, sari and samosa" type(72). One interviewee(73) acknowledged the existence of 'multi-cultural' curriculum reform but she argued that this made no discernable difference to examination performance or employment prospects. The DoE also claimed that any good practice was isolated, only

in the primary sector and most importantly for him, had no framework for guidance(74).

The relegation of 'good practice' in the document represents a denial of a white professional view and also of the curricula emphasis of MCE. The shift from this to an emphasis on equality and justice was a key outcome of black involvement in the process of policy production and supports the contention that Berkshire has adopted a 'black policy'.

Key Concepts

The overall changes in the policy framework happened through the adoption of a particular "position" but was also secured through the development of certain key concepts. In 'Education for Equality' opposition to racism is to the fore:

"...racism is morally wrong and therefore contrary to basic principles of social justice...is against the long term interests of the majority, since it is bound to lead...to considerable social unrest. It damages and dehumanises white people as well as black.."(75)

It concludes that,

"...Britain is a racist society...racism in the wider society is reflected in, and re-inforced by, racism in schools and in the education system"(76).

The strength of Berkshire's anti-racist position, although supported by moral and other arguments, lays predominantly in the latter contention about schools and society.

An early draft of the discussion document(77) defines racism as a combination of discriminatory and negative beliefs whereas the document finally published refers to,

"...routine practices, customs and procedures...maintained by relations and structures of power and...justified by centuries-old beliefs and attitudes...Racism is a short-hand for this combination of discriminatory practices, unequal relations and structures of power and negative beliefs and attitudes".(78)

The first policy paper(79) endorses this definition but refers to "the distribution of power and influence" not to "structures and relations". It therefore weakens the structural emphasis of the consultative document.

Racism is further defined through a distinction from racialism:

"The latter refers to explicit negative beliefs, and to intentionally offensive or violent behaviour....The term racism is much wider ...Racism encompasses racialism, but refers to institutions and routine practices as well as to the actions of individuals, and to unconscious and unidentified effects as well as to deliberate purposes".(80)

This distinction is particularly important because it is evidently not understood by many respondents to the policy. The criticisms that teachers perceived the policy to be making of them(81) depended on misunderstanding racism as racialism. Many may be guilty of the first - often through failure to act against it - but few are guilty of the latter(82). Combatting racialism is a relatively straight-forward, technical, problem. Dismantling racism on the other hand requires complex and detailed institutional analysis.

This latter fact partly explains a shift at the implementation stage of the policy. A shift in emphasis from racism to racialism occurs not because racialism is pushed to the fore, it was always one issue among many, but because the institutional analysis(83) necessary for dismantling racism in education does not feature in the policy's prescriptions for action and change.

Two further concepts feature centrally in the policy: equality and justice. Both are important because they are used to give summary answers to questions about the goals of the policy. Racial equality is defined as follows:

"There will be racial equality in education...if and when Asian and Afro-Caribbean people are proportionately involved in teaching and administration at all levels, in

higher and further education, and in streams, sets, classes and schools leading to higher and further education."(84)

This amounts to equality of representation in certain key, high status sectors of education and is not the formal equality of access usually promoted via the notion of equality of opportunity. Responses to the policy papers reveal that neither this idea nor the distinction between positive action and positive discrimination is well understood(85).

Racial justice in education is defined as reached,

"...if and when the factors determining successful learning in schools do not discriminate, directly or indirectly, against ethnic minority children."(86)

The two concepts are linked because,

"Justice is the means by which equality is both achieved and maintained. Equality is not only the consequence of justice but also its basis and surest guarantee."(87)

These three concepts, and the relation between them, help to explain the meaning of Berkshire's policy. They, in the context of the analytic framework as a whole, specify an approach to racial disadvantage and discrimination and communicate aims and values. The emphasis on a structural concept of racism and the acceptance of 'black definitions and experiences' places the policy in a critical tradition that attempts to escape the limitations of approaches based on integration and cultural diversity. But it would be wrong to conclude from this that Berkshire's position is fixed and that particular priorities and measures for action will now follow. This can be illustrated, in the first instance, by examining the struggle and debate that has surrounded key terms used in the discussion documents and policy statement.

Terminology

The distinction between frameworks is vital in putting forward a preferred approach and hence a preferred set of practices. Certain concepts were emphasised and each gains significance through the role it plays within the particular

approach or analysis. Terms also, as signifiers of concepts and hence as cyphers for approaches or values, play a central role and are objects of struggle and negotiation.

During the development of the policy there were certain key debates over terms and phrases. These debates covered issues of correctness, emphasis, euphemism, significance and representation. In most cases each of these facets of terminological dispute were in evidence. Three examples will serve to illustrate this.

First, the title of the policy developed from one referring to "multicultural education", through one referring to "anti-racist education", to "Education for Racial Equality". The first shift represented the general move in framework and emphasis. The second sought to adopt a more positive orientation: "for" rather than "anti".

Secondly, the most important terminological choice was between "black" and "ethnic minority". Officer papers(88) written in 1981, before the Advisory Committee(89) met, use the latter but the Advisory Committee soon changed to the former. They use "black" to refer to both Afro-Caribbean and Asian people because it,

"...emphasises the common experience which both Afro-Caribbean and Asian people have of being victims of racism, and their common determination to oppose racism."(90)

Thirdly, the phrase "language of minority communities" was changed by the advisory committee to what it actually meant: "Asian languages". Issues of accuracy come to light as does the political significance of "black" - it makes connections and highlights common experiences

In the light of this, it is highly significant that the only major change the Education Committee made to the Advisory Committee's report was to replace "black" with "ethnic minority". This was the price for obtaining consent to agreeing the statement from all parties within the 'hung' council. Without this the statement may not have been agreed at all. One of the consultants on the policy referred to this as a

change in the "conceptual language of the policy statement"(91). However, he added that,

"...the definition of "ethnic minority" is about the best you can get under the circumstances".(92)

This shows how the battle over terms is a complex one. The definition referred to includes references to power structures and the common experience of racism. It thereby uses concepts derived from an 'anti-racist' approach to define a term central to a 'multicultural' one. Such contradiction and tension shows that the meanings of the central terms are fluid and will 'finally' depend on how the policy is implemented.

The debate over terms focuses another important debate within and around the policy: whether to emphasise black-white relations or to emphasise the position of all ethnic minority groups. In Berkshire's policy the relation between black and white is presented as having analytic priority over other relations of subordination and domination between racial, cultural or ethnic groups. It is also prioritised in practical terms, it is a focus for action, and therefore a political priority. The issue to be decided is whether this prioritisation constitutes a theoretical or practical flaw in either the presentation or stance of the policy.

Most of the criticisms(93) of this approach concentrated on four issues: class and gender; other types of racism; ethnicity; positive action and equal opportunities. These issues raise, albeit obliquely, questions central to the specificity of black oppression and show the importance of the clarification attempted in chapters two and three. Each objection is represented as taking issue with the black-white emphasis. However, each actually contradicts central elements of the policy's explicit position on the nature of black oppression and of the wider analysis of the racial structure of the social formation on which that position draws.

Class and gender issues appear mostly in lists of alternative bases for discrimination, in claims that Berkshire's position could apply equally to all of them(94). It

is clear that women and girls, working class adults and children, the unemployed and the handicapped are discriminated against but does that invalidate the policy's position or analysis? Berkshire's position would surely be strengthened by being developed to show the relation of racial oppression and exploitation to that based on class and gender. In fact, the limitations of the policy with respect to structural aspects of educational racism could then be explored and removed(95). But that would have to be done, as I have shown, through an exploration of the specificity of black oppression which necessarily involves an understanding of the relationship between race and class. The use of unstructured lists of discriminations leads only to a pluralist equivalence between different types of discrimination and would serve to undermine the potential effectiveness of the policy in opposing racism.

The second and third issues, of non-colour based racism and of ethnicity, do point to limitations of the policy but misunderstand its location, its audience, and its function. One critic argued that,

"The failure to acknowledge the existence of anti-semitism as a form of racism is both ignorant and offensive"(96)

This is a powerful claim, as would be that of anti-Irish discrimination, for inclusion in Berkshire's definition of racism. Both are far more than ethnocentric or stereotyping attitudes, both are structural and have distinctive historical relations with Britain or Western Europe. However, the specific qualities of the 'Berkshire situation' must be recognised. "Education for Equality" was not an abstract exercise nor an attempt to 'operationalise' a 'complete' concept of racism. It is the result of largely black pressure and it does not claim to exhaust the forms of racism. The focus is black-white relations because it had to speak to black people and their experiences and perceptions and it had to address itself to white people, especially white professional educationalists.

The major problem with the emphasis on black-white relations is not so much its adequacy as a basis for the

analysis of racism but its re-inforcement of an exclusively 'racial' focus. Troyna and Williams go so far as to argue that Berkshire was unable to accommodate a class element in its analysis because of the 'crude black-white distinction'(97). It certainly assists in that but I would argue that it is symptomatic of a particular approach to racial specificity which is also articulated through the issues that are focused on and prioritised.

The issue of ethnicity had largely been pre-empted by the consultative document's use of "black" over "ethnic minority" but despite the policy paper's use of a positive definition of that latter term, the change in terminology opened up the policy to pressure for a change of focus. It was argued that too narrow a definition of "ethnic minority" is employed(98) and that it should be "widened" but this would contradict many other aspects of the policy and would therefore weaken, not strengthen it. It would cease to speak to black people and thereby lose its main role and justification.

These arguments for maintaining the emphasis of the policy on black-white relations suggest what might be termed a "situational definition of institutional racism". It points to the need for a model of institutional racism which will allow that not all levels or instances of racism will be present in all LEA's or in all schools(99).

The particular form of any given instance of racism will tend to prioritise certain racial or ethnic groups over others. The focus will tend, because of the racial structure of the social formation as a whole and because of groups' specific histories, to be on Asian and Afro-Caribbean groups. This is not however inevitably the case in all situations. Predominantly white areas, those with significant South European, Irish or Jewish populations will feature a variety of forms of educationally specific institutionalised racism and hence will require different strategies and foci.

Lastly, the policy's commitment to positive action(100) has provoked both misunderstanding and opposition. This has

depended on a combination of equating positive action with positive discrimination and questions about how this affects the idea of equal opportunities.

Positive action is linked to pursuing actual equality, i.e. equality of outcome and therefore contains an implicit critique of 'equal opportunities'. Many people argued that equal opportunities existed in Berkshire but how is this to be reconciled with a strong black belief to the contrary and with the low representation of black pupils in high status schools, streams and sets?

Berkshire's emphasis on justice clearly shows that equality of opportunities is not enough. This is true also in the definition of racial equality which calls heavily on the general 'position' of the policy. To accept the idea of equal opportunities would be to ignore the barriers to equality. Not to advocate positive action to overcome such barriers would be to undermine the policy as a whole.

Structure and Culture.

Each conceptual or terminological issue points to the importance of the structural emphasis contained in the policy position. In the development of the policy the tension between structural and cultural considerations, between an institutional focus and a curricula one has been a major dynamic. The aim of equality articulated through the opposition to racism, shifts the focus onto schools as institutions. It emphasise school structure and provides a framework within which curricula and school processes and practices can be criticised. But some crucial school processes and functions are missed because the policy fails to consider the specificity of racism in education and to locate schooling within the structural and cultural racism of the social formation as a whole. It fails to link its analysis of structure to the processes of schooling.

Schools effectively allocate and select children for their roles, employment (if fortunate) and statuses as adults. When this function is performed within a racist social formation it

functions in an effectively racist way. The racial composition of Berkshire means that allocation and selection are essential agenda items for any policy aiming to combat racism in education. Neither features in the policy, consequently the processes of institutionalised racism which exist in the relations between schools are not scrutinised or affected. At best, the processes and relations within individual institutions will be recognised and remedied(101).

The absence of issues of allocation and selection indicate that while the racial specificity of the policy is a strength with respect to its presentation and acceptability to both the black population and to the council, it is a weakness with respect to central structures of racial discrimination in education. To raise and pursue these issues would also involve confronting processes and structures through which class privilege is maintained. This indicates that at the level of the policy's "analysis", the failure to make any link between race and class leads to major limitations on the range of issues which can be acted on and hence on the potential effectiveness of the policy. In theoretical terms, the policy lacks precisely the analysis of the specificity of racial oppression and exploitation that I sought to develop in chapters two and three.

The presentation of the three frameworks, one of which is endorsed and two others rejected, is designed to give guidance to practice. How the role for a policy statement outlined earlier is fulfilled should depend upon the framework and analysis endorsed. In principle, the framework will define key concepts and terms, specify certain meanings for those concepts and terms and proscribe other common-sense understandings. This complements the function of the statement with respect to change and innovation. Some practices and approaches, aims and understandings will be endorsed and promoted, others de-legitimated and discouraged. Knowledge and information about frameworks and approaches therefore becomes crucial to practitioners, politicians, parents

and governors because the fulfillment of this role depends on the level of awareness of the tri-partite distinction and of its significance for practice. Lack of such knowledge will cause problems for policy implementation.

The importance of disseminating the policy is not limited to a question of informing teachers and others and leading them to implement the policy. It appears to be the *raison d'être* for specifying a framework in the first place. But this does not seem to have been a consideration. The framework adopted is analytically superior to the two rejected. Also, it has the politically important quality of connecting with and endorsing 'black definitions and experiences'. But its success in these respects leads it to be presented at a level of generality that makes its implications for practice, and its meaning for practitioners, obscure and uncertain. What the policy will mean in practice still remains to be specified and it will depend not upon the framework and analysis but on the particular issues raised and the projects and measures adopted to resolve them.

A structural analysis of racism, and hence a structural concept of race, is central to the policy's framework. It is also maintained that schools re-inforce this structural racism. But the level of generality at which this is argued is not only a practical problem for implementation. If racism in education is adequately to be theorised then it is crucial to identify the specific form that racism takes in education. What are the processes, practices and structures through which racism is reproduced in education? Failure to pose this question leaves the analysis and the framework for action, only partially articulated. It allows a re-articulation through the projects and issues prioritised which does not necessarily reflect the major concerns implied by the framework.

The issues that feature on the policy agenda are important channels through which the policy is articulated. Silences and omissions affect that articulation both through specifying the limits of the policy and through the development of a system

of priorities. How this articulation takes place, what its significance is and what it says about how we should read policies will be considered in the following section.

The Role of Agenda Development in Policy Articulation.

From 1979 to 1983 a list of areas of concern and topics for action developed as the policy as a whole developed. Which areas these were, who raised them as issues, how they were approached and the action finally taken all contribute to an understanding of the policy in practice. They also offer the key to the likely impact of the policy.

These issues can be viewed as potential agenda items which compete both for inclusion and priority. As a category, "agenda item" does not refer to a homogeneous group of topics or issues. For example, the first agenda item was that of the policy statement itself, an item that underpins all of the others. Consultation and resourcing are issues themselves but they also touch on most demands and proposals for special projects or measures. An issue like "curriculum reform" also includes others such as "Asian languages in the curriculum" but can be viewed as an item itself. Agenda items may have different levels of generality or specificity and may be included in, or dependent on others.

However, competition between agendas was a central component of how different general positions were articulated and how they fought for legitimation. That competition took place not between complete and opposed programmes nor for a limited number of "slots". Any item from competing agendas could in principle be included or excluded. They are competing for priority, for legitimation and for resources.

Developing Agenda. Developing Framework.

The development of a policy agenda can be traced from the same origins as the demand for a policy statement: CRC's and WIPA between summer 1979 and spring 1981. In total, at least

thirty-four different issues feature in official papers and documents between April 1981 and January 1983, but only seventeen can be traced through to implementation and a majority of these originate in early 'community' proposals. This would seem to support the contention that the Berkshire policy has a "black perspective".

If one examines the relationship between the developing policy position and the agenda of issues a more complex picture emerges. Early agendas, those that pre-date the Advisory Committee, seem to be broadly of two types: one type, emanating from "community" sources was mainly a list of demands and priorities without a well articulated framework; the second type, in official LEA papers, presented topics and issues within a reasonably explicit multicultural framework. From this it appears that a relatively stable, continuous agenda begins without an overall framework or within a multicultural one but ends up accompanying an 'anti-racist' one. This must raise doubts about whether the policy agenda is the practical consequence, manifestation or concretisation of an anti-racist, structural analysis.

It has to be decided how this continuity bears on the eventual framework. If one were to argue that a framework delineates or implies, a particular set of issues for action then the cited continuity might appear to undermine the policy's general stance. However, it is clear that many topics are issues whatever the framework adopted. The framework may affect an agenda not so much through the items included but through the action taken on a given issue. One may discover more about what a policy means through specific approaches or interpretations of issues. Further, silences and absences from the agenda may say more about the policy than the issues included.

Silences and Omissions.

I have referred to the absence of allocation and selection from the official agenda. These issues were, and are, of major

importance to black groups. Similarly, the availability of single-sex schooling for girls was on many community agendas but appears nowhere in official documents. Pre-school and nursery provision were also raised in many submissions and although they appear in the consultative document, the policy papers do not prescribe any action.

The above issues are important not only as issues per se but for two further reasons. First, they may be viewed as central components of "black agendas". They lead one to ask to what extent a black agenda or agendas existed and if they existed how successful they were in becoming part of the official agenda. Secondly, all of these omissions bear witness to the problems encountered when the remedial change required has large structural or financial implications. They show that when the necessary action strays beyond reformatory or compensatory measures then other principles - selection, elitism, financial stringency - dominate the principle of equality.

Further issues occur in many submissions and in official drafts and documents but fail to reach the implementation stage. These include representation on boards and committees and suspensions and exclusions. The reason for their exclusion is harder to discern but the difficulty in changing these may be a factor. Each is located within institutional practices. The first is embedded in the system of political nominations and LEA processes of appointment; the second in school processes of designation and punishment. To change either would involve a type of institutional analysis that is lacking from this policy but is clearly demanded if one is to locate these processes within any model of institutional racism.

Overall, issues which have not become agenda items follow the pattern that Troyna and Williams have identified(102). Items are excluded which have great significance for racial equality even though they are neither racially specific nor do they work through race. Hence, action in these areas would have significant implications for other types of inequality and for

the organisation of the system and provision of schooling. Their omission provides the connection between the exclusively racial focus of the policy's analysis and the emphasis on 'black needs' enshrined in the projects and measures that make up the implementation strategy.

The Prioritisation, Relations and Content of Agenda Items

The inclusion or exclusion of agenda items contributes to determining the meaning of a policy and consequently points to how it should be read. Further processes can be identified which depend upon three related properties of items included: prioritisation, relations to other agenda items and the internal form and content of such an item. A brief example will illustrate this.

"Ethnic monitoring" was seen as an essential issue in early officer papers but as a result of the intervention of black members of the Advisory Committee, it was dropped as an agenda item. They argued that the collection of information on academic performance and progress of black pupils was both unnecessary and diversionary. They claimed that such exercises had frequently been a substitute for action or an attempt to prove that things were not as bad as some people made out(103). This position relates both to the effects of prioritising the issue and a relation with other agenda items through which it may undermine or dominate them.

The importance of the 'internal form' was later shown when WIPA were calling for the (re-)introduction of complete record keeping in schools and for a joint school-community study of the more subtle features affecting West Indian childrens' attitudes to learning(104).

This shows that the opposition to the collection of information is not opposed to it as such but depends on the context and motivation. Research can have a place if not carried out in an 'anthropological' way. The issue over "ethnic monitoring" is not as it may appear an argument over which facts to collect or an opposition between fact and opinion.

Critics of "Education for Equality" castigated it for its "baseless assertions and opinions presented as facts"(105). However, that document, to the extent that it represents a black perspective, takes black experience seriously and validates it as a source of social facts. The issue then is about whose experience counts and who controls the definition of the problem.

If statistics about black achievement are collected by the LEA then it is pre-dominantly in the hands of white researchers and policy makers who consistently fail to acknowledge black perceptions as valid or sufficient basis for action. It is a matter of power and control, of who defines, locates or identifies the 'problem' and its extent, of who draws up the agenda.

The agenda of issues that accompany the policy statement and framework interpret and re-articulate it and indicate that a process of negotiation and change is taking place. These processes will be also be evident as the policy moves on to specific projects and measures. It becomes clear that there is no logical or necessary relation between these three stages or aspects of the policy. A connection exists but it is more one of opening up or closing off possibilities.

The agenda outlines priorities and promotes specific projects and measures to a greater extent than the framework, there is a more immediate connection with action and change. This suggests two general conclusions about the way in which LEA policies and approaches have been analysed in the past. First, the emphasis of critics on the general approach, analysis or values of a 'multicultural' framework helps, through a 'symptomatic reading', to identify the basis of limitations and lacunae in practice. However, adopting an 'anti-racist' approach which remedies the deficiencies of a multicultural one does not necessarily lead to anti-racist practice. Secondly, a concern to develop an adequate framework, concepts and terms is important but it can become a purely academic exercise if the agenda is not given equal weight and consideration.

Agendas highlight topics for action but the prioritisation of different items, their meaning in practice and their relation to other items is not fully articulated until the measures that are to be taken are outlined in terms of action and change. This will be demonstrated through examining the strategy and structure of implementation.

Implementation: Policy Interpretation and Definition

It may appear that the final stage of a policy, implementation, is a largely "passive" phase in which an already formulated policy is put into practice. For example, this assumption underlays Menter's criticisms of Avon for failing to respond to certain 'racist' incidents. He assumes that this is a deviation from the meaning of the policy, a corruption and undermining of it(106).

In opposition to this, my analysis of the process of policy production and articulation indicates that a policy is more fluid, the product and object of continued negotiations. As a corollary, implementation should also be seen as an active phase in which the meaning of the policy is further defined. It is clearly the stage at which action is taken to support and motivate initiatives that further the aims of the policy but it also represents a (re-)articulation of the policy through practice. Consequently, one has to examine the relationship of commitments and concerns to trends and directions in practice in order to understand what the policy comes to mean.

My concern in looking at the implementation of the policy is not to arrive at an assessment of whether the policy is working or not but to answer the question, can it work? I have, through my analysis of previous stages of the policy, presented an interpretation of the policy. It is necessary now to see whether the interpretation of the policy implicit in the structure of implementation is consistent with that earlier interpretation. I will argue that, in general, the projects, measures and new appointments that have been proposed do not

seem to follow from the previous stages of the policy. They seem to be the part of the policy that has been given the least thought and consideration.

The 'strategy' for implementation appears to have two main parts. First, support and assistance to schools in implementing the policy and second, the monitoring, overseeing and development of the policy at an LEA level. Support is organised through four types of new appointment: for curriculum and language, for 'community education', a Team for Racial Equality in Education (TREE) based at Bulmershe College, Reading and an Assistant Education Officer. Overall responsibility for the second lays with an Advisory Panel drawn from community, professional, and political sources but it is assisted by three working parties.

Supporting Implementation in Schools.

The third of Berkshire's policy papers on Education for Racial Equality is entitled "Support"(107) and it outlines 16 projects recommended by the Advisory Committee to the County Council. These projects are tied into the six aims and sub-sections of the formal policy statement(108). The way in which the aims are related to the 16 projects reveals certain dominant patterns of interpretation. This interpretation is carried out through two process: through the emphasis and meaning given to particular issues or agenda items; through specific appointments and their location within the structure of the LEA and of the system of provision.

Two emphases appear to dominate the first process: the curriculum and language provision. In the projects designed to meet aims 1 and 2, the emphasis on the curriculum is overwhelming. This is to be expected in so far as the 'promotion of understanding of racial equality and justice' applies to schools but that aim should also apply to the LEA's own employees, particularly senior officers and advisers. If they do not understand and fully endorse the authority's policy

then the scope and rate of development of school practice will be seriously limited.

The second aim seeks to 'identify and remove all practices, procedures and customs which discriminate against ethnic minority people'. Through its interpretation in projects 6 to 9 that aim is significantly undermined because those projects refer only to curriculum development. Also, this is interpreted in the narrow sense of the overt and intentional content of the "curriculum"(109) and is seen primarily to involve issues of language provision. This represents a major shift from the policy's overall emphasis on structure rather than culture. Practices, procedures and customs do involve knowledge and belief and therefore the 'curricula content of schools' but as I have argued, the established, routine and unconscious workings and organisation of the school and the LEA form the basis of racial inequality and discrimination. Where are the projects designed to identify, analyse and remove these aspects of institutional racism?

The emphasis on language provision is problematic for the policy for a number of reasons. First, as I have argued in chapter four, throughout the short history of racialised forms in Britain, LEA's and teachers have emphasised the language needs of black people both as a major area for provision and as a major determinant of disadvantage. That emphasis was a definitive characteristic of both the integrationist and cultural diversity models rejected by Berkshire in favour of one based on equality. Their re-emergence as dominant concerns, casts doubt on the authenticity of Berkshire's stated perspective. Language is certainly an issue but why has it achieved such priority in the implementation of the policy?

In the debate over language provision questions of structure, organisation and control, of resourcing and consultation have been raised. Many elements have been present in the debate: support for the community's voluntary language provision, supporting bi-lingualism, mother-tongue teaching, Afro-Caribbean dialects, Asian languages in the curriculum and

language support and E2L services. However, the major controversy, the system of language provision, appears to turn on four issues: the stigma associated by many(110) with the "segregation" of Asian children into language centres; the appropriateness of the staffing of those centres(111);, the effectiveness of the provision; control and accountability.

Given these issues the factors determining which appointments were made and their location in the LEA's system of provision are surprisingly ill-considered and pragmatic. The adviser for MCE claimed that a number of concerns were operative in deciding on some of the posts and where they were to be located(112). He cited as influential factors, a general perception that the provisions for Asian languages were required by the Asian community, his own insistence on supporting bi-lingualism and the stress one of the consultants placed on the need to include Afro-Caribbean dialects(113). In short, projects were proposed because they were in the minds of the members of the Advisory Committee at the time. There is no evidence that they were included to implement the specific policy adopted by Berkshire nor to achieve the stated aims. The aims had not been followed through nor given any operational meaning in order to provide a framework for targeting priorities and proposing appointments and projects.

Once these posts and projects had been evolved, deciding where they should be located seems to have been done on largely pragmatic grounds. This may be a sound basis for deciding but it appears to have dominated other important questions of how different institutional and organisational locations affect the form that implementation takes.

Projects 3, 7 and 8 are all located within the language support service which has also been enlarged, via project six, to cover the curriculum. This location was represented by the adviser for MCE(114) as being both the most appropriate and potentially productive location. He identifies the Reading language service as one of few 'radical voices'. They had long lobbied for a resource officer and therefore would best utilise

that officer. Further, the enhancement of that service served to legitimise the wider activities and questioning the language service was already engaged in.

These minor structural changes and decisions about structural locations appear then to be closely linked to concerns of legitimation and acceptance, to supporting and developing good practice. However, in terms of the structure of the LEA's provision generally, the potential and legitimacy of any curriculum innovation initiated from these sources will be closely tied to the structural location of the language service, its range of influence and legitimate activity. The projects and appointments tie in closely to existing structures and hence to power relationships within the structure whereas one of the aims of policy should be to transform those structures.

Community Education Officers.

The second aspect of "Support", the appointment of two Community Education Officers (CEO's), falls outside the existing structure of the LEA. The form that re-interpretation and re-definition of the policy takes through these posts will therefore be different. In the first instance one CEO has been appointed to work with Afro-Caribbean communities and is based in Reading, the other works with Asian communities and is based in Slough. The issues and dichotomies raised by these posts are illuminated by the different emphases and priorities that the two appointees have.

The Asian CEO stressed the issue of diversity(115). He sees as a direct corollary of the policy, that diversity must be appreciated, distinctions should be objects of pride. He claimed that,

"These fundamentals...will form the basis for combatting racism, discrimination, general stereotypes and negativeness of one group over another".(116)

He therefore sees the main function of the CEO as being,

"...to provide opportunities to communities and individuals of general awareness of their co-existence under a diverse situation in this multicultural society".(117)

A CEO must be aware of,

"...sensitive issues which exist amongst various groups of people and thus avoid getting drawn into taking sides".(118)

Both CEO's see it as an essential part of their job to channel information and to facilitate contact between schools, the LEA and black communities. The lack of such an interchange has been identified as a major problem in the past. Through this role the CEO's will necessarily act as advisers to schools, the LEA and to black communities but this makes it difficult to say who the CEO's represent.

Both CEO's are concerned to increase the influence of black communities but different mechanisms are envisaged for this. For the Afro-Caribbean CEO the make-up of the black community is not really an issue because she puts her emphasis on her role in supporting black pressure on the LEA. She envisages an active role for black groups in putting pressure, asking questions, being critical and monitoring the effectiveness of the policy. Her role is to facilitate this pressure through information. Doing this effectively will depend on how she deals with particular grievances or incidents.

This can be approached in two ways: cope with and solve particular cases as and when they arise; promote, develop and organise pressure around issues. Here I found a significant difference of approach between the two CEO's.

The Afro-Caribbean CEO advocated taking on the underlying issue when presented with a particular case. This is to be done through raising that issue with community groups and seeking backing from those groups. The other CEO emphasised the role of the expert in dealing with individual cases concerning education. Both stress the importance of black people being fully involved in the decision making processes of education but the Asian CEO put it this way:

"Through expert advice and consultation members of the Asian community suitable in taking offices of responsibility will be motivated towards taking part in various administrative positions."(119)

This begs the question of who is suitable and of who decides. It also raises the problem of who benefits from the LEA's policy and of the role of black professionals within it. A major danger is the LEA using its own employees as community spokesmen and women(120). Two concerns seem to come together here, the ability of such employees to represent black communities and scepticism about the true interests of those who are appointed. The proposed appointments were referred to as an industry benefitting a chosen few(121). Another respondent referred to the,

"Anxiety about the creation of section 11 posts and having more black teachers who would exploit black pupils and families. It could increase the stranglehold on black people...Black workers could be used by the Establishment to destroy black religion, culture, tradition, and identity... There is no real intention to provide equality."(122)

As more black people are employed by the council or are in other ways identified as having professional status, differences with respect to Britain become apparent. These can be different kinds of involvement in Western British society, different levels of accommodation through language, life style, aspirations, type and source of education and allegiances within British politics. In short, it could be argued, differing degrees of accommodation with racism.

The adviser for MCE argued that the more western orientated Asians had benefitted most from the policies and practices of the LEA:

"Anything we do is likely to be to their advantage, we can and do listen to them more than anyone else, they are likely to get jobs, their organisations are likely to receive grants. Grants sponsor and affirm. The LEA has been clumsy and insensitive, slow to understand complexity."(123)

The Asian CEO's emphasis on expert advice implies a limit for the legitimate involvement of the majority of members of black communities and suggests that black professionals can best represent their needs. A different view was offered by the Afro-Caribbean CEO. She viewed her professionalism as an asset to be utilised in furthering the aims and role outlined above. She aims to use it as an advantage in supporting good education and in opposing defensive attitudes and practices.

The approaches of the CEO's represent two different interpretations of both what needs to be done and of how to go about it. They involve different approaches to being paid by the LEA but trying to work for "the community". Which is adopted will affect whether the black professionals appointed are co-opted and largely neutralised, or maintain a contradictory autonomy, are accountable to black communities and work through this to change the LEA on a more fundamental level. Through their approach to their role they are interpreting and re-defining the policy.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Development.

Projects 15 and 16 outlined in the "Support" policy paper, setting up an Advisory Panel on Education for Racial Equality and the appointment of an Assistant Education Officer(AEO) to provide administrative support, are the main changes in the structure of the Education Department itself. They, with the 'TREE' team and a working party set up to look at this specific subject, have the task of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the policy.

The appointment of the AEO shows an understanding of strategic development and the necessity of structural change in the LEA. The AEO gives credibility to the policy by having it represented in the departmental hierarchy. The DoE's stated intention(124) to move the AEO to another area of responsibility within the department in order to 'mainstream' the policy also shows an understanding of the dangers of marginalisation. The AEO's responsibility with respect to the

other officers, raising awareness and advising on in-service, further suggests a concern with affecting all aspects of the work of the department. How that can be done and the difficulties and implications are not specified but it is an important first step to realise such measures to be necessary.

The establishment of the 'TREE' team shows few signs of strategic planning. Their responsibilities, for monitoring, in-service and youth and community work, are important areas for action, but their relation to the policy is largely accidental. They are concerned with issues that to a large extent support the other appointments but they were appointed nine months before the others. Their role, in monitoring and in-service especially, are central to the policy but the posts evolved out of pressure from Bulmershe College rather than through the demands of the policy.

The working parties set up under projects 1, 12 and 14 in the policy paper on "support" identify important areas for further work. They acknowledge the necessity of developing the policy. One, on appointments and promotion identifies an issue which will clearly need careful consideration in order to maximise the possibility of effecting some change. The other two, however, would appear to be mis-timed.

The question of monitoring and evaluation will become an issue as the policy develops but without a clear strategy or as Troyna and Ball(125) put it, a coherent set of principles and recommendations for action, what will be monitored? What counts as good practice? But to compound the problems, what is meant by 'monitoring'? Should it be an integral part of implementation, with teachers and others monitoring their own practice as well as using more 'objective' measures of change? Answers to these questions are not currently evident.

The third working party topic is probably the most important of the three. In-service is likely to be the key to the successful introduction of practice consistent with the policy but there are problems here too. How is in-service work supposed to sponsor change? Early in-service meetings were

mainly concerned with informing teachers, especially head-teachers, of the content, values and aims of the policy and policy statement. It was also hoped that teachers would inform each other of the developments taking place in their schools and help in the development of guidelines on how to implement the policy in schools.

It appears that the success of in-service is likely to depend upon certain problematic aspects of the policy in general. The generality of the analysis, its lack of exploration of educationally specific features of racism, makes the development of guidelines from school practices difficult and unlikely. The lack of guidance, the absence of a relation to teacher's experiences and understandings of school processes and practices means that the policy analysis appears not as a framework for practice but as an abstract exercise.

Overall the pattern of implementation reveals a range of interpretations of the earlier stages of the policy. No single direction is evident but with the exception of the 'activist' approach to the CEO's role, the 'strategy' for implementation compounds the problems of the policy analysis and agenda.

The foci of the new appointments, special projects and measures seem to confirm Troyna and Williams' conclusion that even within an 'anti-racist' framework, the orientation is towards meeting the 'special needs' of black students(126). As Troyna and Williams argue, this orientation undermines the LEA's stated intention to involve all teachers and students in the institutionalisation of anti-racism(127).

If one considers the question, "can the policy work?" in relation to the six aims of the policy statement, then one must conclude that it is unlikely that those aims will be fulfilled. That conclusion depends on the limitations of the analytic framework and hence the meaning it gives to the aims, on the interpretations and omissions in the policy agenda and on the general orientation of the implementation strategy. In other words, the problems are cumulative, compounded by successive stages of the articulation and development of the policy.

Conclusion: Reading Policies.

This chapter has been concerned with posing and answering three types of questions. First, I have asked why a policy was produced; secondly, what its significance is; thirdly, its likely effects. Those questions raise problems inherent in recent attempts to assess the significance of LEA policies on race and education(128).

The first section demonstrated the complexity of the motives, pressures and contexts which led to a policy being produced. It showed that policy production is a process of negotiation and the position statement an outward sign of the stage and state of that negotiation. Different groups, organisations and individuals will have different motives and interests but none is totally dominant and therefore no single motive or cause can be identified.

The outline of the factors which led to the formation of policy, and the contexts within which that took place, included national events like the Bristol riots of 1980 and concern to minimise disaffection and conflict. Local events and pressures also contributed to a concern with legitimation but that did not lead to a policy of containment and dissipation of radical criticisms. Those criticisms and other anti-racist voices were instrumental in producing a policy which in its analysis or framework at least, was critical, radical and anti-racist.

"Radical" critics of MCE and LEA policy making have warned that black, and white anti-racist, criticisms of educational provision can be controlled, dissipated or co-opted through such policies(129). That is always a danger but my analysis of policy production shows that control etc. is not unequivocally either the function or intention of LEA policy initiatives.

The problems with Berkshire's policy do not derive from the motives or intentions of individuals or groups instrumental in the development or adoption of the policy. Limitations in the policy stem from two problems in the theoretical framework: an inability to link a structural concept of race

and racism to a concept of class; and the level of abstraction and generality at which the analysis is carried out i.e. its failure to detail the relation between racial structures and educational processes. Together, this leads to a lack of structural change in the LEA, in schools and in the system of provision because it leaves unexamined the class structures and relations through which racial inequality in education is perpetuated. These absences point to two components necessary for an adequate analytic framework: an emphasis on the relationships between race and class inequalities; an emphasis on the relationships between educational and racial contexts.

Questions about the significance of policy statements ask about how one should judge and react to those statements. At one level, the significance of Berkshire's policy is that its statement has an overtly "anti-racist" stance and therefore supports and endorses black definitions and perceptions of race and education, i.e. it refuses official and dominant views of the social, racial and educational structure. However, this involves a definitive characterisation of Berkshire's position which I have shown to be problematic both in principle and in practice. The tensions and contradictions between the different stages of the policy and between overt "position", agenda, concepts and terms all contribute to the complex constitution of what might be identified as the policy's 'position'.

The third type of question about effects is the hardest to answer. I have argued that one cannot decide, at this stage, whether the policy is working but one can ask whether it can work. The analysis of the structure of implementation and the issues it raised has shown that there are serious problems. Some derive from the limitations of the analysis of structural racism within education that is found in the policy. Others depend upon the re-interpretation of that approach through an agenda of issues and a strategy for implementation. Successive stages compound the problems of the approach to racial specificity, cumulatively they undermine the chances of changing the structures and processes through which education

contributes to racial inequality. The limitations of the original structural analysis of racism leads to implementation which is racially specific but not structural. From this one is forced to conclude that the areas in which it is likely to facilitate or foster change are limited.

I have emphasised the importance of viewing the stages of policy production, adoption and implementation as developing, re-defining and re-articulating the policy. That is most evident in the relationship between the "position" found in each stage. Those relationships are political - negotiation, conflict and struggle - as well as logical - consistency and implication. Consequently, what happens at a given stage is not determined by what has taken place before. The outcomes of particular struggles open up or close debate, limit or extend the agenda, allow or de-legitimise particular issues and set up a system of priorities. All of these will affect what happens in subsequent stages but they do not allow us simply to "read off" what will take place.

Viewing the policy in this way shows that the three stages referred to, production, statement and implementation, should not be seen as totally discrete. Each stage may operate in affecting or effecting another. For example, both production and adoption of the statement directly affect and have a role in implementation, implementation continues the stage of stating the policy's position by interpreting and redefining it.

It has been my intention through this chapter to answer by example the question of how one should read LEA policies on race and education. Reading and evaluating policies should, if the complexity of those policies is to be understood, identify and relate each of the processes through which the policy derives its meaning. Those are the motives, contexts and processes of policy production; the adoption of a particular policy position and rationale; the development of an agenda of issues and priorities for action; the releasing of resources, promoting and legitimating practices and fostering institutional change.

Chapter Five. Notes and References.

- 1) Troyna and Ball (1985), Troyna and Williams (1986).
- 2) Brent Education Committee(1983).
- 3) ILEA (1983c).
- 4) See Willey (1984) p.77 for an account of this policy.
- 5) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).
- 6) A number of different types of source are drawn on in this chapter. Where published documents and papers have been used, they have been included in the bibliography. Other documents which are not published works but are public and attributable are cited in full in the notes to this chapter. Private documents, personal records and notes have also been extremely important sources and where possible full details are given in the notes. But in cases where I have been given privileged access to correspondence and other documents where confidentiality has to be maintained, I have indicated the type of source, e.g. 'governing body' or 'primary school headteacher'. One other source has been crucial and that is interviews with a range of key figures in the production of Berkshire's policy. In this case, interview dates are given, and the status or role of the interviewee is indicated.
- 7) The document which generated this attention was Advisory Committee For Multicultural Education (1982). For press coverage, see "Berkshire plans tactics in war on racism" in the T.E.S. 25th. June 1982, Berkshire Evening Post 29th June 1982 and Slough Observer 9th July 1982.
- 8) See for example Hatcher and Shallice (1983), Hatcher (1985) and Flew (1984).
- 9) ILEA (1983c).
- 10) See for example Hatcher and Shallice (1983).
- 11) See chapter four.
- 12) See chapter four.
- 13) See for example Hatcher (1985).
- 14) For further demographic detail about Reading see del Tufo, Randle and Ryan (1982), pp.85-86.
- 15) The 1981 census revealed that, based on place of birth of the head of household, 6% of Berkshire's population were from the New Commonwealth or Pakistan but for Slough this figure was 21%, for Reading 8%, Maidenhead 6% and for other towns and rural areas, at most 2%. Also of great significance for education was the percentage of people in these households between 0 and 15 years, 34% as opposed to a county average of 24%.
- 16) Contained in Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).
- 17) The issue of consultation was a major one through out the period when the policy was formulated and after. It involved what structure to set up, who to consult, how to get manageable but representative committees and a number of other issues. The two consultants were vital in attempting to achieve a workable consultation structure that allowed all interests to be expressed but it is clear that 'consultation' as a process leaves many questions of

- legitimation, consensus and engagement with dissenting views unresolved. For further general discussion of these issues see Troyna and Williams (1986) pp.76-77.
- 18) The two consultants were Chris Mullard from the University of London Institute of Education and Tuku Mukherjee from Roehampton College, both of whom are academics in the field of anti-racist education. They brought that specific perspective to their work in drafting the policy.
 - 19) Berkshire LEA Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education (1982).
 - 20) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a, b & c).
 - 21) See Mullard et al (1983) p.17 for an elaboration of this distinction.
 - 22) For details of the proposals see del Tufo et al (1982) p.76
 - 23) See del Tufo et al (1982) pp.77 & 81.
 - 24) Mullard argued for the existence of this campaign at a seminar for new appointments who had been appointed as part of the implementation of Berkshire's policy, on 17th. September 1984.
 - 25) Op.cit. T.E.S. 26th June 1982.
 - 26) This interview took place on 6.12.84.
 - 27) Berkshire Chief Executive to Director of Education 9.7.80.
 - 28) C. Mullard, seminar 17th. September 1984.
 - 29) As mentioned, a key figure in the development of the policy was the one black Labour Party councillor but because of the 'hung' nature of the council at this time, all party support for the policy was a requirement if its adoption by the council were to be at all likely.
 - 30) Troyna (1984b) p.211.
 - 31) Commission for Racial Equality (1983) p.V.
 - 32) Interview with campaign members, 27.11.84.
 - 33) According to the 1981 census, percentages of residents seen as 'originating' from the new commonwealth or Pakistan to be found in an 'enumeration district' in Reading ranges between 22.4% and 1.9%.
 - 34) See del Tufo et al (1982) p.83. As will become clear, the campaign was arguing that, based on a range of measures, it was the already 'poor' schools to which black children tended to go.
 - 35) A view expressed by a campaign member in interview 18.10.84.
 - 36) The questions raised were not peculiar to this campaign. They contained views put forward by many critics of Section 11. See Hibbert (1982 & 1983) for further discussion of this.
 - 37) This argument was explained in interview with campaign members and is summarised in a private paper written by the adviser for MCE in June 1981.
 - 38) Slough and Reading CRC's (1979).
 - 39) Slough CRC Education Committee May 1980.
 - 40) Letter to Slough CRC Education Committee June 1980.
 - 41) Letter to Director of Education 30.4.81.

- 42) Dorn (1983) pp.4-5.
- 43) This group was the precursor to the Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education and it planned the process of consultation through which the policy statement was to be drawn up.
- 44) As will become clear later in the chapter, this proved to be accurate. The doubts expressed and the call for caution were well founded.
- 45) The views quoted here are drawn from the adviser's notes on the meeting.
- 46) A view expressed in interview.
- 47) Interview 6.12.84.
- 48) Interview 6.12.84.
- 49) Interview 6.12.84.
- 50) Letter to Director of Social Services, 1st. April 1982 concerning co-ordination between departments on "ethnic minorities".
- 51) Letter to DoE June 1981.
- 52) In interview.
- 53) Troyna (1984b) p.204.
- 54) Ibid.
- 55) Op.cit. p.205.
- 56) Troyna (1984b) p.205.
- 57) Members of the zoning campaign in particular in interviews 18.10.84. & 27.11.84.
- 58) Campaign member in interview, 3.12.84.
- 59) Letter to a member of Reading CRC in 1980.
- 60) See the quote from the meeting of Ad Hoc group quoted above.
- 61) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).
- 62) Ibid p.5..
- 63) Ibid.
- 64) Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education (1982) p.5.
- 65) Mullard, speech to new appointments of Berkshire LEA, 14th September 1982.
- 66) T.E.S. 26th June 1982
- 67) According to private notes this statement was made by one of the consultants at a consultative meeting in Reading, 14th September 1982.
- 68) This was the 'sub-text' of letters from teachers organisations, from the staffs of some schools who saw references to 'racism' as divisive and was explicit in transcripts of the ad hoc committee from 1981.
- 69) See the account of Ad Hoc group's meeting above.
- 70) Letter to the Director of Education 5.5.82.
- 71) Berkshire LEA Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education (1982) p.13.
- 72) See chapter four for further discussion of this.
- 73) In interview 3.12.84.
- 74) Interview 6.12.84.
- 75) Op.cit. p.9.
- 76) Ibid.
- 77) Prepared for a meeting on 23rd. February 1982 and entitled "Three Possible Frameworks".

- 78) Op.cit. p.9.
- 79) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a)
- 80) Op.cit. p.4.
- 81) These were expressed in submissions from Berkshire Teaching Unions.
- 82) The individual racism of teachers is a moot point in current debates on LEA strategy for change, particularly in the light of the 'McGoldrick Affair' in Brent. Whether significant numbers of teachers are 'racist' is a point of dispute between teachers organisations and black parents and groups. In chapter six I attempt to show how institutional racism provides the space for the operation of any individual racism that does exist.
- 83) This would depend upon the elucidation of a model of institutional racism. For a discussion of this and an outline of such a model see chapter six.
- 84) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a) p.5.
- 85) See for example, letter from NAS/UWT Berkshire Federation to the Director of Education, 8.12.82 and from a member of Berkshire Education Committee 5.5.82.
- 86) Berkshire Education Committee (1983a) p.5.
- 87) Ibid.
- 88) These were predominantly written by the adviser for multicultural education.
- 89) This was the committee which was responsible for drawing up the draft document, "Education For Racial Equality".
- 90) Berkshire LEA Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education (1982) p.3.
- 91) Letter to the adviser for multicultural education undated.
- 92) Ibid.
- 93) These criticisms were contained in direct responses to the draft document, "Education For Equality".
- 94) See for example, a letter from a Headteacher of a Church of England school to the Director of Education 10.6.83.
- 95) For elaboration of this point see chapter six.
- 96) Letter to DoE from a lecturer at Bulmershe College.
- 97) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.105.
- 98) See for example letters to the Director of Education from the governors of an Infant School, 17.11.83. and from the governors of a Secondary School 11.10.83.
- 99) For an elaboration of this point, see the discussion of institutional racism in chapter six.
- 100) See Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).
- 101) The importance of these points will be further clarified by the model of institutional racism in chapter six.
- 102) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.108.
- 103) Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education minutes 2nd February 1982.
- 104) Letter to Director of Education 1.8.83.
- 105) See, for example, a letter from the Chairman of Education Committee to the Director of Education 5.5.82.
- 106) Menter (1984).
- 107) See Berkshire Education Committee (1983c).
- 108) See Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).

- 109) The limitations of such a view will be illustrated in the model of institutional racism outlined in chapter six.
- 110) See, for example, letters from Slough Islamic Trust 26th. October 1982, and from Guru Nanak Satang Sabha 27th. June 1983.
- 111) Some Islamic groups were critical because centres had no Muslim staff even though Muslim children pre-dominated.
- 112) In interview.
- 113) Interview 11.2.85.
- 114) In interview.
- 115) Interview 27.11.84.
- 116) Paper presented to new appointments induction seminar, November 1984.
- 117) Ibid.
- 118) Ibid.
- 119) Ibid.
- 120) See, for example, a letter to the Director of Education from the Rajasthan Welfare Society 29.6.83.
- 121) Ibid.
- 122) Letter to the Director of Education from a local community leader, 1.9.83.
- 123) In interview.
- 124) In interview 6.12.84.
- 125) Troyna and Ball (1985a) p.169.
- 126) See Troyna and Williams (1986) p.208 and the discussion in chapter four.
- 127) Op.Cit. p.109.
- 128) For example in Hatcher and Shallice (1983).
- 129) See the account of 'the control thesis' in chapter six.

Chapter Six. Beyond a "Radical Critique" of MCE.

Introduction.

Through the discussions in the previous two chapters I have sought to outline and analyse the development of "racialised forms of education". That has taken the form of examining the development of national policy, its dissemination to a variety of audiences and interventions and initiatives in practice. Chapter five has revealed the complexity of LEA initiatives and given some guidance to how they should be analysed. I have argued that in both the general analysis of the succession of racialised forms and in specific assessments of LEA policy and practice, theorists associated with the "radical" critique, have mis-read these developments. In this chapter I shall show that the theoretical problems identified in chapters four and five are compounded by, and in many respects derive from, the theoretical and conceptual base of the "radical" or "anti-racist" critique.

This critique of MCE has provided a basis for an alternative approach to racial issues within education. This approach has been called "anti-racist education" (ARE) and it currently competes with MCE at the levels of policy, theory and practice for dominance and legitimacy.

There are many points of conflict and disagreement between MCE and ARE, all of which have distinct implications for practice. Much of the anti-racist critique of MCE is theoretically valid but it has yet to lead to a coherent alternative or to any strategic framework for assessing different initiatives. The major aim of this chapter is therefore to examine the anti-racist critique of MCE and analyse the deficiencies that have led to the unproductive polarisation that currently dominates the debate.

I have argued that although this critique is substantially correct in its analysis of the political meaning of MCE, it mistakes the nature of the relation between different levels of activity - policy, theory and practice - and between sites of

activity - national, LEA and school. Apart from the theoretical problems this raises for analysing different racialised forms of education, it has major consequences for anti-racist strategy and practice.

The anti-racist critique of MCE has provided an analysis of the racial context of MCE but it is also necessary to examine its educational context and meaning and relate this to the racial context. Without this, an anti-racist educational practice cannot be given a sound theoretical foundation.

One potential link between racial and educational contexts is the analysis of the racism of the education system which plays a central part in the anti-racist critique and hence in ARE. Central to this project is the concept of "institutional racism". The frequent but varied and complex use of which prompts the following questions: What is meant by "institutional racism"? How is racism institutionalised in education? How does the racism of the educational system relate to the structural racism of the social formation? It is a central argument of this chapter that the anti-racist critique is not currently able to provide satisfactory answers to these questions.

This chapter seeks to build on the insights of the anti-racist critique of MCE by suggesting ways in which it has over-simplified the meaning and significance of current policy and practice. Two aspects of this task are the subject of this chapter. First, I will examine the characterisation of MCE which emanates from the anti-racist critique. I will consider the arguments and contentions of that critique and identify some of the assumptions and problems to be found in its theoretical and conceptual base.

Part two of the chapter will begin the task of analysing the concept of "institutional racism". The clarification of this concept is central to the anti-racist project as a whole and it should also contribute to understanding how an analysis of the structural racism of the social formation as a whole relates to racism in education.

MCE and the Anti-Racist Critique.

MCE is in many ways currently the dominant racialised form of education. It is dominant in that "multicultural" can be used to mean, by definition, current practices in multi-racial schools but it also describes the general orientation, the objectives and organisation of those practices. There is a difficulty though in talking about MCE as a dominant racialised form because of the vagueness with which "multicultural education" is applied to policy and practice. "MCE" is used as a general term for any type of intervention which aims to make education recognise the multiracial nature of post-war Britain. It covers tokenist responses of the 'three S's' type(1) and the more sophisticated, 'whole school' approaches(2). However, one advantage of using "racialised forms of education" as the generic term is that it removes the need for vague uses, and "MCE" can then be restricted to a specific type of initiative(3) which is becoming institutionalised within the structure of some LEA's and schools.

The critique of MCE from an "anti-racist" perspective that is outlined below, tends to employ, with the exception of Mullard's work, a broad definition of MCE. Although this leads to a generality which may weaken the detail of the critique, the argument as a whole applies to a broad range of recent policies and practices.

Practice can be taken to be "multicultural" to the extent that it employs the aims, conceptualisations and language of state discourse on race and education over the last five to ten years. It is that state discourse which informs and inscribes "multicultural" practice and which the critics of MCE have taken as their principle object of study. However, the little research information available shows that "multicultural" practice is neither widespread nor common, let alone "dominant"(4). Vestiges of earlier racialised forms are still evident but it is the overall direction of change plus the official sanctioning of MCE that makes it the dominant form.

To begin to outline the major points of contention between the proponents of MCE and its anti-racist critics one needs an idea of the content and basis of a 'multicultural' approach. Two elements can be identified: the aims and values employed; the social analysis or model of society within which aims and values are located.

If one examines the aims and values, although MCE is beginning to take on different, specific institutional forms at LEA and school level, a continuity can be identified spanning almost twenty years. This may be summarised as a concern with promoting, on the one hand, racial harmony and tolerance, and on the other hand, equality of educational opportunity. These two concerns permeate reports from the late 1960's but become explicit in the late 1970's in the 1976 Race Relation Act(5) and in the 1977 report of the Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration(6).

The first of these aims was first officially expressed in Roy Jenkins' speech(7) in 1966. Since then, a concept of cultural diversity within a framework of cultural pluralism has featured in debates around race and education. It is that concept that underpins MCE. "Cultural diversity", "tolerance", "harmony" and "understanding" are the key words, they provide the central values and aims of MCE. They have featured in each national report or statement from the early 1970's through to the Rampton and Swann reports.

These general aims and values would be supported by most, if not all, of the critics of MCE. The major problem is not the aims and values themselves but the lack of understanding in MCE of the barriers to their realisation. Underlying this has been an assumption that measures which may promote good race relations will necessarily lead to greater equality of opportunity. Consequently, tolerance and understanding have often dominated initiatives where equality was required. This has compounded the ignorance of barriers to equality and both have depended on a characteristic implicit and under-developed conception of the racial structure of society.

A second element of the 'multicultural' approach is the assumption that we live in a plural society. Both of the aims cited above are grounded in a belief in the existence and the desirability of a culturally plural society. One in which cultures, life-styles, beliefs, and pressure groups co-exist without hierarchy or relations of dominance. Within this the state features as an "honest broker", only called upon when one group becomes too powerful or sub-ordinate.

This assumption informs and motivates the concept of cultural diversity. It also allows the connection between school and society to be expressed through the key notion of equal opportunity. "Equal opportunity" is an educational goal, something that schools should be committed to and strive to achieve, but it is also seen as a way of securing equality in employment and in other social institutions.

The limitations of the concept of equal opportunity(8) stem from the assumption that factors restricting racial equality in schooling and in employment are contingent features of the structure of schooling and of the division of labour. Consequently, no social criticism is necessary nor does one need to examine the everyday organisation of schooling for discriminatory practices. Differences in life-chances are assumed to stem from differences in life-style and culture becomes the focus of multicultural 'theory' and practice.

The concept of culture is therefore one of three major differences between MCE and the anti-racist critique. A second point of conflict draws on different views of culture but crystallises around racism. Opposing concepts of racism and roles for educational policy and practice with respect to the perpetuation of racism both feature here. The third issue depends upon the anti-racist analysis of racism but centres on the role and context of MCE.

MCE and Cultural Difference.

"Culture" is central to the social analysis, explanations of underachievement and articulation of educational goals of a wide range of forms of MCE. It offers the source of materials etc. used to combat poor self-image. It locates the origin of disadvantage and it is seen as the main manifestation of irreducible racial differences.

Culture has featured in explanations of underachievement from notions of culture shock(9), to various reports' view of the causes of differences between Afro-Caribbean and Asian pupils(10). It is the key notion in explanations of racial conflict and under-pins the emphasis on tolerance and combatting ignorance.

In the elaboration of positions broadly typified as "multicultural" there will be many levels of sophistication in the concept of culture employed. James, for example, is extremely aware of the dangers of assuming cultural homogeneity or continuity(11). But, the concept of culture in MCE is grounded in a pluralist model of society: cultures exist in parallel not in hierarchical relations. As Carby argues,

"An indigeneous cultural autonomy is assumed present into which other cultures can be integrated, ignoring any class or gender differences. Generalisations are then made in the same manner about Caribbean and Asian cultures."(12)

This concept of culture, focused on the exotic, the artifacts and the festivals of 'other cultures' has been one concern of the anti-racist critique. Carby contrast this view of culture with one drawn from 'cultural studies' which,

"..by insisting that 'culture' denotes antagonistic relations of domination and subordination.. undermines the pluralistic notion of compatability inherent in MCE."(13)

Notions of homogeneous racial or ethnic cultures, implicit in MCE, link culture to the idea of 'basic' or biological differences and supports a view of ethnic or racial groups as equal but different. This can then be used to justify inequality through emphasising cultural or ethnic differences rather than

the common experience of racism. It is also disturbingly close to the idea of irreducible racial difference which Barker identifies in the ideologies of extreme right wing and avowedly 'racialist' organisations(14) and which they have used to rebut the charge that they believe in racial superiority.

The theory and practice of multiculturalism based on difference, Mullard refers to as "ethnicism". He claims it represents the institutional and ideological incorporation of ethnic minorities,

"...it transforms the ideological form of racism into its cultural form of ethnicism."(15)

Concepts of culture and ethnicity therefore play a central role in the elaboration of explanations of underachievement and of the structural and experiential realities of race. MCE exchanges biological determinism for cultural determinism and constitutes a set of representations of ethnic differences which justify actions which institutionalise ethnic differences and hide experiences and conditions common to all black groups(16). This is an example of how MCE, through its absences or theoretical shortcomings, leads to institutional solutions which allow the structural basis of inequality to remain unchallenged.

Racism and MCE.

The emphasis on ethnicity and culture in MCE is opposed in the anti-racist critique by a stress on the significance of racism and the structural inequality of the social formation. This has been expressed in two connected contentions about MCE and racism made by the anti-racist critique. First, it argues that MCE fails to acknowledge the existence of racism in schools, in the education system in general and as a structural feature of the social formation(17). Secondly, that through this absence, and through its conceptualisation of racial conflict, MCE focuses attention away from racism and attempts to manage its effects.

The silence of MCE on racism can be perceived in a number of areas. In the aims and values discussed earlier the emphasis on tolerance and equality of opportunity functions as an alternative to recognising how racism undermines formal equality and how it is integral to the structure of our society. In culture also, the assumed parity of cultures means that the relation between cultural hierarchy and structural racism remains hidden.

But if one looks closely at the twin aims of good race relations, tolerance etc. and equality of opportunity the assumption that measures appropriate for the former will enhance the latter depends on an implicit view of racism as a matter of attitudes and prejudice. This view became explicit in the treatment of racism in the Rampton and Swann reports. The Rampton Report was significant in that it recognised the presence of "unintentional" racism within schools but this was understood as a characteristic of individuals not of institutions(18). So although it recognises the existence of racism, it does not challenge the earlier emphasis on attitudes and understanding, prejudice and tolerance and prompts "Racism Awareness Training"(19) as the natural counter-part of a multicultural curriculum.

Similarly, the Swann Report(20) has been criticised for the under-developed nature of its approach to racism. NAME, for example, argues that the report does not apply the concept of institutional racism to the school system(21). They claim that,

"Swann's "theory of racism" is not a theory at all, but a collection of disjointed observations."(22)

This aspect of the critique of MCE calls upon structural concepts of race and racism(23). In this, the relationship between race and class is emphasised at the expense of ethnic or cultural relations. Race relations, if understood as being between homogeneous groups, are also seen as less important. This is a direct response to the omission from MCE of racism and to its separation of race and class.

In the anti-racist critique, class and race are analysed as structural and political entities. In classical Marxism the revolutionary project or task has been to bring together the objective structural realities of class and the historically contingent sense of class or subjective reality(24). In the anti-racist critique, race is a structural concept rather than a cultural or ethnic one, the political task is to unify "the race" across subjective or structurally contingent ethnic or cultural divisions. It therefore stands in direct opposition to notions of irreducible ethnicity inherent in more recent forms of MCE(25).

If one examines the second contention, the absence from MCE of a consideration of racism is implicated in the failure of policies and practices to remove racial inequality in education. Mullard(26) asks why, after twenty years of work by the CRE, DES, LEA's etc., are racism in education and black underachievement still prevalent. He speculates that possible answers are: lack of real commitment, or lack of administrative and financial resources, that the project is long term because attitudes have to be affected, but whatever the answer,

"...all current multicultural education policies and practices...whatever else they might be achieving they are not tackling effectively the problem of racism."(27)

One has to ask how this failure should be interpreted. Willey(28) amplifies the above claim but blames the lack of central strategy for the failure of policy. He also cites as a cause the contradictions between the assumptions contained in official discourse and the realities of trying to implement policy in schools. He claims that the implications of pluralist objectives were not followed through to educational change and that schools cannot develop positive responses to cultural diversity without confronting the realities of racial discrimination. He adds that,

"A gap between policy and practice has developed and has led to approaches which argue that the prime objective should be equality and combatting racism."(29)

That this has been the impetus for the development he describes does not seem to be confirmed in my research(30) but Willey is correct to the extent that a new explicit stance with respect to racism has, in some schools and LEA's(31), been adopted. This new stance is a reaction to the charge that MCE is not only agnostic on racism but that, through its emphasis on culture and ethnicity, it fails to oppose structural racism and helps to structure and institutionalise new cultural forms of racism.

The proponents of the anti-racist critique argue the failure of MCE to confront racism is one of the processes through which it has managed it and its effects. Mullard claims(32) that multicultural policies and practices at best ameliorate the conditions of racism. He says that they have two effects: they help white children to see cultural and ethnic differences as important while there is no educational evidence to suggest they are; they make life tolerable for black children, they allow them to live with racism. They,

"...seek to better the educational experience of black children by compensating for rather than removing the educational source of educational disadvantage."(33)

"...by emphasising the multicultural often at the expense of the academic, the requirement to see ones position in a multicultural rather than a racist society...it becomes easy to overlook, discount and thus, by default, legitimate the institutional forms and expressions of racism."(34)

He is therefore forced to conclude that present policy is,

"...either racist in essence, racist in its consequences or ineffective in combatting racism."(35)

It may be argued that it is the overall outcome of racist procedures and practices going unchecked, of them effectively being unopposed that is significant for an analysis of MCE but Mullard glides between intention and outcome, between function and effect and hence conflates these distinct aspects of policy and practice. This form of analysis echoes the approach to racialised forms of education which was discussed in chapter

four(36). It expresses and pre-figures the framework within which the anti-racist critique analyses the role and context of education and hence of MCE.

The role and Context of MCE.

Mullard's view outlines the effects of multicultural education on the processes and practices of education and on the racial structure of society in general. Both are perceived as racist, MCE functions to deflect and contain black resistance. Functions, which can only be understood within an analysis which emphasises two things: the role of school in reproducing socially divisive ideologies and structuring the division of labour; its operation within a racist society and structure.

The role of education in the reproduction of economic and social relations is usually articulated around two mutually reinforcing processes: the reproduction, through differential accreditation, of class relations and the division of labour; the reproduction of social relations and the hegemony of the state and dominant groups in society.

It is this role of education with respect to a racially structured social formation that leads education in general, and MCE in particular, to be implicated in the reproduction of structural racism. Carby claims that,

"An understanding of the relation between the function of schooling as an institution, and issues of race, is crucial to an understanding of the ways in which state intervention in schooling has become more direct, overt and authoritarian."(37)

Mullard claims that schools, as agencies of socialisation and cultural transmission, have an important role in the transmission of racist culture(38). He argues that the overall function of schools is to inculcate dominant social norms and values, to allocate human resources into the adult role system and to select through achievement and the differential valuation of achievements(39).

If the role of education is one element of the theoretical base of the anti-racist argument here, the second element depends upon the context within which education is taking place. Mullard argues that the social context of MCE is,

"...not only broadly racist in character...(but) it is also racist in structure...(MCE)..tends in consequence and application to reproduce both the racial structure of power and the racist conditions and assumptions on which this structure of power is constructed."(40)

Consequently the reference point for goals with respect to race relations is racist. Schools, Mullard claims,

"...identify their role and operate within the dominant racist value and political goal structure implicit in official policy on black immigration.(41)

Mullard's position is readily supported by numerous official texts. In addition to the many statements(42) expressing fears about the consequences for the social fabric and structure of Britain of black underachievement and consequent protest, other explicit statements show how far "the state" will go in accomodating black demands:

"...in understanding and providing for the difficulties of minorities care has to be taken not to overcome them by reversing well-tried policies or... by bending a system evolved to suit the majority so far as to unhinge it altogether."(43)

The suggestion that the education system actually suits the majority clearly ignores its class base but that is not the issue here. The statement corroborates the contention of the "control thesis" (that MCE is about controlling black disaffection) in so far as the concerns and limits of official documents are concerned.

The anti-racist critique of MCE suggests that, through an apparent concern for equal opportunity, concerns about cohesion and control in the class-room(44), and in society, are motivated and articulated:

"...concern over classroom disruption by black pupils, violence, rejection of school mores, lack of work motivation."(45)

Through this,

"The discourse of multiculturalism is situated within an increasingly racist social, economic and political climate. It is centrally part of 'Blacks are a social problem'."(46)

Carby sees the emphasis on cultural diversity as a reaction to black groups recognition of the need for awareness of black culture and history but it was,

"...turned by the state into a superficial gesture in an attempt to control the rising level of politicised black consciousness."(47)

Similarly, Mullard, in contrast to Tomlinson(48), argues that MCE did not evolve out of educational concerns but out of,

"...a series of political interpretations made about the threat blacks posed to the stability of liberal democratic and capitalist society."(49)

Carby, in commenting on Little and Willey's(50) findings that MCE has had little impact because of the lack of change in "white schools" claims that this is not surprising because MCE has been,

"...conceived and applied as a method of social control over black children."(51)

She argues that this underpins the significance of state documents 'locating the problem' in black children, the black family and the black community. It allows and justifies state intervention through social workers, education welfare officers and other state agencies which make up the mechanism for the control of black youth(52). Control of black disaffection and resistance is, within the "control thesis" both the function and the intention of state policy, the two are equated. This leads Mullard to prioritise the racial and political contexts of MCE over its educational context and hence avoid having to relate those contexts and understand the form each gives to the other. Such a prioritisation contributes to the inability

referred to of many critics of MCE to understand why the practices and ideologies of multi-culturalism have been acceptable to some teachers.

In response to this, Green rejects what he calls the, "...professedly radical critiques of MCE all of which treat the latter as a homogeneous entity, as if there were no contradictions in it."(53)

He criticises the position taken by Carby(54) and Mullard(55) (a position re-affirmed by Carby in later articles(56) but significantly developed by Mullard in his subsequent papers(57) on three major counts. Green claims that there are three crucial simplifications in the way the argument is set up: MCE is uncontradictory, a single unity, with a single motivating force and one trajectory; intentions are confused with outcomes, aims of state policy will necessarily be realised in practice; there is no sense of school as a site of struggle(58).

Green's concept of MCE is more general than Mullard's and includes what the latter calls MRE and MEE, but if one examines the policy and practice of any of these, Green's first contention can be seen to be true(59). The second is a statement of the possibility of opposition to officially sanctioned aims, values and priorities. It suggests that although "state policy" attempts to frame understandings and to de-limit types of practice, gains can be made. It is therefore a statement about the "relative autonomy" of school which opposes a narrowly 'functionalist' account of the relation between school and society. Green's third contention similarly opposes another theoretical tenet of the "radical critique", that schools are totally constrained by their state nature and their overall function as "ISA's"(60). It is, however, incumbent upon Green to demonstrate that it is possible, in theory and in practice for schools to be a site of struggle and to specify the conditions governing that possibility.

Green highlights the complexity of the relations between policy, practice and theory but he is arguing for what a

loosely defined MCE might become on the basis of what it occasionally and marginally has been. For all my criticisms of Mullard's approach to characterising and relating the racialised forms, it is clear that if Green is to be proved right in practice then a theoretical framework for pursuing anti-racist education is vital.

Further examination of the theoretical framework that is being offered, shows that many of the problems arise out of the way in which the state and power have been conceptualised. This is revealed in the analysis of the management of racism in and through education. Carby, in particular, bases her analysis on three assumptions: first, that there are only two active participants in the struggle over the management of racism - "the state" and "black youth", all others are either irrelevant or reducible to the first.

Secondly, because MCE is seen as a struggle between just two 'actors', the contestation and exercise of power is merely a dialogue. Power is understood as being directly applied, any reaction is equally direct but opposite. The only possible outcomes are the subjugation or the continued resistance of black youth. Carby does not consider the way power is deployed, nor the way some actors resist their role in its deployment. Mullard(61) stresses the importance of power when he offers a definition of racism and he demonstrates that it is one of the most important omissions from MCE. Carby(62) also criticises MCE for ignoring the social relations of power and begins to put power on the agenda of the debate between MCE and ARE. But as Dorn and Troyna(63) point out, most theorists treat power purely through its visible exercise and through the study of overt decisions. They argue that it is necessary to distinguish different 'faces' of power: the processes by which issues are decided; processes by which they become - or do not become - 'key issues'; and,

"...the socially structured and culturally patterned behaviour of groups and practices of institutions."(64)

It is necessary to show how power operates. It can operate directly but often it is exercised indirectly. It is mediated, often unconsciously deployed and exercised through inaction. To summarise, state power as expressed in the state control of schooling is an institutional form and as such has all the complexity of institutions in its functions and processes.

Thirdly, it appears necessary for the 'state vs black youth' opposition that the contradictions and complexities of the state be glossed over. Otherwise, difficult questions about the relation between the limitations and gains of "reformist strategies" need to be addressed. Also, questions of agency and intention of teachers, quasi-autonomous bodies and of pressure groups need to be considered from the standpoint of their own 'internal logic' not just their global function.

It might be argued that these 'assumptions' are actually demonstrated by events, by outcomes and that no prior assumptions were made. This is sustainable if MCE could be accurately equated with official discourse plus global outcome but such an equation not only fails to exhaust the scope of MCE, it fails to inform an active and constructive anti-racism, substituting for it a loose and rhetorical activism.

Carby's critique is a reading of official discourse on MCE, but it is not an analysis of MCE itself. It is her view of the state as homogeneous, dominating and determining outcomes directly that leads her to believe that it is such an analysis. Clearly it was not Carby's concern to develop a detailed theory of the state but her work would have benefitted from being informed by recent Marxist debates in this area(65). In contrast, I have attempted to contribute, albeit obliquely, to these debates through an emphasis on both internal and external processes and relations of the state as well as on more explicit statements and activities.

From this one must conclude that even if MCE is only a straight-forward part of the management of racism, any analysis of MCE and of the institutionalisation of racism in schools must examine the processes by which this occurs. It

must reveal the roles taken by various actors and types of actors, the justifications, the explanations and practices involved. Then it can begin to show how official justifications and explanations connect with those at the school level and with the practices that give them force and form. This in turn opens up the question of the agency and intention of teachers and other educationalists and therefore begin the task of grounding practices that oppose the hegemony of MCE.

If one examines now the second 'actor' in the struggle over education and the reproduction of racism, the problems with a simple concept of the state are compounded by the way in which resistances are conceptualised. In the first place, although Dhondy and Carby emphasise resistances of black students to both racism in education and to multiculturalism neither offers any analysis of the contradictions or limitations of that resistance as it is commonly expressed.

Dhondy organises his notion of resistance around the common aims and experiences of Afro-Caribbean and Asian peoples. He focuses on the "refusal" of young blacks(66) to compromise with school values or the pressure to work at all costs. This he links to a general cultural resistance, to a political culture. But he fails to see the parallels with the culture of masculine working-classness that Willis has identified for a group of white "lads"(67). Willis's "lads" and Dhondy's "youths" both re-interpret failure as success but Dhondy accepts their interpretation, he ignores the danger of even greater powerlessness inherent in it and he promotes a masculine notion of "black culture" that a priori excludes black women.

Even though "resistances" are central to the "radical critique" of MCE, recognition or understanding of resistance to MCE is very limited. Although state documents reveal political concerns about black disaffection and the consequences of underachievement it is clear that black dissatisfaction with education is not diminishing nor is the willingness to air wider grievances. It seems that as "progressives" misconstrue the potential of education to

transform society so do "radicals" mistake its power to control. As Green argues, MCE cannot defuse black resistance nor control rebellion(68). Black students will not see educational reform as compensation for what troubles them, i.e.

"...the whole systematic framework of racial domination in its entirety, not just this or that bias in school."(69)

Given that MCE aims to defuse racial conflict without challenging institutional racism, attempts at control must be judged against black responses to institutional racism. Also, when MCE does enjoy any measure of success this cannot be dismissed as purely an illusion of equality and harmony. That success expresses the contradictions and limitations of the aims of many black and white criticisms of state schooling.

Carby and Dhondy offer a critique of MCE which in some of its tenets connects powerfully with a traditionalist critique of progressivism. Stone(70) articulates this view and expresses many black parents aspirations and values with regard to education. Stone's critique focuses on the idea that low self-esteem accounts for black underachievement and on the "progressive" practice that follows from it. However, as Green points out(71), Stone is wrong to assume that all teachers indulge in MCE because they believe that black children have low self-esteem or a negative self-image.

Stone's position is similar to the "simple" demands by black parents for good education for their children. As Leander points out, they distrust MCE because it refuses,

"...to treat them as equals through the device of treating them as separate."(72)

Rex(73) also stresses the importance of the academic status and validation of MCE. However, the demand for "good education" is certainly connected to a preference for formal modes of instruction based on Caribbean and Asian experiences(74) and on a clear understanding of the type of education given high status in Britain.

It is important to recognise the complexity of black criticism and resistance if a strategy for unifying it is to be

developed. It is a central issue for any radical approach to race and education which hopes to inform and motivate a radical practice. Dhondy and Carby present a superficially radical critique but they mythologise resistance and confine struggle to a very limited number of "sites". In particular they ignore the school as a site of struggle and thereby dismiss the actual and potential resistance of teachers.

Little recognition is given to the contradictory elements of the "progressivist" ideology which has situated some teachers within multiculturalism. Carby(75) claims that progressive teachers saw MCE as a way of combatting underachievement but failed to appreciate that it was part of a mechanism for increasing direct social control over black communities. She says that those teachers have been an integral part of an interventionist strategy and claims that they latched onto it as the last bastion of teacher control over curricula innovation. Teachers,

"...were busily being multicultural whilst really protecting the ground for their own autonomy".(76)

The only exception to this for Carby is what she refers to as the "missionary approach"(77) to doing good to black youth. Hence, Carby lumps together all the contradictions and problems of liberal and radical ideologies of practice. Her comments undoubtedly identify some of the justifications and motivations which are operating but because she assumes this to be the whole picture, radical or progressive teachers are refused any role in an anti-racist strategy.

The "radical critique" of MCE in many respects echoes a 'left' critique of "progressive education". So it appears that the debate between anti-racists, multiculturalists and critics such as Stone, re-articulates, through a debate about racial inequality, an ideological and practical opposition with a history in education, i.e. the opposition between radicals, progressives and traditionalists. That suggests that an analysis of MCE needs to relate it, and its alternatives, to progressive education and other ideologies of practice(78). An

analysis which locates MCE not only within its political and racial context but also within its educational context.

A theoretical basis which builds on the critique of MCE and grounds an alternative 'anti-racist' approach needs to analyse both the general racial structure of society as a whole and the current state of racial discourse and practice within education. These two theoretical strands are essential components of a framework for an "anti-racist education" but two important questions remain to be answered.

First, the reproductive role that is ascribed to education allows little space for the dismantling of racism within or through education. The limits and parameters of teacher anti-racism are not explored in a positive way, in fact any belief that this is a possibility is written off as self-delusion and it appears that the state can only be opposed from outside its institutions. The relationship between national and local educational apparatuses outlined above do not totally confirm this view nor do the dynamics of policy production in LEA's which have moved towards an anti-racist position(79).

A 'reproduction and resistance' framework leaves the uncertainty of reproduction and the contradictions of resistance unexamined. The fact of contestation or resistance is recognised but a theoretical framework for that resistance is necessary if its political and strategic potential are to be evaluated. Struggle and contestation may be constitutive of races and classes as well as between those already formed(80), but the 'reproduction and resistance' framework assumes that such social forces pre-exist the struggles that in fact form and re-form, structure and re-structure them. Without recognising the possibility of two types of struggle, the internal contradictions of resistances and of cultures of resistance cannot be revealed nor analysed.

Secondly, a materialist, structural approach to race is not something that can just be asserted. It will necessarily cut across other materialist approaches to stratification in which class is taken as the primary category. One needs to ask how

racial discrimination is structured and reproduced, how it evolved to its current form and what relation these processes bear to those operating through class and gender. The anti-racist critique of MCE criticises the plural, culturally based view of social structure but what does it put in its place? It uses a view of structural racism and the specificity of racial exploitation and oppression that is largely underdeveloped especially in terms of its relation to class.

These critical points with respect to the "radical critique" of MCE represent some of the weak strands in that approach. I have focused on theoretical problems around "the state" and "power, and on control and the function of schooling for a number of reasons. First, although I have argued that there is no simple link between the theoretical framework and the practices of a racialised form, conceptual and theoretical clarity and rigour are essential for effective anti-racist practice. Secondly, in many respects the conclusions of the "radical critique of MCE" may be accurate but the form of argument and the assumptions identified imply a very narrow range of options for opposing MCE, for de-constructing institutional racism and for institutionalising anti-racism. Thirdly, the characterisation of "past" racialised forms and of the current "dominance" of MCE both simplify the complexity of current assumptions, policies and practices. Over-simplified dichotomies are represented as real alternatives and the heterogeneity of actual policies and practices is glossed over.

The conceptualisation of anti-racism and an understanding of its limits depends on specifying the relationship between school and its social and economic context. Also, the alliances seen as possible or desirable will depend upon how race and class are related. A strategy for institutionalising anti-racism will depend on the development of a theoretical framework within which practices can be analysed and assessed.

Racism and Schooling

The question of racism has been shown in the first half of this chapter to be one of the major critical foci of the anti-racist critique of MCE. It would appear that the conclusions of the anti-racist critique are substantially correct but that the theoretical basis upon which these claims rest has problems in its content and omissions. In the rest of this chapter I intend to subject the arguments around racism to greater scrutiny and attempt, through an examination of the concept of institutional racism, to suggest ways in which the relationship between the racism of the social formation is linked to racist educational structures.

If one recalls the argument about MCE and racism, three contentions summarise the major points of criticism. First, is the general absence in MCE of consideration of racism as a significant factor in racial disadvantage. Secondly, when racism does feature in any explanation within MCE, a concept is employed which emphasises the psychological and cultural over the institutional and structural. Thirdly, partly through the above two characteristics, MCE fulfills a function for the management of racism and the control of its effects.

The general silence on racism is secured partly through the "racial inexplicitness"(81) characteristic of many official documents. As Carby(82) has argued, the notions of "deficiency and deprivation" employed to explain black underachievement(83) were borrowed directly from the cultural deprivation debates which centered on social class in the 1960's(84). Also the emphasis on the 'decaying inner cities' made in the Select Committee report in 1975(85) contributes to communicating an unequivocally 'racial' message without explicitly examining either race or racism. Mullard explains this silence by arguing that it has been almost impossible for white defined policies and practices to focus on the problems of racism.

"For to have done so would have amounted to an irrevocable challenge to the educational and social system, as both

require racism, albeit in its cultural form of ethnicism, to mediate, regulate and manage the deeper and politically more important gender and class conflicts that really do threaten the basis of established society."(86)

The connection is thereby made between a silence on racism and both the overall control function of MCE and the development within MCE of an ethnic form of racism, ethnicism. Through emphasising culture and difference as the basis of racism,

"The practice of multi-culturalism attempts to defuse conflict between individuals rather than challenging institutional racism."(87)

This emphasis, coupled with the ignorance of power and power relations(88), leads to taking racism out of the political realm and into the technical or narrowly pedagogic. But this, Martin Francis argues is a self-defeating strategy:

"...it is the de-politization of racism through the development of MCE that leaves teachers unprepared for the issue of power, patronisation and white racism that emerge when they attempt to put multi-cultural ideas into practice in a racist society."(89)

The official emphasis on needs and underachievement have been important to both the attempt to ignore racism and the subsequent approach of defining it purely in terms of culture and prejudice. In the former racism has been limited to at best a secondary role, in the latter it has featured as one component of an explanation of underachievement but always based on the action of individuals. Because individual prejudice cannot account for all racial disadvantage, this limited concept of racism allows it to be relegated to being one cause among many.

The 1981 report of the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee(90) uses differences in the achievement of 'West Indian' and Asian pupils to conclude that racism is not sufficient explanation for underachievement and that cultural differences must be seen as its primary basis. Such a

conclusion makes a number of mistaken assumptions. First, that equal achievement (with white pupils) entails equal life chances i.e. that employment is based on equal reward and access for equal certification. Secondly, that racism in education is only an issue if it affects performance. Thirdly, it assumes that if racism exists all ethnic groups and genders and classes within them will adopt similar strategies to cope with it. Fourthly, as Bhikhu Parekh (91) has pointed out, referring to the groupings "West Indian" and "Asian" assumes a non-existent homogeneity, particularly in the latter group, and masks wide discrepancies in achievement.

It becomes clear that racism is most evident in MCE as an absence, both through total exclusion and through selective inclusion. This, as a strategy for containing the effects of racism contains internal tensions and contradictions that may threaten the potential effectiveness of that strategy. As Hatcher and Shallice(92) point out, failing to tackle racism may undermine both the hegemony required over the black population and the need to restrain 'counter productive' manifestations of racism.

Systematic Racism.

The key contention in the anti-racist critique of MCE and hence in ARE, is that racism is not only wide-spread but is a systemic feature of educational provision and of schools. The use of the term "institutional racism" is designed to convey this idea, that racism is a property not of particular individual educationalists but of educational institutions.

The concept of institutional racism bears on three issues central to the analysis of education and racism. First, and most important, is the question of how education contributes to the reproduction and propagation of racial inequality. Using the concept of institutional racism, this question can be reposed as "what features of the educational structure, of the system of provision and of the structure and organisation of schools sustain racial inequality?"

Secondly, it has been argued, by Mullard(93) in particular, that the form in which MCE has been developed has led to MCE itself being a form of institutional racism. This is an extension of the contention that MCE both obscures the structural nature of racism and serves in the management of racism and its effects. Because MCE identifies racial groups on the basis of black ethnic minority group cultures(94), which are seen as both internally homogeneous and different from each other, it both grounds and allows a cultural form of racism: ethnicism. Therefore, as MCE becomes institutionalised, so is ethnicism. This, Mullard emphasises, is taking place at both LEA and school level with the appointment of black "multicultural" teachers, advisers and officers(95). He argues that the institutionalisation of ethnicism through an implicit cultural hierarchy leads to an ethnic hierarchy or "etharchy"(96).

Thirdly, where MCE is not institutionalised, other processes secure the role of education in sustaining racial inequality. Troyna(97) has addressed the issue of the limits of the development of MCE by seeking to explain the 'non-institutionalisation' of MCE. This, he argues, has not depended entirely on the ('unwitting') racist attitudes of teachers(98). This points towards the centrality of institutional racism and Troyna's argument would be greatly strengthened by a detailed examination of how it operates through school processes and structures.

There is no assumption that the development of MCE in schools is resisted or fails because it threatens racism. But the failure of multicultural initiatives to achieve their stated aims and the limitations of MCE in practice in securing racial equality in education derive largely from being undermined by the processes and structures of institutional racism. That the conceptual framework used by MCE ignores those processes and structures and hence allows this, is one of its greatest weaknesses.

Of these three issues, the first is my main concern, the development of an adequate concept of institutional racism is both pressing and necessary if the anti-racist critique of MCE is to ground an alternative practice. However, I hope to show that the other two issues are clarified by outlining a model of institutional racism.

Racism and the 'Radical Critique'.

In the 'radical critique', the emphasis on systemic racism draws on two theoretical arguments. First, a general analysis of the racial and social structure of Britain. Racism, as a structured and structural feature of our social system, helps to secure the dominance - both material and cultural - of the ruling class over that system and helps to reproduce it in a racially stratified form. Secondly, a view of the overall social and economic function of schooling. Because education fulfills a role in reproducing a racist i.e. racially stratified, social formation, it is itself racist.

Racial stratification and racial discrimination are integral to our social formation and it would seem to follow that because education is located within, and dependent upon, that social formation, it would be implicated in the reproduction of racism. However, the problems with the 'control thesis' and notions of uncontested and unmediated reproduction indicate that the racism of schools, of education is not established solely by reference to its social location and function.

I have suggested(99) that it is useful in analysing racism to distinguish four 'levels' of racism: ideas, practices, institutions and structures. I have also argued that the major alternative approaches to racism over-emphasise either the first or the fourth of these levels. In analysing racism and education the problem is essentially one of identifying the relations between the four levels which lead to the manifestation of racism at the level of the institution.

It is important to recognise, as the anti-racist critique has, that schools operate within a racist social context and social structure but if racism in and through education is to be understood in sufficient detail to inform an anti-racist practice then two further aspects need to be analysed. First, the role of individuals, their practices, understandings, justifications, actions and inaction within the institution must be explored. Although inequality within the institution is largely a product of interactions between the racial structure of the social formation and the institution, the operation of the institution will depend upon the actions of individuals or groups of individuals. Secondly, if one is to demonstrate that institutions are racist it is necessary to identify the procedures, processes and practices that make this so. From this we can begin to explore the complex relationship between different levels of the educational structure - national, local and school. Hence, schools can be located within a relationship not of overt and total control but within a web of formal and informal controls and formal and real autonomies.

To pursue this 'specification' of racism in schools it is useful initially to consider the forms that two opposed approaches to racism - attitudinal and structural(100) - take with respect to its form in schools. Within this, three types of characterisation are evident: the individual, the institutional and the structural/contextual.

'Individual Racism'

A number of ways can be cited in which individuals in schools may be said to be "racist". One can refer to the overt and the covert, the intentional and the unintentional or unexamined. These categories are not separate and their application may lead to much misunderstanding when 'individual racism' in schools is discussed. Confusion derives from three things: first, the failure to distinguish racialism from racism, secondly, the assumption that actions follow directly from beliefs and hence that beliefs and actions do not really need

to be considered separately and thirdly, the attempt to consider 'individual' racism apart from its institutional location and general social context.

Within schools it should be obvious that there are (among others) teachers and pupils and these two groups occupy very different locations within the institution. Therefore, when one refers to a member of either group as being 'racist', although similar attitudes or beliefs may be involved, the institutional significance of that person being 'racist' will be different.

This is shown by the fact that while there are school policies aimed predominantly at combatting racism amongst white pupils(101) none have evolved to combat or even to recognise teacher racism. This, I would argue, is primarily because of the general refusal by teacher organisations(102) to acknowledge the existence of teacher racism but is compounded by the institutional problems of dealing with it. It is clearly difficult and controversial to identify any but the most overt ways in which teachers can be said to be 'racist'.

Willey(103) quotes a useful practical distinction between different 'types of racist' students: hard core racists, students on the periphery and unintentional racists. Different strategies for teaching and for discipline will be necessary for the different groups. Members of racialist organisations pose very different types of problems to the large proportion of white students who embrace a 'common-sense' racism. It is important to note that where racism has been recognised as an issue, although common-sense racism has become an object of concern in some schools, generally the initial spur has been the activities of conscious and overtly racialist pupils. Consequently, when racism in schools is raised as an issue it is assumed that that type of overt racialism is meant(104).

In a sense, overt and explicit attitudes and beliefs, even when expressed by teachers, are as Mulvaney argues(105) the easiest to deal with because the fact of their existence cannot be disputed. However, reluctance to act against such a teacher

from both LEA and senior school staff can be found even when the LEA has an explicit 'anti-racist' policy(106).

One attempt to solve some of the problems caused by treating racism as a matter of attitudes alone is contained in the formula "Racism = Prejudice + Power"(107) or "Racism = Prejudice + Discrimination + Power"(108) This is usually employed to distinguish racism from ethnocentricity which may be an attribute of any individual or group, from negative attitudes towards other white cultural and national groups and to stop black anti-white attitudes being labelled as "racist".

The formula achieves these objectives because of the introduction of "power" to the equation but the continued emphasis on prejudice makes it another psychological and individual definition. Sivanandan(109) points out that this formula is employed within the growing phenomenon of Racism Awareness Training which, although it claims to recognise the importance of power, only includes the personal power of whites over blacks not institutional power relations and structures of power. In Racism Awareness Training racism is seen as a white problem(110) but for individuals not for white dominated structures and institutions. Hence, the structural and the ideological remain unrelated, the former is ignored and the latter is restricted to attitudes and beliefs.

To relate the ideological and the structural involves determining the form in which racism occurs in school, its relation to racialism and hence necessitates locating the individual within the institutionalisation of racism in schools and in the educational system in general.

Racism and Racialism.

It is important to clarify what type of beliefs are being attributed to the 'overt racist'. The distinction between definitions based on superiority and those based on difference is relevant here, so too is the separation of actions and beliefs(111). Banton's definition of racism(112) is essentially a 'superiority definition' of the type cited by Barker(113).

Consequently Banton is lead to label doctrines based on cultural differnces as "racialist" or more accurately, according to him, "ethnocentric"(114).

An alternative basis for distinguishing between racism and racialism is to restrict the former to beliefs usually but not exclusively concerning racial superiority and then to see the latter as referring to actions, based on those beliefs, which descriminate. Both bases for distinguishing are relevant when one attempts to specify the form in which racism occurs or is reproduced in education and in schools.

Davis accepts a definition of racism which involves the biological determination of racial characteristics and culture and the inherent superiority of one race over another(115). He then distinguishes this from racialism which he defines as the creed and method of political agitation i.e. 'aggressive and abusive behaviour' of the NF, BM or similar groups. He claims that teachers dissociate themselves merely from racialism and that racism continues and develops because members of an institution refuse to recognise its subtle form.

Davis is identifying one misconception and he is correct to stress the 'subtle forms' of racism but the issue is how these forms operate, how the individual and the institution interact to generate racist effects. Also, many teachers do accept both Davis's definition of racism and the distinction from racialism but beliefs about natural racial differences, abilities and propensities are extremely widespread and although not invoking 'superiority' do justify differences of treatment. Ironically, the latter approach is explicitly outlawed by a 'colour blind' ethnocentric position but given a gloss of 'celebrating diversity', it gains legitimacy in MCE.

The significance of any of the above approaches to racism and racialism can not be decided in absolute terms. Their usefulness will depend on the distinction that one seeks to emphasise or prioritise. There is clearly no consensus on how the terms are to be used but this confusion should not allow the different aspects of racial discrimination or disadvantage

to be subsumed under one amorphous term: "racism". It is necessary to use the above distinctions to begin to specify in detail the organisation of racism in education and show how different aspects of it are related. The dangers of excluding any of the contributory processes from the term "racism" are that they can then be allocated to a less "serious" category of problem. But it is a major contention of this chapter that the processes of racism within education are more complex than the application of the term "racism" would necessarily indicate.

The above discussion concerns overt and explicit beliefs about racial and cultural differences but they may also comprise a strand of what may be termed 'unexamined' racism. Such beliefs are based upon generalisations and stereotypes which may be 'verified' by experience but that experience will have been made sense of through those specific beliefs and through a belief in the applicability of deterministic racial categories(116).

Of more importance are the processes and social structure which frame and underlay the above relations between beliefs and experiences. Stereotypes given a particular educational form within schools derive from the individuals location within racist ideology. The general racism of British culture informs the "practical" and "common-sense" racism which is integral to teachers' culture and to their understandings of their task. The latter connects with the received knowledge and maxims of both general pedagogic and subject specialist practice to produce an important part of the fabric of racism in schools(117).

Although an educationally specific (but not autonomous) racist ideology is propagated and given its specific content by individual teacher trainers, heads of department and authoritative written sources, transmission occurs within educational institutions. It is embedded in the institutions' practices and procedures and it helps to justify and explain those practices and procedures. This suggests that individuals are not only located within but cannot be separated from, their

institutional and social contexts. Further, as chapter four has shown, officially sanctioned policies and discourses, through affording both general and specific racial categories, have a direct input into the institutionally structured racism of schools.

Some of the above discussion concerns explicit prejudice involving beliefs of superiority/inferiority but much of it concerns implicit beliefs about difference. It is that phenomenon that the concept of "unintentional racism" employed in the Rampton Report(118), is supposed to address. The report responds to many West Indians citing racism as a major cause of educational underachievement by conceding that both intentional and unintentional racism exist. But it stresses that few teachers are explicitly racist even though some may "unintentionally" be so(119).

This racism, according to the report(120), takes the form of teachers believing that West Indian pupils are inevitably a cause of difficulty and therefore adopting negative or patronising attitudes. Also, it argues that teachers expectations of those pupils achievement are low and this becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Official teacher reaction to this view has been interesting. The NUT states that,

"While the Union notes that the Committee alleges that a small minority of teachers are racist, we totally reject the view that teachers allow racist views to percolate through in their dealings with pupils."(121)

In this quote it is possible that the use of both "racist" and "racialist" is designed to convey a fine distinction but if so, which distinction are they employing? Equally vague is the level of intention that "percolate" is designed to imply. Amid this confusion the union implicitly accepts the existence of unintentional racism and suggests that the answer to it,

"...lies in more adequate preparation of teachers for their role in educating young people in a multicultural society."(122)

The NUT therefore sees unintentional racism as a technical problem of preparation, information and increased pedagogic skill.

The Rampton Report, through its emphasis on 'unintentional racism', invites a response focused on changing the individual. It does this, as Mullard points out(123) in parallel with gently chastising teachers, schools, LEA's and the DES for lack of action but not for being part of the problem.

The AMMA(124) takes up the distinction between explicit or intentional racism and unintentional racism but it seeks to define this as being between "racism-defined-by-intention" and "racism-defined-by-effect". It concurs with the Rampton report by claiming that the latter is more prevalent(125). The second category is the AMMA's version of unintentional racism but it then chooses to refer to it as "institutional racism" arguing that that term removes the danger of 'vilification'.

This is a positive step to the extent that individual teachers may react less defensively but the new label does not involve a change of emphasis from the individual to the institution as the source of the problem. The familiar entreaties for "mutual knowledge, understanding and tolerance" substitute for both critique and strategy. The institution remains unchallenged but the individual is now also beyond reproach.

The concept of "unintentional racism" refers to specific processes, understandings and practices within the school which, because individuals are institutionally located and their practices institutionally structured, should be included in the designation of "institutional racism". Also, although the failure to separate beliefs and actions undermines clarity in analysing racism in schools, teachers do have power over pupils, derived from their relative institutional location and allowing their "unintentional racism" to inform their actions.

"Institutional racism" is to be preferred to "unintentional racism" for two further reasons. First, "unintentional" is equivalent to "non-culpable" but failure to act or acting

through non-decisions are ways of exercising power which maintain racist procedures and structures. Resources, facilities, courses, support and advice are now available in some LEA's for action against non-overt racist processes and effects in schools. Schools do have the power to change many aspects of the life of the school. To fail to do so contributes to the neutralisation and marginalisation of those who challenge racism; by refusing to back anti-racism, schools fail to make anti-racist activity legitimate.

Secondly, the individual focus of "unitentional racism" promotes a strategy of personal change based for example on improved training and Race Awareness Training(126) rather than attempting to model the processes and structures, aims and effects, informal and formal relations of the school which provide the fabric into which racism is woven.

Institutional Racism.

The concept of institutional racism is important if the racial context of schooling is to be related to its processes and organisation, it offers the possibility of significant advance. But as Troyna and Williams(127) have pointed out, it has been applied in an indiscriminate way.

One necessary clarification depends on distinguishing between different 'levels' of the institutionalisation of racism and identifying the relation between them. These levels are: the particular educational institution - the school, the educational structure and the general institutional racism of the social structure. In the anti-racist critique, the latter, referred to as "structure", has been emphasised and the other two levels "read off" this determining level(128). It is not the dominance of this level that I wish to question but the assumption that other levels can be "read" directly from it.

Carby, in seeking to emphasise the general racial context, makes a similar distinction:

"A distinction has to be drawn between attempts to confront racism by changing educational policy and an understanding

of educational racism as one instance of institutional racism in the context of other forms of institutional racism within a racist society."(129)

However, Carby does not see that that distinction necessitates the close examination of the relationship between the general racial context and the form racism takes in education. A general institutional racism does exist, although this might be more accurately called structural racism, but education is not just an 'instance' of this. One must not assume that the former determines the latter.

The opposite tendency to the above poses problems of a different kind but of a similar magnitude. For example, the Scarman Report(130) recognises the possibility of institutional racism occurring through the practices that public bodies adopt unwittingly discriminating against blacks. However Scarman could only view racism as a contingent feature of social and economic organisation and structure. He was also forced to distinguish between his recommendations on policing and his comments on other areas of social policy. Therefore his recognition of institutional racism was limited to particular agencies rather than encompassing the social formation as a whole. A generally racist system thereby continues largely undisrupted and any change of policy or practice is concentrated within policing and law and order.

Willey runs similar risks even though he now aligns himself with the proponents of ARE(131). He stresses the need to examine the processes and procedures of schools for institutional racism(132). This is an essential part of de-institutionalising racism but he considers the institution separately from its context and location:

"A racist institution is quite simply one in which discriminatory rules or systems apply and no one has either noticed or tried to remove them."(133)

He also, is failing to relate the different levels at which the institutionalisation of racism takes place. Both omit the centrality of the relationship between the racial context, the

social role and the processes and organisation of education for the institutionalisation of racism in education. However, it is notable that Willey's account suggests a practice, it has an analysis and strategy which although flawed and limited is more constructive than any derived from Carby's analysis.

Various authors have recently attempted, by focusing on the processes and practices of school, to identify aspects of institutional racism. Both individual and structural emphases can be found. Saunders(134) for example, assumes that racism is a question of believing in one's superiority and that this is a 'colonial legacy'. He then argues that British institutions are invested with such attitudes and values and this leads to discrimination in institutions i.e. institutional racism.

The earlier discussion(135) of the problems of seeing racism as individual attitudes or beliefs applies to Saunders' approach but he does identify some aspects of institutional racism: systems of teaching and learning organisation e.g. sets, streams and bands; 'culture bound' methods and levels of control; cultural differences implicit in school ethos and in attitudes to teachers and to discipline. Each of these would feature in any list of 'what to look for' when trying to identify discriminatory processes or procedures but Saunders is not able to relate them within any sort of framework.

Dorn's(136) work concentrates more on LEA policy activity but he reports similar limitations to those evident in Saunders' discussion. He identifies as common issues for concern, E2L, Mother-tongue teaching, curriculum development, 'Section 11' funding and teacher training and in-service work. Although such measures could contribute to removing racism other measures which would more directly confront racism are often omitted, e.g. positive action on appointments, resource allocation, further education and policy evaluation. He adds that there is also no consideration of the implicit assumptions of the education system that might comprise institutional racism e.g. Church schools' admissions criteria, streaming, suspensions and referrals to special education(137).

Further attempts have been made by ALTARF(138). In their book "Challenging Racism", Betty Hunter(139) stresses staffing aspects of institutional racism. Starting with the under-representation of black people in teaching compared with their over-representation in non-teaching staff, she further identifies, black teachers' promotion and career prospects, their general job situation in schools and the disproportionate number designated as 'supernumerary' &/or redeployed. All contribute to institutional racism, all directly affect black teachers and have implications for how both white and black children learn the school's valuation of black people. They reinforce general societal racism for both groups and by failing to offer positive role models for black pupils leave pupils prey to other racist processes within the school.

It is important however if effective counter-strategy is to be developed to identify how the above are institutionalised. Lynette Hubah(140) claims that for black teachers, the root cause of inequality is the assessment of their competence by headteachers and inspectors. She argues that there is no set pattern of precise criteria for promotion, it is a variable and subjective decision and therefore open to misuse.

Hubah is correct for those particular headteachers and inspectors who are racist because informality and inexplicitness may provide a cover for prejudice. However many headteachers and inspectors would defend themselves against such a charge by citing the criteria they claim to have used. It is those criteria that need close scrutiny because they may well embody assumptions about how competence is demonstrated and judged, about priorities, aims and objectives that are culture-specific and work to the disadvantage of black people.

Those criteria will form a received knowledge which guides and justifies certain practices. They are institutional to the extent that they are systematically propagated within the institution and to the extent that they perform a function necessary for the continuance of that institution. They are

employed and carried out by individuals but are to a great degree independent of them.

Shallice refers to broader concerns in reporting on the development of an anti-racist policy in an ILEA girls school(141). She identifies various types of 'covert racism' in order to answer the question "Is the institution racist?". She lists, school meals, relatively few black teachers, cultural ignorance, the unawareness of the pressures facing black girls outside of the school, that the curriculum is not culturally diverse, stereotypes and negative images, Christian bias in assemblies, language and racist idioms, low expectations and different treatment of black girls.

Many schools will demonstrate some if not all of these features and will also operate discriminatory systems in the area of discipline and pastoral care where, reflecting dominant approaches, black children will be seen as problems per se. Control will become the major criterion of success, not educating pupils to fulfill their potential and to oppose racism and discrimination.

From the many facets and processes of institutionalised racism listed above one begins to see the number and variety of aspects of the education system and of school life that have to be examined, as well as the location and function of schooling in general. I have stressed the importance of locating beliefs and actions which discriminate within the structure of school as an institution however what I have is still little more than a composite list of processes etc. It is necessary to categorise these and offer some sort of framework or model within which their relative significance and the relations between them can be understood.

A Model of Institutional Racism in Education.

A model(142) of institutional racism in education should include three main facets. First, the operation of schooling in the context of a racially structured social formation, racist culture and racist ideology. Secondly, the socially reproductive role and effects of the system of schooling. Thirdly, the organisation, processes and practices of schooling itself. The theoretical problem is to show how the first two provide the context, background, content and social meaning of the third. It is necessary to show how the three aspects are related.

The first part of the model has been stressed in the radical critique of MCE. The social formation as a whole has a racial structure. Structural racism is secured through employment, housing, domestic law, immigration law, social benefits, general life chances and standards of living and the exclusion of black people from positions of power in key structures and institutions.

The second aspect also features prominently in the radical critique. Education is seen to aid in the reproduction of the social and racial structure. Troyna and Williams(143) identify two aspects of this, cultural and ideological reproduction but I would wish to add to this, the reproduction of the racial division of labour. I would therefore argue that education does play a direct role in the creation of structural inequalities.

Some features of educational organisation and practice are about race or work through race. Many features are 'racially neutral' but they, through their location in a racist social context, may be racist by omission or racist in effect. The 'indirectness' of educational reproduction depends on the processes and practices of education operating in a heavily racially structured society. In that context, a formally meritocratic system will not challenge nor disturb the racial structure. It will legitimate it through silence and inaction.

But silences can be broken, action can be taken. That the reproductive role of education is mediated and indirect means

that it may be contested. The racial structure of society determines that any inequalities of access or levels of resourcing and provision in education lead to racial discrimination in and through education. But this can be challenged. An awareness of context can lead to equitable distributions of access and provision. Similarly, processes and structures that are racist by omission or racist in effect can stop being 'racially neutral' and work to combat racism.

This role for education in the reproduction of racism shows the importance of the third component in the model of institutional racism in education. It has been largely ignored and never integrated into a structural, anti-racist approach. The structure and organisation of the education system and of schools themselves, operate systematically to reproduce, transmit and allow a racist structure, culture and ideology. The immediate or direct cause, but not always the source, of this is the organisation of educational provision and of the school. All aspects of educational life are implicated in this: structure, organisation, and relations; processes and practices; understandings, educational knowledge and belief.

The previous section gave an indication of the types of structures and processes involved but as I pointed out, a framework of categories, a 'model' of the institutional features of racism, was still lacking. To begin this task, I suggest the following twelve categories, arranged in three groupings, into which the features identified can be placed.

Structures, procedures and practices:

1) Relations between educational institutions. This is the most general level and involves the system and organisation of educational provision within an LEA. A number of features can be relevant: the availability of 'choice' between voluntary schools, selective schools and 'comprehensive schools'(144); the co-existence of 11-16, 16-19 and 11-19 schools(145); the location of institutions in relation to the local 'racial demography'(146) organised through the designation of catchment area or primary - secondary links; bases and

processes for school allocation, selection and dislocation (special education, special units etc.) and other determinants of differential access.

2) Relations between schools and parents and between teachers and parents. Both relations are predominantly black - white relations. The government and control of schools is dependant on a system of political representation that largely excludes black people(147). Teachers as an occupational group are also largely white. This leads to white domination of the educational system and control over the content of the curriculum and over educational values and aims. The exclusion of black parents expresses their relative powerlessness and allows a discriminatory system of education to continue.

3) School structure and organisation. The allocation of pupils to different types of teaching groups within the school. This involves banding, streaming and setting; withdrawal and remedial groups; allocation of subjects and courses at 14+ and 16+, examination groups and entries(148).

4) School procedures, processes and other institutionalised ways of completing tasks, performing functions and attaining goals may discriminate or differentiate on the basis of race. They may work through race, or because of assumptions, ethnocentricity or culture-specificity, discriminate in effect. Included here would be systems and practices of discipline, processes and practices for exclusion or suspension, referral to outside agencies - including special units, EWO's and Educational Psychologists - relationships and forms of communication with parents.

5) Institutional practices. This refers to all forms of systematic behaviour which derive their meaning and rationale from their institutional setting. They will often be based on received knowledge, successful pedagogic strategies and both general and subject specific teacher maxims. As examples one can cite, the development and encouragement of different abilities and propensities in different racial and ethnic

groups(149); low standards and expectations; liberal responses to disaffection or misbehaviour.

6) Received 'knowledge' about races within the institution. This will often be found in conjunction with 3) and 4) above and will include beliefs and 'knowledge' about racial characteristics, whether emotional, cultural, psychological, physical or intellectual, which motivate, legitimate and justify discriminatory practices, procedures and processes. These are institutional because the school and other educational institutions are the site of their formulation, dissemination, reproduction and validation.

Curriculum:

7) Overtly racist overt content. This may be predicated on cultural or biological superiority or difference. It can be prescriptive or proscriptive and may occur through omissions or assumptions in any and all subjects. This will link the activities of the school to a colonial legacy of ideas and to the content of a more general racist culture and ideology.

8) Covertly racist overt content. Because racism may also be based on 'difference' any clear distinction between overt and covert racism is difficult to apply. What is covert and what is overt depends on one's understanding of the various forms that racist attitudes may adopt and the justifications and explanations that may be employed. However, categories 6) and 7) between them cover the continuum of explicitness from ethnocentrism, exclusion and marginalisation to tokenistic or de-contextualised cultural pluralism.

9) The "hidden curriculum". Messages are conveyed by racist practices, procedures and structures and so this category will often be applicable with other categories or instances of institutional racism. But one can find examples, such as the existence of positive role models, their authority and status, to show how the relative value of different ethnic groups is conveyed without reliance on other aspects of the institution.

Legitimation and de-legitimation:

10) Inaction over any aspect of racism internal to the institution. The failure to explore, expose, analyse and work to remedy any of the above allows education to continue to reproduce racism and is therefore culpable. It is questionable whether the term "racism" clarifies the role of inaction or indecision sufficiently, but failure to oppose racist structures, cultures or ideologies of schools contributes to their reproduction.

11) Inaction over cultural and ideological forms of racism which are manifested in schools. This concerns the importance of challenging common-sense racism in all school situations and explicit teaching about race, culture and beliefs through a range of subjects. It is an intervention into the racist consensus .

12) Inaction over the effects in school of the structural racism of the social formation as a whole. Clearly, actual 'remedial action' is limited here but failing to recognise the overall racial context of schooling involves a denial of the major determinant of Black British experience. Education will therefore miss the opportunity to develop understanding of the racial structure of the social formation. It will also endanger other aspects of anti-racist strategies through ignoring the major condition of racism. This shows how crucial are links with black communities in the development, implementation and monitoring of anti-racist policies and strategies. It reveals that activity in school to de-institutionalise racism should not be carried out without awareness of and co-operation with, similar activity outside school.

The instances cited cover most of the life and work of the school and show that if racism is to be opposed in and through education then few, if any, aspects of the school can remain unchanged. Each of the levels or instances of institutional racism in the above schema requires different types of action within and by the school.

Apart from the identification of the different aspects of institutional racism the model offers some clarification of two issues vital to the opposition between MCE and ARE. First, is the question of the different emphases, priorities and absences to be found in competing racialised forms of education. Competing priorities indicate or signify different analyses - implicit or explicit - of racism in general and of how it can operate in education. Each racialised form of education therefore articulates causal links between instances of institutional racism, i.e. between aspects of the model. Each prioritises, allows or disallows action on each instance and hence points to a view of the relationship between school and society as mediated by race and racism.

This schema allows one to understand the significance of various analytical and practical shifts within and between different racialised forms. The type of MCE which has been the subject of the 'radical critique' would seek to remedy 6), 7), 8) & 11). Developments from that which refuse the radical critique but accept its emphasis on structural racism, a 'left' multiculturalism exemplified by Green(150), would emphasise 3), 4) & 5) but would retain and act on those covered by MCE. The "anti-racism" of Willey(151) would recognise all seven instances so far included but would add 9) also. This is clearly an advance but it lacks the recognition and emphasis of 12) found in an "activist anti-racism" based on black perceptions, experiences and priorities rather than white institutional solutions.

It is significant that although some awareness of the functioning of 1) could be found in black communities and anti-racist campaigning groups(152), it is not recognised by schools and has not been the object of LEA policies. That omission depends upon failing to recognise the racial and educational contexts of the school as an institution.

The limitations of approaches which omit some of the instances of institutional racism derive not only from an incomplete understanding of racism in education, from the fact

that significant aspects will be missed but also from the effect that certain types of focus may have for the management of racism. Generally, the major opposition between structural and cultural approaches to racism is given its educationally specific form through which instances are recognised and emphasised. In chapter five I argued that the structure and organisation of provision determines educational outcomes to a far greater extent than the content of provision. The model I have put forward shows that the structure and organisation of education are central to the reproduction of racial discrimination and disadvantage. It suggests that a failure to recognise or emphasise those aspects, effectively hides the nature of racism in education. It therefore supports Mullard's contention that MCE deflects attention away from racism and aids in its management. Overall, the structural emphasis of ARE is supported but extended through a focus on the structures, processes and practices of schooling.

The second issue that is clarified by the model of institutional racism is the relation between racism in society and racism in schooling. As I have explained, this has generally been expressed in terms of a model of social structure and a view of the role of education. For MCE, this has involved a pluralist conception of social structure and an assertion of the role of education in promoting and securing equality of opportunities. For ARE, the social structure is seen to be heavily racially stratified and education's role is predominantly reproductive.

In ARE, the simplicity of the model of social structure and the problems of a functionalist account of schooling, have left it open to theoretical critique and devoid of a workable strategy for practice. The model of institutional racism that I have outlined starts to answer in more detail questions of how and why schools are 'racist' and clarifies and gives credibility to the anti-racist case. It shows how equality of opportunity may systematically be undermined through the structures, procedures and practices of schooling.

The identification of the major processes through which racism occurs in schooling, and the demonstration of their dependence on context and function, brings together two aspects of anti-racism: "global function" and "institutional solution". It shows that the former is substantially correct in its conclusions about the racial meaning of MCE but that it simplifies educational processes and hence leads to erroneous strategies to combat racism in education. The model starts to clarify the limits of institutional action by criticising the "racial neutrality" of processes and structures etc. and by locating the 'source' of racism not in the school but in its interaction with the racial-social context and in its relation to the social formation as a whole.

The context of schooling gives rise to discriminatory effects and gives 'racially neutral' processes a racial meaning but the context, through its cultural and ideological aspects, also affords some of the discriminatory 'content' of schooling. This occurs in a number of the instances identified. For example, beliefs about race and about the applicability of racial and other deterministic categories, are employed both directly as educational justifications and guides for practice and indirectly, in educationally specific forms. Such beliefs and 'knowledge' will also feature in the explicit content of the curriculum.

Finally, it is important to stress that the nature of the processes and structures through which racism works in education are such that the form in which it operates in an individual school or LEA will depend upon the specific racial and organisational characteristics of that school or LEA. In other words, although I have offered a general model of institutional racism in education, it must be viewed as a 'situational model' because which instances operate will depend on specific local conditions. In a racially heterogeneous LEA in which different schools have different racial compositions, all twelve instances or aspects of institutional racism may be operating. Whereas, in an 'overwhelmingly white LEA' 1) to 6)

will be unlikely to be significant. This is ironic because it means that MCE may contribute to good practice in exactly those schools resisting its introduction but will be at best cosmetic in the racially mixed inner-city schools where it is found.

Conclusion.

In this chapter I have been concerned to critically develop the "radical critique" of MCE. In chapter four I concentrated on how the radical critique approached the analysis of racialised forms of education and particular initiatives in policy and practice. The focus of my argument was the relationship between theory, policy and practice implicit in the radical critique. A second aspect has been added in this chapter and that has concentrated on how the "content" of MCE has been analysed. Through examining this, I have attempted to explore the assumptive and conceptual base of the radical or anti-racist critique.

The significance of this, or the assumption behind it, is not the same as that implicit in the anti-racist treatment of MCE. I am not attempting to "read off" the meaning or chance of success of anti-racist practices from the theoretical framework that appears to inform them. This difference derives partly from the fact that my critique explicitly denies the validity of arguing in that way but one must also take account of the "oppositional" character of the anti-racist critique and hence of ARE. If a practice is oppositional it requires an articulated framework within which practices can be developed and assessed. Without such a framework, existing "dominant" multicultural interpretations are likely to continue to dominate practice even if the practice is called "anti-racist".

An adequate theoretical framework which makes major improvements to that criticised in this chapter is particularly important given that if one were to follow the view of schooling found in that framework, then no anti-racist

education could be possible in theory, let alone in practice. That analysis of the function and context of schooling implies that the social meaning of all educational initiatives, whether avowedly anti-racist or not, must itself be racist. Or to put this more positively, the anti-racist practice that does exist contradicts in practice the analysis of racism and schooling that it prima facie endorses.

The main concern of this chapter has therefore been the relation between the function of schooling, its context and location within a racially structured social formation, and the processes and organisation of education itself. I have argued that an adequate understanding of this relation is central to understanding the racism of the education system and hence for a systematic anti-racist practice.

The second part of the chapter has concentrated on beginning to develop such an analysis of the educational form of racism. In the model of institutional racism outlined three facets were identified: the racial structure of the social formation, the allocative and reproductive role of the educational system, the organisation and processes of schooling. The systemic racism of education is constituted in the relation between these three.

Structural and cultural racism provide contexts for the racism of the educational system, educational processes are inscribed within this racial framework. It is the major source of the content of educational racism. It also determines the significance of educational processes for race.

The social and economic role of the educational system shows the overall pertinence of race for education. To fulfill certain functions for a social system which has a strong racial hierarchy is to be implicated in the perpetuation of racial inequality.

Racism is institutionalised through the structure of the educational system and through the organisation and practice of schools. Some aspects of institutional racism work through race or have race as their explicit focus, others operate in a

discriminatory way because of the racist, cultural and structural context that inscribes them.

The complexity of racism within education has been raised as a problem not only for analysis but for the applicability of the term itself. No other term presents itself which does not court the danger of omitting some of the processes that contribute to discrimination and disadvantage. But it is important to remember that effective anti-racist strategy depends on understanding the complexity and variety of those processes.

The nature of the relation between the contexts, roles and processes of schooling indicates that the 'instances' of institutional racism will not be significant for race alone. In the context of a society stratified through gender and class also, some instances will work to secure the continuity of class and gender inequality. It is not just about race, it concerns dominance, oppression and inequality in general

Chapter Six. Notes and Reference:

- 1) See chapter four for details of the type of approach that this term summarises.
- 2) This is the type of approach endorsed in the Rampton Report, see especially p.29.
- 3) i.e. to the institutionalised practices and policies that Mullard (1981a) has described as 'ethnicist'.
- 4) See Townsend and Brittan (1972), Little and Willey (1981) and Troyna and Ball (1985b).
- 5) Op.cit.
- 6) Op.cit.
- 7) See chapter four for details of this.
- 8) See chapter four.
- 9) See for example Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.3.
- 10) See for example, House of Commons (1981) p.55.
- 11) James (1983) p.225.
- 12) Carby (1980b) p.4.
- 13) Carby (1980a) p.64.
- 14) Barker (1981).
- 15) Mullard (1981a) p.129.
- 16) See Mullard (1981a) p.133.
- 17) See for example Carby (1980b).
- 18) Op.cit. pp. 12-13.
- 19) See Sivanandan (1985) for a critical evaluation of Racism Awareness Training
- 20) Op.cit.
- 21) Op.cit. p.1.
- 22) Ibid.
- 23) See the discussion in chapters two and three for what is involved in 'structural' concepts of race and racism.
- 24) For a fuller discussion of this see chapter two.
- 25) It is this concept of ethnicity and the use that is made of it that Mullard has focused his more recent critique on. See Mullard (1984b) p.17.
- 26) Mullard (1982) pp.25-26.
- 27) Ibid.
- 28) Op.cit. pp. 3-4.
- 29) Willey (1984) p.12.
- 30) The account in chapter five of the Berkshire policy has shown that it was not this disjunction that lead to explicitly anti-racist policy but pressure caused by local events and action and by national events such as the St. Pauls riots.
- 31) For example, see ILEA (1983b), Berkshire Education Committee (1983a).
- 32) Mullard (1982b) p.26.
- 33) Mullard (1982b) p.27.
- 34) Mullard (1982b) pp.27-28.
- 35) Mullard (1982b) p.21
- 36) i.e. that the analytical or assumptive base discerned in a racialised form both generates specific practices and

identifies the intentions behind the production of associated policies.

- 37) Carby (1982) p.183.
- 38) Mullard (1980b) pp.11-12.
- 39) Mullard (1980b) p.13.
- 40) Mullard (1981a) p.135.
- 41) Mullard (1980b) p.14.
- 42) These official fears have been expressed in a range of ways: explicitly, in terms of consequences for 'Race Relations', with reference to 'disaffection'. For examples see Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1969) pp.6-7; Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.4. para 20; Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977) p.20. para 57; House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1980) p.54.
- 43) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.3.
- 44) See for example Carby (1982) p.195.
- 45) Green (1982) p.23.
- 46) Carby (1980b) p.13.
- 47) Carby (1982) p.194.
- 48) See Tomlinson (1983) p.21 where she claims that, contrary to the arguments of Mullard and Carby, MCE arose out of the educational concerns of classroom practitioners.
- 49) Mullard (1980b) p.15.
- 50) Little and Willey (1981).
- 51) Carby (1982) p.183.
- 52) See Carby (1982) p.191.
- 53) Green (1980) p.20.
- 54) See Carby (1980)
- 55) See Mullard (1981b)
- 56) See Carby (1982)
- 57) See for example Mullard (1984a)
- 58) Green (1980) pp. 21-22.
- 59) For further clarification of this point see the discussion of the development of practice in chapter four.
- 60) This refers to Althusser's analysis of schools as "Ideological State Apparatus" outlined in Althusser (1971).
- 61) Mullard (1980b) p.4.
- 62) Carby (1980a) p.64.
- 63) Dorn and Troyna (1982) p.175
- 64) Op.cit. p.176 quoted from Lukes (1974)
- 65) For a summary of these see Jessop (1982).
- 66) See Dhondy (1981).
- 67) See Willis (1977).
- 68) Green (1982) p.25.
- 69) Ibid.
- 70) Stone (1981).
- 71) Green (1982) p.28.
- 72) Leander (1983) p.36.
- 73) See Rex (1984) pp.42 & 44.
- 74) See Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) p.15.
- 75) Carby (1982) p.197.

- 76) Carby (1982) p.198.
- 77) Carby (1982) p.199.
- 78) This contention will be a starting point for the discussion in chapter seven
- 79) For example in ILEA, Berkshire and Haringey.
- 80) This argument depends directly on the emphasis on the political aspects of class formation which was developed in some detail in chapters two and three.
- 81) As I have argued in chapter four, this idea of the 'inexplicitness' of early national policy on race and education is not without problems but the lack of an explicit racial focus was one of the major mechanisms through which attention was directed away from racism.
- 82) Carby (1980) p.63.
- 83) See discussion in chapter four.
- 84) For a critique of the use of 'cultural deprivation' with respect to social class see Keddie (ed) (1973).
- 85) Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1975)
- 86) Mullard (1982) p.32.
- 87) Dodgson and Stewart (1981) p.42.
- 88) The importance of power relations to the development of a coherent anti-racism will be evident in the model of institutional racism offered later in the chapter and in the discussion in chapter seven.
- 89) See Frances (1984) p.85.
- 90) House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (1981).
- 91) Parekh (1985a)
- 92) Hatcher and Shallice (1983) p.5.
- 93) See Mullard (1984a) p.36.
- 94) See Mullard (1984a) p.36.
- 95) Mullard (1984a) p.34.
- 96) This is a term coined by Mullard and used to refer to this ethnic hierarchy in a Lecture at the University of London Institute of Education, 21.11.83
- 97) Troyna (1985).
- 98) Op.cit. p.209
- 99) See chapter two.
- 100) See chapter two.
- 101) For examples of these, see the school policies contained in ILEA (1982).
- 102) See NUT (1981), AMMA (1983)
- 103) Willey (1984) p.49.
- 104) See note 101.
- 105) Mulvaney (1982) p.1.
- 106) See for example Menter (1984) concerning Avon LEA.
- 107) See for example Mulvaney (1982).
- 108) See ILEA (1983b) quoted by Willey (1984) p.42.
- 109) See Sivanandan (1985).
- 110) Sivanandan (1985) p.19.
- 111) This is not to say that both cannot be 'racist' but as has become clear, it is useful to attempt to develop a differentiated model of racism and to restrict its loose and 'catch-all' use.

- 112) Banton (1970) p.17, defines racism as "the doctrine that a man's behaviour is determined by stable inherited characteristics deriving from separate racial stocks having distinctive attributes and usually considered to stand to one another in relations of superiority and inferiority".
- 113) See Barker (1981).
- 114) Banton (1970) p.31.
- 115) Davis G.(1982) p.4.
- 116) See Syer (1982) for a discussion of the relationship between racism and deterministic thought.
- 117) For example, with respect to the common views of Afro-Caribbean athleticism and the consequent direction of such children towards sports in school. See Carrington (1983).
- 118) Op.cit. p.12.
- 119) Ibid.
- 120) Op.cit. pp. 12-13.
- 121) NUT (1981).
- 122) NUT op.cit.
- 123) Mullard (1984) p.19.
- 124) AMMA (1983) p.14
- 125) Ibid.
- 126) See Sivanandan (1985).
- 127) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.48.
- 128) This view of the relation between the three 'levels' represents a simplification of the nature and location of state institutions which depends on an approach to theorising the state in general. See note 69.
- 129) Carby (1980) p.62.
- 130) Op.cit.
- 131) If one compares Willey (1984) and Little and Willey (1981) Willey moves from a critical or 'radical' multiculturalism to endorsing an explicit focus on racism.
- 132) Op.cit. p.36.
- 133) Op.cit. p.55.
- 134) Saunders (1981) pp.22-23.
- 135) See chapter two.
- 136) Dorn (1983) p.4.
- 137) Ibid.
- 138) Op.cit.
- 139) Hunter (1984) p.23.
- 140) Hubah (1984) pp.25-47.
- 141) Shallice (1983).
- 142) To use the term "model" implies that the analysis offered in this section will outline the full working mechanism of racism in education including the effective relations between levels and instances. I do not claim that that is achieved. What is offered however is more than an unrelated 'list' of aspects. I seek to identify some of the effective links between the context, function and instances of institutional racism and some of the ways in which the different instances reinforce or support each other.

- 143) Troyna and Williams (1986) p.6.
- 144) The situation in and around Reading shows what may happen when 'comprehensive' and selective schools co-exist, see chapter five for more detail. The ILEA provides an example of the discriminatory effects of voluntary schools' selection criteria.
- 145) This becomes relevant to race and class if 11-19 schools are located in predominantly white, middle-class areas and the others in multi-racial, working-class areas. The differences in resources in particular may lead to further divergence in the life-chances of the pupils at the different schools.
- 146) This, as I explained in chapter five, was one of the major concerns of the 'zoning' campaign in Berkshire.
- 147) This can be true for teacher, parent and political governors and will not necessarily change with the provision for greater parental involvement in the 1986 Education Act.
- 148) For some particularly revealing data see Wright (1985b).
- 149) See note 117.
- 150) See Green (1982).
- 151) Willey (1984).
- 152) A prime example of this was the 'zoning' campaign discussed in chapter five.

Chapter Seven. MCE: Ideologies and Practices.

Introduction.

The preceding chapter has considered some elements of an answer to questions about the nature of the educational context and the educational specificity of the development of racialised forms of education, especially MCE. The overall picture has as its foundation a theoretical outline of the racial structure of the social formation. This provides a general framework for interpreting and analysing the racial policy context for multicultural policies, practices and LEA initiatives, and hence their meaning for race and politics. The last chapter attempted to examine how this context and the racial structure of the social formation affected educational practices, processes and organisation. It has therefore attempted to show how, within an educational institution, race and education intersected. In this penultimate chapter, the remaining part of the picture will be illuminated through examining the ideological parts of the educational context. The previous chapter has shown the institutional determinants of the limits and the form of development of MCE. This chapter will show how institutionalised ideologies and ideological views of the institution, and individuals' locations within it, have also affected the limits of MCE and the form in which it has developed.

The educational context of MCE needs further elaboration at two main levels. First, general educational policy which not only provides a background for policy on race but also directly affects the form that racial policy takes. Secondly, the understandings and 'ideologies' that govern teachers' perceptions of their tasks and underpin practices considered adequate for those tasks. The first level will be most clearly evident in the financing and resourcing of education. In particular the last decade has seen a steady reduction in the level of central government support for local authorities and a consequent reduction in the amount that LEA's have been able to

spend on education(1). This affects the introduction of MCE in two main ways: it means that attempts to set up multicultural initiatives are taking place at a time when even existing provision cannot be maintained and so adequate funding for those initiatives is difficult to find; the limited extra funding available through Section 11, Urban Aid or Educational Support Grants(2) for such new initiatives represent most of the few ways in which LEA's can attract extra central government support.

In LEA's with few or no black pupils the two financial pressures combine to make it very difficult, even if they have the will, to introduce MCE in their schools. For LEA's with a significant black population the form in which multicultural initiatives are funded contributes to viewing black pupils as a problem per se(3). If that is compared with the fact that the promotion of racial equality is one of the very few areas of educational policy making that has not been increasingly centralised in recent years, one is led to ask why policy in this area is so out of step with the rest of educational policy. It also suggests that the motivation of both LEA's and teachers should be examined where they have adopted multicultural perspectives or practices.

The adoption, or rejection, of 'multicultural' approaches will depend upon the processes, suggested earlier(4), through which LEA's and schools are targetted as 'having a problem' by official reports and documents. The form in which this message is received and the limits of the actions taken will depend, in part, on the institutional features of schooling identified in chapter six(5). But, as I will demonstrate in this chapter, they are also mediated by general 'philosophies' or approaches to education which inform and direct teachers' practice. These philosophies I will show to be most usefully and accurately understood as "ideologies of practice" (in both Marxist and pluralist senses(6)) which provide the educational rationale, justification and foundation for MCE. They are the basis for the 'acceptability' of MCE to particular groups of teachers,

they proscribe the form and limits of multicultural interventions and allow teachers to re-interpret the concerns of 'official policy' as their own.

If the acceptability of MCE to some teachers is based on important ideologies of practice and if the form in which MCE has been developed depends on these ideologies then they are major barriers to the development of ARE. As an alternative approach to race and education, ARE will require an alternative approach to educational practice in general and will have to challenge existing educational ideologies not only ideologies of race. Without such a challenge, ARE will be interpreted through dominant ideologies and practices and its anti-racist orientation restricted to a theoretical critique and abstract framework.

To further complicate the picture, there is a growing disjunction which Troyna identifies, between policy statements adopted by LEA's and the development of practice in their schools(7). Troyna claims that the existing literature on the 'non-institutionalisation' of MCE in schools erroneously focuses on teachers attitudes. He argues that any disparity should be re-located in a 'broader analytical framework'. Troyna is yet to offer any framework as such but he does refer to two contributory elements: resources and organisation(8). He also mentions, almost in passing, that multicultural changes threaten the professional standing of teachers and base values of the profession. But the significance of this claim is not drawn out, what does it imply for the implementation of MCE in schools? How does it suggest that one should analyse teacher resistance to MCE?

Troya argues that the non-implementation of MCE should be approached through seeing MCE as the "latest progressive innovation"(9). This, he claims, leads to posing a different set of empirical questions:

"...does the limited impact of multiculturalism differ in any sense from the impact of other 'progressive' innovations on the routine practices and arrangements of schools? Can

'resistance' to MCE be explained purely and simply in terms of the 'race' component of this innovation?"(10)

One can also ask whether the acceptance of MCE can be explained purely in terms of race (and racism), or does it need to be related to other educational 'innovations', practices and ideologies? Carby's contention(11) that MCE currently represents the only source of "progressive perspectives" on the curriculum suggests that the relation between MCE and progressive education should be explored. But the link between MCE and progressive education is also raised in arguments and explanations for the ineffectiveness and dangers of MCE. Hatcher and Shallice claim that generally MCE suffers from the same problems as progressivism, a 'warrenist' perspective(12). Carby makes a similar but more damning criticism:

"The "progressive" boom in the industry of multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic teaching materials, journals, departments and organisations was doomed to be myopic, failing to address the issues around which blacks themselves were to organise."(13)

Mullard offers a third strand and counsels even greater caution when he claims that, MCE

"...has been able to transpose an implicitly racist ideology, ethnicism, into the 'progressive' educational ideology of multi-culturalism."(14)

Given these various claims, if one is to decide on the possibilities and limits of the practice of MCE one needs to ask what is meant by "progressive education", what the foci and limitations of that approach to education are and what form of continuity or shared characteristics exist between MCE and PE.

Asking these questions will allow the re-evaluation of the ideological role of MCE. Progressive education will be considered as an ideology of practice. An ideology which, with other ideologies of 'professionalism' and 'autonomy', provides a crucial but as yet unexplored, part of the educational context for MCE. Through analysing this educational and ideological context, a basis can be suggested for the receptiveness and

resistance of teachers to the concepts and framework of MCE. Consequently, this adds another element to the picture of how a racialised form of education is complexly constituted through relationships between the levels of theory, policy and practice.

If ideologies of practice are major determinants of endorsement or rejection of MCE, it will be useful to re-consider patterns of 'multicultural' development and rationales used to resist such developments.

A second task is to clarify the key concept of an "ideology of practice" which clearly has a central role in the analysis that is being suggested. I will explore that through examining the role of certain ideologies in educational practice.

The third section will outline the major characteristics of progressive education in order to show the continuities and shared characteristics it has with MCE. This will be followed by a consideration of teacher professionalism and autonomy. I will show how they have shaped multiculturalism and helped to fix its limits. Further, I will argue that how they interact with progressivism provides an important dimension of the educational-ideological terrain on which MCE has operated.

MCE in Practice: Endorsement and Opposition.

I demonstrated in chapter four that identifying the ideological role of 'official policy' resolves an apparent contradiction between the limited dissemination of MCE and its current status as the dominant racialised form of education. But, although the extent of multicultural practice is accurately described as 'partial and incomplete' or 'limited in scope and seen as peripheral to the main work of schools'(15) there is also evidence of increasing levels of activity in both policy and practice(16).

Within this general scenario of uneven, heavily localised and changing development, it is necessary to make a number of distinctions to show where initiatives are taking place and what their characteristics are. One pattern that is evident is

the existence in the primary sector of different emphases and priorities to those in the secondary sector(17). Also of significance is the comparison between different subject areas within the secondary curriculum. Some subjects such as English and Social Studies have readily made themselves sensitive to the racial or ethnic make-up of the pupil population but others have resisted such changes through claiming a 'neutral' or 'objective' content.

Differences between subjects in their degree of culture specificity can be identified and clearly the content of some subjects will lend itself to 'multicultural' revisions more readily than others. Intrinsic differences between subjects explain, to a certain extent, the pattern of development of MCE. However, the apparent validity of that explanation depends, in the first place, on the curriculum development emphasis of MCE. The concern, prevalent in MCE, with the overt content of subject curricula has directed the attention of teachers to the assumptions, biases and omissions relevant to race which have been operating in their subject area. This is a corollary of the cultural pluralist basis of MCE which focuses on the cultural content of the curriculum rather than the processes, practices and structures of the school.

The limitations of MCE in its restrictive understanding of racism and discrimination, the absence of a concept of institutional racism, underpin its failure to achieve the often espoused aim of affecting all areas of the curriculum. It is possible, as recent initiatives have shown(18), to find ways of revising mathematics, science etc. in order to reflect and promote a multicultural society but even though these changes do represent improvements and arguably lead to the development of a 'better' education(19), they often appear tokenistic, contrived and peripheral to opposing racism. If curricula change were one aspect of institutional change, a part of a comprehensive strategy for de-institutionalising racism, such revisions could be seen as sensitive and educationally sound. While they are portrayed as the major way in which teachers

are asked to contribute to opposing racism, serious doubts must continue about their importance or relevance.

A second basis for the pattern of development of MCE in secondary education is, I would argue, the extent to which the values and aims of progressive education have become part of the official and dominant framework of the subject in question. James'(20) observations concerning the pattern of multicultural revisions of school subjects would seem to support this contention, although his point is somewhat different. He argues that introducing new items into the curriculum will affect the "overall structure, coherence and progression of a well-thought-out curriculum". He claims that,

"It is no co-incidence that, in practice, it has proved easiest to introduce 'multicultural' content into those areas of the curriculum which do not have (or have widely abandoned) a clear-cut sequential structure."(21)

He puts English, Religious Education and Social Studies into this category but the analysis of 'progressive education' that follows will show that the implicit critique of the 'sequential structure' in current approaches to these subjects indicates an acceptance of central tenets of 'progressive education'. A critique of hierarchical learning complements other values and aims of progressivism and it does not necessarily mean that there is a lack of structure in the learning process.

The pattern of adoption of MCE depends on understandings of the nature of both MCE and the task and the role of the teacher and the school. This is clear if one examines the justifications that have been used to excuse the lack of action by most LEA's, schools and teachers. A number of categories of justification can be identified. First, racist views, prejudices and stereotypes which implicitly or explicitly oppose the general aim of equal opportunities. Secondly, the 'colour blind'(22) approach which suggests that the best way to promote racial equality is through the denial of disadvantage and discrimination. This is often supplemented by the claim that MCE or ARE, in raising the issue of racial equality and

racial difference, creates or exacerbates racial tension(23). Thirdly, arguments that claim that MCE is 'inappropriate': to school, because it contradicts ethos and values(24); to the pupils, because they are predominantly white(25); to the subject or discipline, because of the 'neutrality' of its content(26). Fourthly, 'practical' objections which argue that either insufficient time or resources are available or that school cannot affect racial disadvantage or discrimination(27).

This is not an exhaustive list of justifications which may be used and many of them have appeared in previous discussions. However, it is useful to summarise them in this way because of the way in which they relate, on the one hand to the pattern of development of MCE and, on the other hand, the institutional features of schools outlined in chapter six.

When discussing the components of a model on institutional racism in education I suggested that they were relevant not only to racism in education but also to the extent and the form of the development of MCE(28). In that discussion I commented on the problems of calling all of the processes and practices "racist"(29) and, as Troyna argues(30), similar problems appear if all justifications for resistance to MCE or ARE are categorised as evidence of 'teacher racism'. In this context, Troyna poses the question of how one analyses the non-institutionalisation of MCE in schools. To this I would wish to add the question of how one explains the form in which MCE has been institutionalised in those areas where it has been endorsed. I hope to show that the justifications listed are better understood if they are approached through the intersection of ideologies of race and ideologies of educational practice.

Ideologies of Practice.

I have argued that the reports, documents and statements that make up MCE at the level of national state discourse were part of an attempt to minimize the consequences of black

underachievement for the stability and cohesion of British society as a whole. It was therefore placed within an overall requirement to secure ideological dominance as an integral part of continued material dominance. On this basis, MCE as 'state policy' was identified as having, among other things, an ideological role or as being itself 'an ideology'.

When one focuses on MCE as school practice, one needs to ask whether at that level also the defining characteristic is 'MCE as ideology'. At that level, MCE can be viewed as constituted through overlapping sets of values, aims and beliefs but it must also be recognised as a set of practices, maxims and working understandings about race and education which are often not fully articulated or developed. In the context of the various meanings and aspects of ideology(31) it becomes clear that 'MCE as ideology' includes articulated beliefs, values and arguments, "common-sense"(32) and practices. I hope to demonstrate that this sense of 'ideology of practice' also applies to the other educational ideologies to which I have referred. It will become clear that 'progressive education', 'professionalism' and 'autonomy' share various aspects, articulated, common-sensical or practical, of MCE as an ideology and through these have profoundly affected the form and the extent of its development.

I have referred to the problems in applying epistemological categories of truth, falsity and mis-representation to the ideational content of ideologies(33) but when considering each of the 'ideologies of practice' it will become clear that their 'ideological' nature depends on a shared mis-representation of the relation of schools, and teachers, to the demands and needs of the wider society. However, this mis-representation is not only to be found in an articulated or common-sense form, it is also embodied in educational practices, it is material, woven into the fabric of educational institutions.

The 'ideologies' mentioned are ideologies of practice in the sense that they represent practice in an unproblematic way, they portray practice as a matter of common-sense. But they are also very practical ideologies because they hide the contradictory(34) nature of the teachers' and the schools' social location and role. As such they not only represent practice as common-sense, they also allow the teachers' and the schools' role to be interpreted in a practical way.

This characterisation of 'ideologies of practice' is obviously a very general one. It is yet to become clear how relations between ideologies and practices are played out in schools in the ideologies of 'progressivism', 'professionalism' and 'autonomy'. However, it is important to point out that no ideology is totally coherent or internally consistent. Some of the contradictions in each will become apparent but more than that, educational ideologies combine to provide the context and foundation for multicultural practice in considerable tension, with contradictions and oppositions constantly 'resolved' in practices that embody and represent those contradictions.

Progressive Education.

Progressive education(35) forms an essential part of the educational context and background for the development of MCE. Conceptually and historically PE has been the basis for the form that the practice of MCE has taken. This is true not least because, as Carby(36) points out, progressive teachers are an integral part of an interventionist strategy characteristic of MCE. The similarities go far beyond questions of agency to include a range of both contingent and definitional features of PE and MCE. These features can be collected under the following headings: political context and meaning; values and aims; dependence on the ideology of 'equal opportunities'; view of the social and economic location of schooling; the processes of their 'official' incorporation.

The first question that needs to be answered with respect to any educational innovation or movement is the extent to which it has been established and accepted within schools through-out Britain. The limited and uneven development of MCE has been discussed above and a remarkably similar pattern emerges for PE. The reasons for this will be different but in 1978, when PE as an educational philosophy and practice was perceived to be at its height, an HMI report said that within primary schools 75% of classes were taught with a 'mainly didactic approach'(37). At that time PE was represented as having a major influence on the form that educational provision took. It was the specific target of the 'Black Papers'(38) and along with the more traditional 'liberal' education was denounced by the Prime Minister, James Callaghan, in his Ruskin speech(39). This situation mirrors that enjoyed by MCE currently, it is both limited in the extent to which it is practised but is represented as dominant by critics from the political right. In short, the political construction of PE and of MCE is more representative of social and educational trends in values and aims, more indicative of an ideological battle, than signalling developments in practices and outcomes.

The recent "Honeyford Affair"(40), the writings of Flew(41) and comments in the popular press(42) represent an attack on the limited gains and foot-hold secured by MCE. As a counter-offensive it echoes the concerns of the 'Black Papers'(43) and also reveals similar weaknesses in MCE to those found in PE. Ken Jones, in the only detailed analysis of the characteristics and contradictions of PE, argues that progressive strategies have recently been vulnerable to attacks because of the,

"...equivocation at the heart of their ideas and of their narrow social base."(44)

Both of these charges could justifiably be levelled at MCE.

The values, aims and ideas of PE constitute another strand of continuity with MCE. Like MCE, an organising core can be discerned in PE, but as Jones shows, it is not reducible to a coherent and plainly articulated programme(45). However, in the

form that progresivism was adopted in the 1960's three aims and values were central: child-centredness, relevance and the culture of the child(46).

The emphasis on child-centredness comes from the European strand of PE. Jones(47) argues that the ideas of PE came initially from two external sources, the USA and Europe. The main influence in the USA was Dewey of whose thought Jones(48) stresses two features: that it is an attempt to develop a distinctly modern educational practice, and it is in many respects critical of industrial capitalism.

The European strand of PE emphasised different values and aims to that originating with Dewey. In particular it had an emphasis on 'self-realisation' and the inner growth of the individual. This I take to be the basis of the emphasis on child-centredness, a concern for the education of the 'whole child'. As Sharp and Green point out, the child,

"...is allowed to follow his own interests; in exercising his right to 'choose' he acquires self-control and responsibility."(49)

For Troyna, child-centredness in MCE is a major reason for claiming that it is 'progressive':

"...it accords significance and priority to the interests, needs and experiences of all students."(50)

This link has been used as a justification for the introduction of MCE and for the particular form that it has taken. Some practioners have seen MCE (or MEE) as an extension of child-centred methods(51). Others have claimed that racism contradicts or impinges on the progressive aims of valuing all pupils equally and of valuing the knowledge pupils have gained through common-sense learning(52). These may be seen as 'positive' links between MCE and PE but PE may also be used to defend problematic aspects of MCE. For example, Carby comments on Jeffcoate, a proponent of MCE, that,

"To adopt a positive anti-racist stance Jeffcoate defines as authoritarian, whilst he, he states, is a 'child-centred' progressive."(53)

Child-centredness in the European strain of progressivism is accompanied by an attention to the practical activity of the student which Jones identifies as being,

"...useful in dealing not only with vocational education, but also with the problem of motivation."(54)

Similarly, Troyna identifies as a major tenet of PE that, "...the student should be the centre of the educational process. That is, the motivation, interests and experiences of students should determine the significance and relevance of what is taught."(55)

These two views together form a basis for the contemporary tension between two competing parts of the second value central to PE, "relevance". On the one hand, relevance refers to the needs of society in the narrow, but officially sanctioned sense, of meeting the needs of industry and the demands posed by changes in the production process. On the other hand, relevance is closely linked to individual development and should relate to a student's past and current experiences not just to a narrow range of possible future employment.

It has been argued that although MCE is frequently offered as a 'favour' to black pupils, it is in fact,

"...a form of control, an attempt to regulate their behaviour.. the solution to the problems of teachers rather than a solution to their own."(56)

But this is not peculiar to MCE, it springs from the basic contradictions of the idea of relevance and of improving pupil motivation. Relevance, in the way in which it is understood via the legacy of progressivism, involves a belief in the consistency of improving both motivation and intrinsic worth to the student, and their life-chances and employability. That is the dilemma and contradiction that Jones identifies lying at the heart of all progressive innovations.

"Relevance" has been a central value in MCE and it has largely been assumed that it will improve motivation and hence achievement. It suffers from the same problems as PE but has the added difficulty that a comparison can be made, as Leander

shows(57), between the underachievement of "West Indian" children in Britain with its 'irrelevant' curriculum and their achievement in the Caribbean with a similar curriculum.

Child-centredness and relevance as educational values and aims make up a major strand of continuity between PE and MCE. But they are unable to provide a consistent basis for practice or policy in either. The problems, the contradictions in the two values are carried through from PE to MCE. As Sharp and Green argue,

"...the educational ideology of child-centred progresivism fails to comprehend the realities of a given situation of a stratified society."(58)

By focusing on the individual child and by employing an individualistic and de-contextualised version of relevance, PE and MCE mis-represent the social context of the child's experience and of pedagogic practices and objectives.

A third value which plays a central role in PE and in MCE is "culture". I have shown(59) how a particular, limited concept of culture is part of the foundation of MCE. A remarkably similar concept can be found in PE. Jones argues that the form of PE that developed in the 1960's largely discussed educational objectives,

"...in terms of the cultural improvement of individuals and groups."(60)

He adds that,

"It is one of the great unprovens of educational reform that the latter aim offers the best means of meeting economic requirements."(61)

Culture was seen not only as the key to erstwhile deprived and marginalised groups contributing to the modernisation and growth of the country's economy, but it was seen as the major barrier to the educational attainment and hence to opening up opportunity to individuals within these groups. The organising concept and social and political aim in both aspects of this strategy was equal opportunities.

Progressive Education and Equal Opportunities.

The problematic role of 'equal opportunities' in MCE(62) is also found in PE. As part of his characterisation of PE, Jones(63) identifies four elements common to PE and to a strategy based on equal opportunities: they believe that reform can both enhance individual students lives and serve the needs of the nation and industry more effectively; they were both cultivated and rested on a cross-class consensus; they both assume that education is, in ideological terms, neutral or capable of being rendered so; both are official ideologies.

The first point would not seem to apply to MCE in the way in which it does to PE because MCE is located within an attempt to re-structure politically in the context of an "economic crisis"(64) whereas PE developed at the same time as an attempt to re-structure production at a time of economic boom. However, the other three elements, if correctly attached to PE, are revealed as further evidence for a close similarity between MCE and PE.

Jones argues that the first characteristic of PE, equal opportunities, has been the organising concept of educational reform for the last 50 years. It has sought,

"...equal access for all social classes to education, so as to equalise the occupational chances of the individuals who comprise those classes."(65)

He argues that this has implied the acceptance of relations of production and inequalities of class which affect these outcomes. The class structure of society is not questioned. Equal opportunities exhibits a divisive concern with individual educational outcomes, it is not defined in terms of the advancement of the class as a whole and it offers the opportunity to escape from working-class life(66). If one now recalls the earlier discussion of the role of equal opportunities within MCE, it becomes clear that in each of the above three criticisms "class" could be replaced by "race". In each, formal equality of opportunity does little to affect the source of existing inequalities, nor is it supposed to. In PE

and MCE the terms used, their meaning and their social and political significance are the same. The values of PE and the practices they underpin and justify, provide the foundations on which the practice of MCE has been constructed. They have allowed the articulation of the concerns of the state in a way which connects with the concerns of the educational system.

Location and Incorporation.

That articulation introduces the two final elements of continuity between PE and MCE: first, understandings of the social and economic location of schools, and secondly, the process of incorporation that has applied to each type of educational innovation.

In his analysis of equal opportunities and progressive education as aspects of a strategy of educational reform, Jones identifies as a major weakness their lack of concern with the relation between education and the economy. He argues that the division of labour has profound effects on the organisation of schooling and hence on the experience that the majority of the working population have of school(67).

Again parallels with the limitations of MCE can be seen. School is deeply affected and constrained by the racial structure of society. Both MCE and PE attempt to regulate the outcomes of a system which is built upon the need to differentiate. That need, when interpreted through the parameters of stratification operating in society as a whole, determines the lines along which school will differentiate and is consequently a major barrier to actual equality.

The economic context of education raises complex questions of whose interests educational reforms serve. These PE and MCE ignore. Jones argues that PE is incoherent in its view of whose interests it serves and this has assisted in the absorption of its radical criticisms of state schooling into projects of modernisation(68). He claims that the reforming movement in general had no organic links with those whose interests it claims to represent. This is also the case with MCE which, as

a practice, developed primarily out of the concerns of educationalists(69) and hence has met mostly distrust and criticism from black communities(70). In both types of educational reform, this lack of popular support has meant that when the limited, and often symbolic, gains of reform come under attack, the forces necessary for their protection and extension fail to materialise.

It has been made clear that one of the major tasks within the analysis of MCE has been the exploration of the relation between the concerns of practioners and those of the state. For PE the relationship will be different to the extent that the needs of modernisation determined a general expansion of educational provision and a receptiveness to educational innovation. However, the practice of both MCE and PE seeks in part to exploit state concerns whatever the motivation behind those concerns. This is the strategy of taking policy and policy makers at their word espoused, for example, by Green(71). But Jones identifies the danger in this approach when he asserts that the exploitation, by PE, of new found state concerns led to,

"...an over-estimation of the benevolence of the state, the autonomy of the school and the durability of progressive gains."(72)

The problem so well exemplified in MCE is how the practice and the practioner is in turn exploited and incorporated in to a 'project' that may run contrary to their aims. But the incorporation of the practice of MCE, or more accurately, its failure to breach the limits prescribed by the framework employed in official discourse, is not a direct product of the 'state nature' of educational institutions and teachers' location within them. It derives from the convergence of state explanations and ideologies with the practical ideologies of teachers and from the contradictions at the heart of MCE as an ideology of progressive practice. These contradictions express but conceal the tensions between 'teacher autonomy' and the 'state nature' of educational provision. They allow the

educational aims of MCE to ignore the structure of production and the division of labour.

The strands of continuity between MCE and PE underpin much of the practice and value base of MCE. The significance of that continuity is that if its racial, social and economic context makes MCE 'necessary' as practice and articulated ideology(73), then its educational context, particularly the legacy of PE, makes MCE possible as both.

The themes, values, aims and above all, the limitations of PE are continued in MCE and have shaped it both as ideology and as practice. The vulnerability of PE and MCE to attack from educational 'traditionalists' and to incorporation into strategies for the control and dissipation of dissent derive from the contradictions they share as ideologies of practice.

Making the linkage between MCE and PE in this way forms another aspect of a radical critique of MCE and hence it has implications for an alternative anti-racist practice. It shows that if ARE is to supplant MCE and become a practice that overcomes its limitations, then ARE will have to grapple with the contradictions and absences at the heart of MCE and PE. That project will involve addressing questions about educational values, practices and relationships which are rarely present in anti-racist writings. It is clear that neither progressivism nor any other current educational philosophy provides an adequate general framework or foundation for anti-racism.

That point will be re-inforced in the next section when I examine the educational ideologies of professionalism and autonomy. The form and limits to the development of MCE and PE, are not only products of the contradictions and implicit errors of social analysis that lay at their heart, they also stem from the tensions and oppositions that exist between PE or MCE, and professionalism and teacher autonomy. I hope to show how professionalism and autonomy have directly affected how progressive, and subsequently multicultural, aims and values have been interpreted in particular, limited ways.

Professionalism and Autonomy.

Teacher professionalism and the professional status of the teaching force, play an increasingly important part in how teachers perceive themselves and how they are publicly viewed and valued. To seek or claim professional status for teachers involves an attempt to delineate a set of rights and responsibilities with respect to how they do their job and in relation to parents and statutory educational bodies. Through this, professionalism becomes a yard stick or framework within which teachers' behaviour is judged and to which it is expected to conform. The issue of teacher professionalism is currently most evident in the public debate around teachers salaries and conditions of service. But the struggle over the designation of teachers as professionals also has profound implications for the form in which educational innovation takes place and for the limits that are placed on that innovation. In particular, teachers have tended to react to attempts to instigate 'multi-cultural' reforms via conceptions of their own rights and role which have been predominantly based on an understanding of their professional status.

In order to substantiate that claim it is necessary to clarify what a profession is and to indicate what it means to have professional status. Within the literature three alternative approaches to specifying what professions are can be identified: definitions using 'objective' criteria, characterisations depending on moral and subjective criteria and those which view professionalism as a 'folk concept'(74).

As an instance of the first type, Becker(75) quotes one definition of a profession: it must be intellectual, carrying great personal responsibility, learned, practical, have a technique able to be taught, strongly internally organised and motivated by altruism. This is an approach which emphasises features of professional practice but many other approaches have stressed the structure and organisation of professions. Leggatt(76) points out that although definitions vary, the

characteristics cited usually include, careful control over recruitment, training, certification and standards of practice, and a well organised 'colleague group' with disciplinary powers to enforce a code of ethical practice. Each of these approaches has problems. The first because some of the features would arguably not apply to all practitioners of the traditional professions like medicine or the law. The second does apply to these traditional professions but like the first it totally ignores the important aspects of professional 'self definition' and the social processes by which a profession is designated.

One way of recognising the subjective and social aspects of professionalism is to claim, as Flexner does in order to qualify his 'objective' characterisation, that "what matters most is professional spirit"(77). This emphasises the extent to which professional status involves individual and group responsibilities and hence the idea that "profession" is "a term of individious comparison and moral evaluation"(78). Status is thereby conferred through an assessment of the morality and responsibility of the members of a profession. It is clear however, that there is no consensus, except for the traditional professions, as to which of the many claims to professional status are in fact justified. Gaining that status is the object of public debate and struggle and represents an attempt to re-define the position of an occupational group to the advantage of its members.

This indicates that it is not sufficient to do as Becker suggests and to apply the term "profession" to those who have gained and maintained the possession of that 'honorific title' and hence treat it as a "folk concept". This approach is useful to the extent that it indicates that professional status has no specific content but depends rather upon history and the power of the profession to protect its status. But what is missing from Becker's concept is any sense of the process by which different statuses are contested and conferred.

Becker is correct to say that 'profession' is used as a symbol in many ways, by different kinds of people and for

different purposes(79). But professional status is consistently linked to high esteem and prestige for the professional and for the knowledge they are perceived to hold. Consequently, professionals are free of 'lay control'(80). As a symbol rather than as an indication of specific properties, it contains an ideology which provides a justification and rationale for autonomy(81). It may therefore be used to protect 'the professionals' from popular control and accountability. If one recalls earlier emphases(82) on changing the relationships between teachers and black parents, the professional status of teachers will clearly be of central importance to ARE.

Sociological attempts to decide whether teaching is a profession usually depend on one of the above approaches to professions in general. Given my emphasis on the social construction of professional status it is clearly difficult to say once and for all whether teaching is a profession. Within various attempts to specify 'objective' features there is a consensus that teachers do not meet the criteria for being a profession(83) but subjective and social approaches would seem to allow teachers at least to argue for that status. What is significant is that if teachers by and large understand their own position and responsibilities as "professional" then that will inform how they react to attempts to change the nature of their role. In fact part of their attempt to secure professional status will involve the protection and institutionalisation of their autonomy. Professionalism legitimates autonomy and so proscribes changes in power relations between teachers and parents which are fundamental to accountability and ARE.

Teacher professionalism has influenced the reasons for the practical development of MCE as well as the form it has taken. Syer argues that the professionalism of teachers is inseparable from social control, their proficiency is judged by their class-room and general control(84). Professionalism as an ideology that prescribes certain styles and class-room objectives leads teachers to seek the development of limited

forms of MCE. So teachers fulfill the ideological objectives of 'state strategy' and accept the terms and concepts of 'state discourse' because of ostensibly 'autonomous' concerns.

The protection of teacher 'autonomy' provides one reason why educational innovations are pursued within the framework of teacher expertise(85). As Jones(86) points out, even at the height of 1960's progressivism, teachers settled for the gains available within the constraints of their professional autonomy. Therefore, when child-centredness and the critique of 'traditional' education conflicted with professionalism and autonomy, the latter dominated and constrained the former. There was no attempt to identify or develop the educational interests common to the working-class, there was little attempt to gain support for progressive practices nor were ideas systematised to facilitate that attempt(87). This major limitation has under-pinned the inability of PE and MCE to defend themselves when they inevitably come under attack(88).

From the discussions of the characteristics of progressive innovations and of teacher professionalism two strands of the ideology of autonomy emerge. First, that schools decide their own objectives and decide their own ways of operating without outside interference; secondly, that teachers as a professional group have autonomy.

In terms of the formal relations that exist between schools and government, whether local or national, it would appear that schools are indeed autonomous. However, the development of racialised forms of education illuminates some of the general processes through which the concerns, aims and initiatives of schools are constructed(89). The social location and role of the school denies it the autonomy that it in principle possesses. The appearance of autonomy depends, as the analysis of PE has shown, upon schools' role and location having effects, and being interpreted, through apparently independent pedagogic concerns.

Similarly, schools would appear to be free of any formal, lay control by their clients, i.e. by pupils and their parents. The freedom of teachers to decide their own class-room approaches and priorities, their control over the interpretation of the curriculum, does represent a limited autonomy but this clearly takes place within the constraints set by agreed syllabi and examination courses(90). Autonomy does not refer to freedom from constraint but to a specific area of control, a specialism, a technical expertise.

This conception of teacher autonomy has underpinned teacher reaction to the challenge of MCE(91). The autonomy of teachers, their specific area of control and expertise has been important in determining whether or not LEA initiatives are translated into class-room action. That autonomy has been defended against the attempts of LEA's to influence and direct teachers' activity. Jeffcoate argues that,

"...the 'customary autonomy' of schools and teachers remains one of its greatest strengths. It is right that curriculum power should be concentrated precisely where the curriculum is enacted, and in the hands of those with the most experience of the business of teaching and learning. No matter how enlightened the content of anti-racist and multicultural education guidelines recently promulgated by several local authorities, they seem to me to represent a retrograde step."(92)

This view of autonomy underpins the 'technicist' conception of MCE(93) and plays a fundamental role in setting limits to 'multicultural' innovation and change. Two specific limiting effects have been important: first, in interpreting the implications of MCE in terms of class-room practice rather than the activity of the school as an institution; secondly, in maintaining the power relations between teachers and parents.

The absence of the second type of autonomy, teachers' group autonomy, is one of the major reasons that under 'objective' criteria, teachers cannot be given professional status. The individual teacher within the class-room has, as I have

suggested, a degree of control over the specifics of their task but teachers as a group have little control at all over the processes of schooling. Their autonomy, given the way schools are organised and the curriculum controlled, only exists in teachers ability to decide how they fulfill the aims and objectives set for them. It is a control over method but even then within implicit limits dependent upon the socialisation role of the school, the responsibility of teachers to maintain control and conceptions of what is desirable and possible.

Autonomy, as a representation of teachers' control and responsibilities, is predominantly an illusion but a powerful illusion never-the-less. It ignores the degree of constraint that teachers work under, their dependence on the social, economic and ideological contexts of their class-room activity. It does however express first, their active role in interpreting those contexts and pressures; secondly, their negative power in resisting direct attempts to launch curricula innovations such as MCE; thirdly, their active power in their relations with parents.

This picture of teacher autonomy raises a number of questions. First, to what mechanisms of control are teachers subjected? To what extent can LEA's enforce MCE against popular consensus and against teachers' wishes? What sort of 'negative power' do teachers have? What other power relations are relevant to the development of MCE and ARE?

I have argued that the professionalism of teachers is socially constructed. It is an object of ideological struggle, a struggle for the construction of 'professional' status, an attempt to re-define the social meaning of teaching and the types and extent of accountability to which teachers are subjected. "Autonomy" expresses in ideological terms, the relation of teachers to various possible sources of control. Both represent articulations of teachers' views of their social location and role but expressed through defining a realm of expertise and a set of responsibilities. Professionalism and

autonomy are ideologies of power relations, mistaking classroom autonomy for structural autonomy, expertise for control.

Professionalism and autonomy as ideologies are socially constructed and hence relevant to how power is contested. It is this that links them into the problems facing the establishment of ARE because ARE is, amongst other things, about the transformation of power relations.

Conclusion: Power Relations in Education.

Power has been an issue in a number of contexts and in a variety of forms so far. In the analysis of racism, I have argued that it is absent from MCE and largely undeveloped in ARE(94). Power has been an important, but largely implicit, theme of discussions of the relation of national policy to LEA and school policy and practice(95). It was also a major theme in the analysis of the Berkshire initiative, underpinning relations of the LEA to the black communities and to schools and teachers(96). In each context, power has been exercised and contested in complex and often indirect ways. But in each situation, teachers' location within this nexus of power relations has been crucial to the development of practice.

The form that multicultural practice has taken, the ways in which teachers have interpreted a range of pressures to develop a multicultural curriculum, have been partly dependent upon the power relations that teachers are involved in and their understandings of those power relations. This has been explored(97) in terms of the effects on teachers of policy statements and reports produced at a national level. I have shown how the effective power relations between official, and popular, discourse on race and educational initiatives depend upon teachers' 'pedagogic' concerns connecting with, and re-interpreting, the concerns of the state(98). Discussion of how power has been exercised by national and local government highlighted certain features of power: how it may be exercised

indirectly or through inaction and non-decisions. But what types of power relations are teachers involved in?

Two types of power appear to be operating. The first depends upon the relations of control and accountability that exist between LEA's and teachers. Power relations between LEA's and teachers are most effectively shown up when the tacit acceptance of shared aims, perceptions and perspectives is questioned by either seeking to introduce innovations perceived to threaten the division of responsibilities. Various historical examples of this are well documented, the 'William Tyndale' school being probably the most famous(99). Further examples are found whenever LEA's have attempted to develop and implement explicit policies on racial equality(100).

If one recalls the Berkshire example(101) and other research into teacher responses to LEA multicultural or anti-racist initiatives(102), it becomes clear that in resisting significant change, teachers have been making use of a 'negative' form of power. This power derives from the formal autonomy of the classroom, from teachers' power over the specific features of the curriculum and pedagogic method. But that power is constrained by the demands of the examination system which, if they embraced a multicultural or anti-racist perspective, would be much harder to resist than the LEA.

The decentralisation of the education system has been used to justify the lack of leadership at national level and the lack of effective change at school level. But the rhetorical inexplicitness of policy, the process of proceeding through non-decisions has allowed the negative power of teachers to be used to resist innovation and refuse the philosophy of 'Education For All'.

A second type of power relation governs teachers' dealings with parents and pupils. Teachers' 'power' over the curriculum and over method is constrained by public opinion, popular concern and "common-sense" about education. This is a major factor in the determination of what is allowed and what is possible at a given time. But the discussion of the ideologies

of professionalism and autonomy has shown that one of their main roles is to limit parental and lay control over what is taught and how it is taught. The form that the struggle to establish anti-racist education takes will be profoundly affected by teachers' conception of their professionalism and autonomy.

It is clear from the earlier analysis of the anti-racist critique of MCE and from problems experienced in developing and implementing LEA initiatives, that if ARE is successfully to be established then the relation between teachers and black and white parents will be crucial.

Autonomy and professionalism provide the framework through which teachers approach parents. The relationship between school and community is dominated by ideas of teacher expertise and the technical nature of any learning problem. This has been evident in much of what has been said about MCE but one feature is particularly important here. The 'exclusion' of black children from aspects of school life has been identified as one aspect of an adequate explanation of underachievement, one of the processes through which this has occurred has been the failure of schools to communicate with and involve black parents. As in many of the responses of the educational world to its own failings, black parents have been blamed for this problem.

The Rampton Report(103) refers to a wide gulf in both trust and understanding between school and black communities. Addressing the discontinuity between the values and cultures, perceptions and expectations, of schools and those of black parents is clearly necessary for anti-racist practice because it expresses the dominance of white middle-class cultures in schools and the powerlessness of black and working-class parents.

Sharp and Green(104) identify several facets of parental powerlessness: lack of choice of school(105), lack of sanctions against teachers, lack of institutionalised authority, poor access to information to assist and develop their criticisms

of school. They also argue that teachers power over pupils goes beyond their power to 'define the reality of others'(106) but also their ability to control and bring sanctions to bear(107):

"Power...is not just the transfer of communications, information and symbols but also the force which lies behind these symbols."(108)

Teachers' power over parents means that good teacher-parent relations are mainly possible when they are conducted on teachers' terms. This may still be true where specific appointments have been made to bridge the gap, for example, the appointment of community liaison officers in Berkshire(109). Such officers are situated between school and 'the community' and hence they can work to further the involvement of black people but they can also either function to lead black people to conform to what the school requires of parents or to substitute for black involvement.

The curricula emphasis of MCE encourages the idea, as suggested by the AMMA and others, that black communities should be viewed as an 'educational resource'(110). If this means that teaching about black histories and cultures in school involves black people then it is clearly better than leaving it to white teachers but it does not change the power structures that govern the relation between white schools and black parents.

Changing how the school is controlled, instituting new structures of representation and involvement would involve changing power relations between schools and parents. The conditions under which access to the school is allowed would need to be changed. Experiences of both pupils and parents outside of the school would have to become more than an object of study that secures the relevance of the curriculum, they would contribute to a continuity of learning in which the school and communities play complementary rather than antagonistic roles.

The problems of black underachievement and the failure of MCE to alleviate them, means that ARE demands a unity of

purpose between black parents and all teachers that transforms the usual 'partnership' founded on the 1944 Education Act(111). The significance of that change is not 'restricted' to black parents and students, the existing 'partnership' has not been working to the advantage of a majority of working-class people for a long time. The necessary increase in parental involvement and changes in the structure of teachers 'autonomy' and accountability would mean a democratisation of education as significant for the reproduction of the divisions and disadvantages of class as for those of race.

The power relations between white teachers and black parents, it should be recalled, constitute one part of the structure of institutional racism. The power that white teachers exercise derives from their location within the institution and from the structure of the institution itself. It is the institution that has the power and provides the foundation for power relations. This re-inforces the point that racism cannot be equated with "prejudice + power" because that formula focuses on the individual and ignores the location of the individual within an institution.

The transformation of power relations in education is both a priority and a pre-condition for the development of anti-racist education. The democratisation of education, increasing involvement and accountability, are ends in themselves but they should also be the means and the guarantee for transforming education. But to achieve that, the influence of progressivism, professionalism and autonomy must be confronted. Without this, the power relations that they encapsulate will deny anti-racist education the popular and democratic base necessary for developing it to the full and defending it when it inevitably comes under attack.

Chapter Seven. Notes and References.

- 1) The main indicator of this is how the percentage of the Gross National Product spent on education has diminished since 1974/5. For details of this see Department of Education and Science (1986) p.111. It should also be noted that the apparent level of spending hides the shift away from provision for all through for example the expansion of the assisted places scheme and TVEI.
- 2) "ESG" stands for "Education Support Grant", a form of specific grant payable by the DES to LEA's the procedure for which is set out in the Education (Grants and Awards) Act 1984.
- 3) See chapter four for a discussion of the 'black = problem' equation.
- 4) See chapter four.
- 5) See in particular the section entitled "A Model of Institutional Racism".
- 6) The brief discussion in chapter two of the development of Marxist models of the structure of the social formation raised as one issue changing conceptions of ideology. As a concept it is clearly complex and problematic. In this chapter it is used quite broadly. Ideologies of practice are ideologies in the pluralist sense of ideational frameworks for practice. However, through using the term I also wish to convey that they misrepresent the structural location and role of teachers and schools but this is not to say that they are false in the Leninist sense. They accurately portray the way practice negotiates the contradictions of its location. Because of this practices are an aspect of ideology and what one usually calls "ideology" is its expression in ideas and beliefs.
- 7) Troyna (1985) p.209 and Troyna and Ball (1985b).
- 8) Op.cit. p.218.
- 9) Op.cit. p.213.
- 10) Ibid.
- 11) Carby (1980a) p.62.
- 12) Hatcher and Shallice (1983) p.13.
- 13) Carby (1982) p.195.
- 14) Mullard (1980b) p.17.
- 15) See Green (1982) p.19.
- 16) See Mullard et al (1983), ALTARF (1984).
- 17) Compare, for example, Sharman (1982) p.10 and Willey (1984) p.8.
- 18) For accounts of these see, for example, Newnham and Watts (1984) and Gilbert (1984).
- 19) Davis claims that MCE is 'by definition' 'good education' and hence that it can be argued for on purely educational grounds. See Davis G (1982).
- 20) James (1983) p.228.
- 21) Ibid.
- 22) See chapter four.
- 23) This is a point made by Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.28 in connection with Headteacher reactions to high-profile LEA

- statements. It is also a 'justification' that I have encountered in connection with school and LEA initiatives.
- 24) See Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.48 where they quote some Church schools' justifications for not engaging with MCE. See also the Rampton Report p.29.
 - 25) See Little and Willey (1981), Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.27.
 - 26) The effects of this are clearly shown in Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.41, where they compare the attitudes to MCE of Heads of 'Arts' departments in secondary schools and their 'Science' counter-parts.
 - 27) See Troyna and Ball (1985b) p.11 and Little and Willey (1981) pp. 10 & 20.
 - 28) See chapter six.
 - 29) I re-iterate that I am not arguing that they are not all 'racist' but that the range of processes is not illuminated by the use of a 'blanket' term.
 - 30) Troyna (1985) p.209.
 - 31) See chapter two and note 6 above.
 - 32) "Common-sense" is used here in the Gramscian sense to refer to consensual understandings which are often implicit and not conscious or articulated. See Gramsci (1971) for example pp.323-330.
 - 33) See chapter two and note 6 above.
 - 34) This contradiction is between the generally 'educative' role of education and its role in differential accreditation and allocation to positions in the social hierarchy.
 - 35) A full definition of Progressive Education is given in the following pages but it is worth noting at this point that one of ways in which it has been 'defined' in popular usage is in opposition to 'traditional education'. The latter being a form of education based on the transmission through a didactic pedagogy of a given and usually unquestioned 'content', knowledge of which was the principle educational aim.
 - 36) Carby (1982) p.198.
 - 37) Quoted by Jones (1983) p.14.
 - 38) See Cox and Dyson (1971).
 - 39) Op. cit.
 - 40) For an account of the long running dispute that followed Honeyford's Salisbury Review articles see the T.E.S. from March 1984 to January 1986. See also Troyna (1986) for a commentary on the affair.
 - 41) See Flew (1984)
 - 42) See Gordon and Flug (1986) pp.30-31 for a brief account of this.
 - 43) Op.cit.
 - 44) Jones (1983) p.2.
 - 45) Op.cit. p.1.
 - 46) See Sharp and Green (1975) p.41.
 - 47) Op.cit. pp.25-29.
 - 48) Op.cit. p.25.
 - 49) Sharp and Green (1975) p.41.

- 50) Troyna (1985) p.215.
- 51) McKone (1983) p.17.
- 52) Mitchell (1982) p.13.
- 53) Carby (1980b) p.7.
- 54) Op.cit. p.29.
- 55) Troyna (1985) p.214.
- 56) Leander (1983) p.37.
- 57) Ibid.
- 58) Op.cit. p.226.
- 59) See chapter six.
- 60) Op.cit. p.40.
- 61) Ibid.
- 62) See chapters five and six.
- 63) Op.cit. pp.3-4.
- 64) The problems associated with this idea are discussed briefly in chapter one.
- 65) Jones (1983) p.52.
- 66) Ibid.
- 67) Op.cit. p.12.
- 68) Op.cit. p.2.
- 69) The implicit distinction here between MCE as policy or official rhetoric and MCE as practice is an important one. The concerns that each addresses have determined the form in which MCE has been articulated at each of the two levels. The convergence between the two can be accounted for by the fact that practice has taken place within an ideology of race and ethnicity shaped and re-inforced by national statements and policy documents.
- 70) See for example, the Rampton Report p.3 and Stone (1981).
- 71) See Green (1982) p.34.
- 72) Op.cit. p.49.
- 73) This distinction between practice and articulated ideology is actually a distinction within ideology, both are aspects of ideology but clarity demands a 'differentiated' concept of ideology which avoids confusing attitudes, 'theories' and practices.
- 74) See Becker (1971) p.92.
- 75) Op.cit. p.88.
- 76) Leggatt (1970) pp.155-156.
- 77) Quoted by Becker, op.cit. p.88.
- 78) Becker (1971) p.90.
- 79) Op.cit. p.93.
- 80) See Becker (1971) p.95.
- 81) See Becker (1971) p.96.
- 82) See chapters five and six.
- 83) See Leggatt (1970) pp.157-175.
- 84) See Syer (1982) p.99.
- 85) A framework which Williams (1979) terms 'technicist'.
- 86) Op.cit. p.82.
- 87) Ibid.
- 88) Jones argues this in relation to the popular appeal of the Black Papers' assault on PE but the same is true of current attacks by Flew, Scruton etc. on multicultural (and anti-racist) education.

- 89) See particularly the account of how specific LEA's and schools were 'targetted' through national documents and reports in chapter four.
- 90) This is particularly relevant where reforms such as MCE are involved because the intransience of examination boards can be used to justify an unchanged curriculum. See the Rampton Report pp.37-38.
- 91) See NUT (1981).
- 92) Jeffcoate (1984b) p.49. See also pp.150 & 171.
- 93) See note 85.
- 94) See chapter six.
- 95) See chapter four.
- 96) See chapter five.
- 97) See Little and Willey (1981) and Troyna and Ball (1985b).
- 98) See the account in chapter four.
- 99) See Ellis et al (1976).
- 100) For an account of this in Brent, see Barrow et al (1986).
- 101) See chapter five.
- 102) See for example Little and Willey (1981) and Troyna and Ball (1985b).
- 103) Op.cit.
- 104) Sharp and Green (1975) p.213.
- 105) This situation changed radically following the 1980 Education Act but the degree to which choice is exercised will vary greatly.
- 106) In arguing this they are criticising a view they ascribe to Keddie.
- 107) Sharp and Green (1975) p.34.
- 108) Sharp and Green (1975) p.35.
- 109) See chapter five.
- 110) AMMA (1983) pp.22-23.
- 111) Education Act 1944 (HMSO).

Chapter Eight. Conclusion

The genesis of this thesis was a desire to progress beyond what was a sterile, polarised opposition between MCE and ARE and so develop a more adequate theoretical framework for anti-racist practice. I have concentrated on the two major components of the anti-racist critique of MCE: a reading of the contexts within which multicultural policy and practice has occurred; an interpretation of the significance of the content of MCE, including any absences. The issue has been not only how one analyses those contexts but also how the relation between them is conceptualised. Consideration of content has also depended on looking at relationships, between context and content, between theory, policy and practice and between national, local and school educational sites.

I have focused on a range of contexts in order to 'locate' the debate between MCE and ARE and so develop a firmer foundation for anti-racism. The first of these is the historical and racial context provided by post-war black migration and settlement. The changes in economic and political relations and the developments in structural racism through anti-immigration legislation and criminalisation are taken in the anti-racist critique as crucial determinants of patterns of educational intervention. In chapter one, as well as outlining the terrain on which the educational response has been conducted, I sought, as a first step in questioning simple causal relationships between contexts, to highlight problems in reading patterns of migration and settlement and restrictions on black immigration purely in terms of the 'needs' of metropolitan capital for black labour.

The tension between the political and the economic, emphasised in the discussion of state control of black labour, is also a key theme in black experience of the organised white working class. Chapter one therefore identifies problems and issues for analysis of the racial structure of the social formation. Chapters two and three explore the theoretical

implications of these problems and issues and attempt to draw out the strands of a problematic within which the structures and relations of contemporary racial domination can be theorised.

The emphasis in the analysis of racial stratification is historical in order to show how relations between black and white labour, and between classes, can be structural but contingent. The aim of establishing a problematic and identifying theoretical and methodological maxims involves prioritising particular theoretical issues. These issues are mainly the relation between race and class; characterisations and explanations of racism and the nature of racial specificity. But Marxist approaches to these problems, the way they have been posed, have depended upon the wider theoretical issue of the relation between the economic and the political. Each of these theoretical areas has suffered from assuming the separateness of 'structuring' processes - race and class, political and economic - and problems of social analysis have been posed in terms of relating distinct social 'objects'. That problematic has been shown to be unable to relate race and class in a way that can accommodate the experiences of black workers in Britain. One is therefore led to ask how black and white labour has been involved in each others history and how this is represented in the institutional and subjective definition of "the working class" in Britain.

This allows an approach to the racial structure of the social formation which incorporates the relation between race and class as parameters of stratification and clarifies what it means to view 'race' and racism as structural concepts. Together, explicating how race relates to class and how racism is structural begin to suggest some of the processes, some of the characteristics of racially specific exploitation and oppression.

The relation between race and crisis has been mentioned but I have not been able to explore in any detail recent theories even though their concerns are very relevant to the analysis

of racialised forms of education. This has largely been dictated by the space available but the issues on which I have focused could usefully be related to the analysis of race and crisis. Although its object of study is a particular conjuncture, theories of racial stratification, racism and the relation of race and class all underpin an analysis of race and crisis but rarely are they explicit. Further work relating race and crisis to the structural legacy of colonialism would allow the development of the framework I have suggested. It would allow one to see how the structural legacy of colonialism is being re-structured through changes in production, criminalisation of black and white communities and direct assaults on the institutions of the 'priveleged' sections of the white working class.

The historical argument I have employed has necessarily simplified that history with a consequent simplification of relationships and developments. In particular, sections of the white working class excluded from institutions and subjective definitions will have a historically structured relation to black labour that has not been explored. Much more could usefully be said of the relation between black and white labour on the basis of a detailed history but my aim has been to establish the importance of that history and to draw out implications for how one theorises the relation of black labour to capital and dominant forms of the white working class within a Marxist problematic.

Consideration of the historical and structural components of the racial context for racialised forms of education involves re-evaluating one of the main strands of the anti-racist critique of MCE. A reading of the meaning of MCE depends largely on theories and assumptions about the features of that racial context. The purpose of the first three chapters is to identify the nature of that context and so pre-empt simple assumptions about relationships and causes. Scrutiny of analyses of racial stratification is one of two main avenues of

critique that I have employed with respect to the anti-racist critique of MCE. The other is taken up in chapter four.

The chapter concerns key developments in national, LEA and school policy and practice and attempts to identify the antecedents of MCE and ARE. But my aim is not only to sketch the historical educational context, I have also sought to question any simple correspondance between changes in educational policy and practice and changes in requirements for black labour and its control thorough anti-immigration legislation. This contradicts the contention of the anti-racist critique that education has followed these broader social changes. My argument depends upon the earlier analysis of the reasons for anti-immigration legislation but further draws upon differences in developments on national, LEA and school educational sites to deny neat periodisations.

Showing that there are disjunctions between educational sites is complemented by rejecting a causal, necessary link between theory, policy and practice on race and education. The discussions of racialised forms and of the Berkshire policy involve an opening up of the relation between these three levels. Rejecting a simple correspondance does not amount to a new account of how the levels interact but the analysis of the Berkshire policy does identify some of its components.

Rejecting a simple correspondance between theory, policy and practice is crucial for how one analyses MCE and for how one assesses the anti-racist critique and its viability as a basis for an alternative practice. Why this is so becomes clear through an examination of two major foci of the anti-racist critique in the next two chapters. The first is a view of the genesis of policy and its relation to practice and the second, a set of assumptions about the relation between racial, structural context of education and the outcomes of educational processes. The study of Berkshire's policy seeks to identify a framework and methodology for 'reading' LEA policies on race. Through a continued emphasis on negotiation and contingent outcomes I argue that each stage of policy production involves

interpretation, re²-definition and the de-limitation of practices. The role of theory for policy and practice is not causal, it operates more to legitimate and de-legitimate interpretations in practice but it cannot determine what happens in subsequent stages of implementation. For values, concepts and aims to permeate practice they will have to be interpreted in practical terms. Inadequacies or lacunae in a theoretical framework may well undermine practice. Theory may suggest appropriate action but unless a theoretical framework is interpreted in educational and in practical terms the action that 'follows' from it is likely to be mediated by ideologies of race and ideologies of educational practice.

The Berkshire study provide a useful empirical basis for general theory about 'anti-racist' policy. But it has not been possible to trace that policy through to practice and so develop the picture of their relation. It would be extremely useful to further extend my analysis by comparing policy making on race with educational policy making in general. Much more would be revealed about how to read policy and how to assess the role of key actors.

The final two main chapters take up in different ways potential barriers to the development of ARE. Chapter six concentrates on the anti-racist critique of the content of MCE, in particular in relation to racism. Through this, I have sought to identify key processes and relations through which racism is institutionalised in education. I offer a model in which the theoretical framework outlined in chapters two and three is related to educational processes and structures. The significance of educational processes and structures for the complex relation between black labour, white labour and capital needs further exploration. The model draws together processes cited in the operation of institutional racism. Some work 'through race' and other derive their racial significance from the context and role of education.

The key argument of chapter seven is that particular educational ideologies, progressivism, professionalism and

teacher autonomy have had significant effect on racialised forms of education. The assumptions, values and social analysis shared by PE and MCE mean that to a large extent the limits of PE are also the limits of MCE. Consequently, if the practice of anti-racist education is not to be bound by the same limits an alternative general educational framework has to be found.

Professionalism and teacher autonomy represent barriers to ARE because they express power relations and so are crucial to the operation of institutional racism. They permeate how teachers conceptualise their tasks and their responsibilities. They encourage a view of racial equality as a technical problem within education and deny the new forms of accountability that are essential for effective equality. As such they are major barriers to the development of ARE and anti-racists have to decide how professionalism and relationships with parents are to be re-defined.

The issues that are covered in the seven main chapters involve consideration of theory, policy and practice. The main theoretical significance is to be found not only in the substantive arguments made but in the approach to theorising as a whole. It is one of the organising themes of the thesis that an adequate analytic framework has certain necessary components and this implies particular methodological maxims. The methodology emphasises process and so uses 'empirical' data, whether historical or from substantive study, to measure the adequacy of theory. This is not to be bound by the observable but it does mean that complexity must be explained not explained away. The methodology underpins how the components of this thesis have been selected and put together. The interaction of contexts and of different sites cannot be read through any one of them alone. The outcomes of processes need to be understood through looking at the processes not through an interpretation of the context of the outcomes.

To the extent to which my arguments have built upon the insights of the anti-racist critique, the development of a framework and methodology has focused on absences and

simplifications in that critique. The major consideration here has been the role of the educational context and content in determining the form taken by educational responses to race and racism. The importance of this was shown to a limited extent in chapter five but was a major theme of chapters six and seven. This, as an essential part of the analysis has been complemented by the methodological tenet that outcomes cannot be interpreted without an understanding of processes and that the 'objective' location and role of key actors', or groups of actors', must be considered alongside subjective intentions and perceptions of their² tasks.

This methodological tenet I see as one of the major points of significance for how one reads policy. Each stage of policy articulation must be considered as active interpretation and negotiation, not pre-determined by earlier stages. Key actors are also active, constrained by their structural location but not mere effects of it. Consequently, when one analyses or seeks to promote educational policies for racial equality, a range of concerns and issues have to be confronted and some strategy adopted. To have an explicit and well developed theoretical analysis of racism and the racial structure of the social formation is necessary but not sufficient. Understanding of racism in education, of the objective and subjective location of key individuals, of what should be on the agenda for action and of what practical measures are required are also essential if the 'analysis' is to be seen through to practical change.

The focus on the interaction of contexts points to the significance for practice of the approach I have outlined. One of its first casualties is a simple functionalist account of the reproductive role of schools and the educational system. But that approach has been extensively criticised and largely discredited anyway. Of much greater significance, are those aspects of institutional racism, some identified in chapter five but brought together in chapter six, which show how structures and processes based on class, help to secure education's role in the reproduction of racial inequality.

This shows some of the limits to racial specificity in education and starts to suggest a basis on which black-white alliances for educational change might be developed. But this rests uneasily within the structural racism of the social formation as a whole. The 'position' of black people with respect to dominant classes and in relation to the white working class has been conceptualised within the structural legacy of colonial relationships. Consequently, although the interests of both black and white members of 'the working class' conflict with the interests of 'the ruling class', there is a material and structural basis for opposition between black people and relatively privileged sections of the white working class.

Effective practice will depend upon an understanding of what type of action is appropriate for a particular problem or objective and what its limits are. One of the major roles of a theoretical framework which examines the relation between the structural racism of the social formation and the institutional racism of the educational system is to make clear the limits to educational anti-racist action. I have argued that an over-emphasis on the domination of structural racism, allied with a functionalist analysis of schooling as a whole, leads to under-estimating the potential for change in, and through, education often to the point of dismissing it altogether. The antithesis of this simplification is to ignore the social location and role of education, and hence deny the racial significance of its many processes, so that the potential of education to secure social change is over-estimated. Both approaches have, as their most likely outcome, cynicism, despondency and defeat.

The limits to anti-racist action within education follow from the model of institutional racism that is adopted. At the most general level, the relationships between different parts of the theoretical framework needs to be understood in a form which will highlight the effective causes of particular educational effects. It must be clear to what extent educational processes are involved and to what extent certain

outcomes arise more from the racial context and general social and structural role of education.

If discriminatory effects and outcomes can be opposed and removed through educational change then one must show what the appropriate sites and units of activity are. When considering how to combat particular discriminatory effects or actions, should one proceed on a school basis, is action by an individual or group of individuals sufficient, or must action be taken at an LEA level?

For effective practice, one must have a clear picture of the limits of racial specificity in education, and see where 'class' processes and structures have 'racial' effects. This involves 'operationalising' a further aspect of the general theoretical framework through showing the effective relationship between race and class in educational structures, processes and practices. This suggests that the exclusively racial focus of some forms of ARE can be a barrier to its institutionalisation. But this consideration must constantly be balanced in presentation and in action with the danger of stressing gender and class parallels, so that the need for specific anti-racist action becomes lost in a sea of 'equal opportunities'.

The limits and pre-conditions for different types of anti-racist action suggest that one should pose the practical problems raised within a problematic of managing educational change. Much has been said of how policies and practices have 'managed' racism and how racism is institutionalised in education but how does one set about institutionalising anti-racism? Elements of an anti-racist strategy can be identified through drawing on the problems and criteria raised in the analysis of policy making. The outline of institutional racism in chapter six begins to model the structures and processes of educational institutions but much more needs to be said about how the institution is managed, how decisions are made, formal and informal channels for communication and consultation, how exactly opposing educational ideologies and associated practices are structured into the school.

To make progress in answering any of these questions would require an understanding of the nature of schools as organisations. This is an area of enquiry which has not featured in the debate between multiculturalists and anti-racists. It seems that a model of institutional racism is essential but to begin to remedy and change those processes and outcomes one must have a picture of how the institution works in general. This relates to the barriers to change identified in chapter seven because the ideologies of progressivism, professionalism and autonomy are not only rationalisations and frameworks for practice, they are institutionally located and validated practices also. One needs to understand what properties or features of the school allow this to be so, how they work and how they can be changed.

Action and change still demand greater clarity within ARE of not only what the limits to action are how but practice is to be conducted. Having criticised MCE for its stress on an impoverished concept of culture and highlighted the centrality of culture for, in particular, black politics, how is culture to be dealt with in anti-racist education? The anti-racist focus on the structural basis for racism has also meant that the potential for culture as a powerful medium of opposition and contestation has been omitted from the anti-racist armoury. How could a dynamic and political concept of culture which had a recognition of power relations at its core, inform and shape the content, methodologies and roles of education?

This thesis does not seek to consider detailed issues of practice but to develop theory, to suggest a framework for reading policies and to attempt to clarify their relation to practice is directly relevant to it. The main aim of this thesis has been to provide some tools with which to escape from an unproductive polarisation between MCE and ARE and in so doing make progress in laying down a foundation for effective anti-racist practice. When that foundation is firm, anti-racist practice may develop with renewed vigour, determination and hope.

Bibliography.

- Advisory Committee for Multicultural Education (1982) Education For Equality. A Paper for Discussion in Berkshire.
[Royal County of Berkshire, Reading]
- ALTARF (1984) Challenging Racism, [ALTARF]
- Althusser L. (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses'
in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays, [NLB]
- AMMA (1973) Our Multicultural Society: The Educational Response
[AMMA]
- Banton M. (1970) 'The Concept of Racism' in Race & Racism,
Zubaida S.(ed.) [Tavistock]
- Banton M. (1977) The Idea of Race, [Tavistock]
- Barton L. and Walker S.(eds.) (1983) Race, Class & Education,
[Croom Helm]
- Barker M. (1979) 'Racism, the New Inheritors' in Radical
Philosophy No. 21
- Barker M. (1981) The New Racism, [Junction Books]
- Becker H. (1971) Sociological Work [Allen Lane]
- Ben-Tovim G. (1978) 'The Struggle Against Racism. Theoretical &
Strategic Perspectives' in Marxism Today, Vol. 22 No. 7.
- Ben-Tovim G. et al (1981) 'Race, Left Strategies and the State'
in Politics and Power No. 3.
- Berkshire Education Committee (1983a) Education for Racial
Equality: Policy Paper 1, General Policy, [Royal County of
Berkshire, Reading]
- Berkshire Education Committee (1983b) Education for Racial
Equality: Policy Paper 2, Implications, [Royal County of
Berkshire, Reading]
- Berkshire Education Committee (1983c) Education for Racial
Equality: Policy Paper 3, Support, [Royal County of
Berkshire, Reading]
- Bourne J. (1980) 'Cheerleaders & Ombudsmen: The Sociology of
Race Relations' in Race & Class, Vol.XXI No.4.
- Brent Education Committee (1983) Education For a Multicultural
Democracy, Books 1 & 2, [London Borough of Brent]

- Callaghan J. (1976) 'The Ruskin Speech' in Education, 22.10.1976
- Cambell H. (1980) 'Rastafari: Culture of Resistance' in Race and Class, Vol.XXII No.1.
- Carby H. (1980a) 'Multiculture' in Screen Education, Spring 1980
- Carby H. (1980b) Multi-cultural Fictions, [CCCS, Birmingham]
- Carby H. (1982) 'Schooling in Babylon' in The Empire Strikes Back, CCCS [Hutchinson]
- Carrington B. (1983) 'Sport as a Side-Track. An Analysis of West Indian Involvement in Extra-Curricula Sport' in Barton L. and Walker S. (eds) Race, Class and Education, [Croom Helm]
- Cashmore E. and Troyna B. (1983) Introduction to Race Relations, [RKP]
- Castles S. (1984) Here For Good, [Pluto]
- Clarke J. et al. (1976) 'Subcultures, Cultures and Class' in Resistance Through Rituals, Hall S. and Jefferson T. (eds.) [Hutchinson]
- Clarke J., Critcher C. and Johnson R. (eds.) (1979) Working-Class Culture, [Hutchinson]
- Commission for Racial Equality (1977) Education of Ethnic Minorities: a Memorandum, Occasional Paper no.3 [CRE]
- Commission for Racial Equality (1978) Schools and Ethnic Minorities: Comments on "Education in Schools", Occasional Paper no.1. [CRE]
- Commission for Racial Equality (1983) Secondary School Allocations in Reading: a Report of a Formal Investigation [CRE]
- Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (Rampton Committee) (1981) West Indian Children in Our Schools (Interim Report), (Cmd. 8723) [HMSO]
- Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups (Swann Committee) (1985) Education For All (Cmd. 9453) [HMSO]
- Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council (1964) Second Report CMND 2266 [HMSO]

- Cox C. and Dyson A. (eds.) (1971) The Black Papers on Education, [Davis-Poynter]
- Cox. O. C.(1970) Caste, Class and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics [Monthly Review Press]
- Craft M. (1984a) Education and Cultural Pluralism, [Falmer]
- Craft M. (1984b) 'Education For Diversity' in Education and Cultural Pluralism, Craft M. (ed.) [Falmer Press]
- Davis A. (1982) Women, Race and Class, [The Women's Press]
- Davis G. (1982) 'Racism and the School Curriculum, Past and Present' in Multicultural Teaching, Vol.1 No.1.
- Department of Education and Science (1965) The Education of Immigrants, Circular 7/65.
- Department of Education and Science (1974) Educational Disadvantage and the Needs of Immigrants, CMND 5720, [HMSO].
- Department of Education and Science (1977) Education in Schools: A Consultative Document, CMND 6869, [HMSO]
- Department of Education and Science (1986) Annual Report 1985 [HMSO]
- Department of the Environment (1977) A Policy for the Inner Cities, [HMSO]
- Dhondy F. et al (1981) The Black Explosion in British Schools, [Race Today Publications]
- Dodgson P. & Stewart D. (1981) 'Multiculturalism or Anti-Racist Teaching: A Question of Alternatives' in Multiracial Education, Vol.9 No.3.
- Doherty S. (1984) 'Anti-Racist Teaching Policies' in Education for a Multicultural Society, Staker-Welds M. (ed.) [Bell and Hyman]
- Dorn A. (1983) 'LEA Policies on Multiracial Education' in Multiracial Educational Review, Vol.2 No.2
- Dorn A. & Troyna B. (1982) 'Multicultural Education and the Politics of Decision Making' in Oxford Review of Education Vol.8 No.2.
- Ellis T. et al. (1976) William Tyndale The Teachers' Story, [Readers and Writers Publishing Co-operative].

- Eisenstein Z. (ed.) (1979) Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism, [Monthly Review Press]
- Flew A. (1984) Education, Race and Revolution, [Centre for Policy Studies]
- Foot P. (1969) The Rise of Enoch Powell, [Penguin]
- Francis M. (1984) 'Anti-Racist Teaching: General Principles' in Challenging Racism, ALTARF [ALTARF]
- Fuller M. (1980) 'Black Girls in a London Comprehensive School' in Schooling for Womens' Work, Deem R. (ed) [RKP]
- Genovese E. (1976) Roll Jordon Roll, [Vintage Books, New York]
- Geschwender J.A. (1977) Class, Race and Worker Insurgency, [CUP]
- Gibson A. with Barrow J. (1986) The Unequal Struggle, [Centre for Caribbean Studies]
- Gilbert D. (1984) 'Multicultural Mathematics' in Education for a Multicultural Society, Straker-Welds M. (ed) [Bell & Hyman]
- Gilroy P. (1981) 'You Can't Fool the Youths...Race and Class Formation in the 1980's' in Race and Class, Vol.XXII Nos. 1/2
- Gilroy P. (1982) 'Steppin' Out in Babylon - Race, Class and Autonomy' in The Empire Strikes Back, [Hutchinson]
- Gordon P. & Klug F. (1986) New Right, New Racism [Searchlight Publications]
- Gramsci A. (1971) Selections From the Prison Notebooks, [Lawrence & Wishart]
- Green A. (1979) On the Political Economy of Black Labour and the Racial Structuring of the Working Class in England, [Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham]
- Green A. (1982) 'In Defence of Anti-Racist Teaching: A Reply to Recent Critiques of Multicultural Education' in Multiracial Education, Vol.10 No.2.
- Hall S. (1977) 'the Hinterland of Science: Ideology and The "Sociology of Knowledge"' in On Ideology [CCCS, Birmingham]

- Hall S. (1978) 'Racism and Reaction' in Five Views of Multiracial Britain, [CRE]
- Hall S. (1980a) 'Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance' in Sociological Theories: Race & Colonialism, [UNESCO, Paris]
- Hall S. (1980b) 'Teaching Race' in Multiracial Education, Vol.9 No.1.
- Hall et al. (1978) Policing the Crisis - Mugging, The State & Law & Order, [MacMillan]
- Hartman H (1979) 'The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism' in Capital and Class no.8 (Summer)
- Hartnett A. (1982) The Social Sciences in Educational Studies, [Heinemann]
- Hatcher R. (1985) 'On 'Education for Racial Equality'' in Multiracial Education Vol.13 no.1
- Hatcher R. & Shallice J. (1983) 'The Politics of Anti-Racist Education' in Multiracial Education, Vol.12 No. 1
- Henderson J. (1978) 'A. Philip Randolph & the Dilemma of Socialism & Black Nationalism in the U.S. 1917-1941' in Race and Class Vol.XX No.2.
- Hibbert P. (1982) 'Funding Inexplicitness: a look at Section 11 and the proposed revised guidelines' in Multiracial Education, Vol.11 No.1.
- Hibbert P. (1983) 'Section 11 Posts: Review or Reform' in Multiracial Education, Vol.12 no.1.
- Hindess B. (1983) Parliamentary Democracy and Socialist Politics, [RKP]
- Home Office (1965) Immigration from the Commonwealth, CMND 2739 [HMSO]
- Home Office (1986a) Statement of Change in Immigration Rules, CMND 9914 [HMSO]
- Home Office (1986b) Circular No 72/1986: Section 11 of the Local Government Act 1966
- House of Commons Home Affairs Committee(1981) Fifth Report from the Home Affairs Committee Session 1980-81: Racial Disadvantage (Vol.1.), [HMSO]

- Hubah L. (1984) 'The Position of Black Teachers in this Society' in Challenging Racism, ALTARF (ALTARF)
- Hunt A. (ed.) (1978) Class and Class Structure, [Lawrence and Wishart]
- Hunter B. (1984) 'Institutional Racism - LEA Action Needed' in Challenging Racism, ALTARF (ALTARF)
- Husband C. (ed.) (1982a) Race in Britain, [Hutchinson]
- Husband C. (1982b) 'Race, the Continuity of a Concept' in Race in Britain, Husband C. (ed) [Hutchinson]
- Hussey M. (1982) 'Education in a Multi-ethnic Society' in Multi-ethnic Education Review vol.1 no.2.
- Inner London Education Authority (1981) Education in a Multi-ethnic Society. An Aide-memoire for the Inspectorate, [ILEA]
- Inner London Education Authority (1983a) Race, Sex and Class. 1. Achievement in Schools, [ILEA]
- Inner London Education Authority (1983b) Race, Sex and Class. 2. Multi-Ethnic Education in Schools, [ILEA]
- Inner London Education Authority (1983c) Race, Sex and Class. 3. A Policy for Equality, [ILEA]
- Inner London Education Authority (1983d) Race, Sex and Class. 4. Anti-Racist Statement and Guidelines, [ILEA]
- Jackson J. (1970) Professions and Professionalisation [C.U.P.]:?
- James A. (1983) 'What's Wrong With Multicultural Education?' in New Community, Vol.10 No.2.
- James S. ((1975) Sex, Race and Class, [Falling Wall Press/Race Today Publications]
- Jeffcoate R. (1984a) 'Ideologies and Multicultural Education' in Education and Cultural Pluralism, Craft M. (ed)
- Jeffcoate R. (1984b) Ethnic Minorities and Education, [Harper and Row]
- Johnson R. (1979) 'Three Problematics: Elements of a Theory of Working-Class Culture' in Working Class Culture, Clarke J., Critcher C. & Johnson R. (eds.), [Hutchinson]
- Jones K. (1983) Beyond Progressive Education, [MacMillan]

- Keddie N. (ed.) (1973) Tinker, Tailor...the Myth of Cultural Deprivation, [Penguin, Harmondsworth]
- Laclau E. & Mouffe C. (1986) Hegemony and Socialist Strategy, [Verso]
- Lawrence E. (1981) 'White Sociology, Black Struggle' in Multiracial Education, Vol.9 No.3.
- Lax L. (1984) 'Anti-racist Policies' in ALTARF (1984) Challenging Racism [ALTARF]
- Layton-Henry Z. (1984) The Politics of Race in Britain, [George Allen and Unwin]
- Leander T. (1983) 'Multicultural Education and the Notion of Rights' in Multicultural Teaching, Vol.1 No.2.
- Leggatt T. (1970) 'Teaching as a Profession' in Professions and Professionalisation Jackson J. (ed) [C.U.P.]
- Little A. (1978) 'Schools & Race' in Five Views of Multiracial Britain, [CRE]
- Little A. & Willey R. (1981) Multi-ethnic Education: The Way Forward, Schools Council Pamphlet 18 [Schools Council]
- Lindsay L. (1984) 'Quinton Kynaston School' in Challenging Racism, ALTARF [ALTARF].
- Lukes S. (1974) Power, A Radical View [MacMillan]
- McKone D. (1983) 'Multi-Ethnic Education Approaches at Ellerslie Primary School' in Multi-Ethnic Education Review Vol.2 No.2.
- Menter I. (1984) 'MCE: Avon's Calling?' in Multiracial Education, Vol.12 No.2. ??
- Miles R. (1982a) Racism and Migrant Labour, [RKP]
- Miles R. (1982b) 'Racism & Nationalism in Britain' in Race in Britain, Husbands C. (ed.) [Hutchinson]
- Miles R. & Phizacklea A. (1977) 'Class, Race, Ethnicity and Political Action' in Political Studies Vol. XXV. No.4.
- Mitchell P. (1982) 'Developing an Anti-racist Policy. The Secondary Experience' in Multi-Ethnic Education Review Vol. 1 No.2.

- Mullard C. (1980) Racism in Society and Schools: History, Policy and Practice, [University of London Institute of Education Centre for Multi-cultural Education]
- Mullard C. (1981) 'The Social Context & Meaning of MCE' in Educational Analysis, Vol.3 No.1.
- Mullard C. (1982a) 'Multiracial Education in Britain: From Assimilation to Cultural Pluralism' in Race, Migration and Schooling, Tierney J. (ed). [Holt, Rinehart and Winston]
- Mullard C. (1982b) 'The Educational Management and Demangement of Racism' in Education Policy Bulletin, Vol.10 No.1.
- Mullard C. (1984a) Anti-Racist Education: The Three O's, [National Association for Multi-Racial Education]
- Mullard C. (1984b) 'The Three R's: Rampton, Racism and Research' in Race, Education and Research: Rampton, Swann and After, [Centre for Multicultural Education and the Thomas Coram Institute, University of London Institute of Education]
- Mulvaney M. (1982) 'Racism in Schools', Multi-ethnic Education Review Vol.1. No. 1.
- National Anti-Racist Movement in Education (1985) Name On Swann [Name, Walsall]
- National Union of Teachers (1978) All Our Children, [N.U.T.]
- National Union of Teachers (1981) Initial NUT Response to the Rampton Committee Report, Press Release 17.6.81.
- Newnham J. & Watts S. (1984) 'Developing a Multicultural Science Curriculum' in Education for a Multicultural Society, Straker-Welds M. (ed) [Bell & Hyman]
- Nikolinakos M. (1975) 'Notes Towards a General Theory of Migration in Late Capitalism' in Race and Class, Vol.XVII. No.1.
- Parekh B. (1978) 'Asians in Britain: Problem or Opportunity?' in Five Views of Multi-Racial Britain, [CRE]
- Parekh B. (1983) 'Educational Opportunity in Multi-ethnic Britain' in 1Ethnic Pluralism and Public Policy, Glazer N. & Young K. (eds), [Heinemann]

- Parekh B. (1985a) 'Backdrop to the West Indian Tragedy' in The Times Educational Supplement, 22-3-85.
- Parekh B. (1985b) 'The Gifts of Diversity' in The Times Educational Supplement, 29-3-85.
- Parmar P. (1981) 'Young Asian Women: A Critique of the Pathological Approach' in Multiracial Education Vol.9 no.3.
- Parry J. and Sherlock P. (1971) A Short History of the West Indies, [MacMillan]
- Phizacklea A. & Miles R. (1980) Labour and Racism, [RKPI]
- Reeve A. (1981) 'The Way Forward' or 'The Long and Winding Road'?' in Multiracial Education, Vol.9 No.1.
- Reeves F. & Chevannes M. (1983) 'The Ideological Construction of Black Underachievement' in Multiracial Education, Vol.12 No.1.
- Rex J. (1970) 'The Concept of Race in Sociological Theory' in Race and Racism, Zubaida S. (ed.) [Tavistock]
- Rex J. (1983) Race Relations in Sociological Theory, [RKPI]
- Rex J. (1984) 'Equality of Opportunity and the Minority Child in British Schools' in Race, Education and Research: Rampton, Swann and After, [Centre for Multicultural Education and the Thomas Coram Research Unit, University of London Institute of Education]
- Rex J. & Tomlinson S. (1979) Colonial Immigrants in a British City, [RKPI]
- Robinson C. (1979) 'The Emergence and Limitations of European Radicalism' in Race and Class Vol. XXI No.2.
- Robinson C. (1983) Black Marxism, [Zed Press]
- Saunders M. (1981) Multicultural Teaching. A Guide for the Classroom, [McGraw-Hill]
- Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1969) The Problems of Coloured School Leavers, [HMSO]
- Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1973) Education, [HMSO]
- Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration (1977) The West Indian Community, [HMSO]

- Shallice J. (1983) 'Formulating an Anti-Racist Policy at the
Skinner's Company School' in Multi-ethnic Education Review,
Vol.2 No.2.
- Shallice J. (1984) 'Racism and Education' in Challenging Racism,
ALTARF, [ALTARF]
- Sharman G. (1982) 'Multicultural Teaching...what exactly is it?'
in Multicultural Teaching, Vol.1 No.1.
- Sharp R. and Green A. (1975) Education and Social Control,
[RKP]
- Sivanandan A. (1976) 'Race, Class and the State: the Black
Experience' in Race and Class Vol.XVII No.4
- Sivanandan A. (1977) 'The Liberation of the Black Intellectual'
in Race and Class Vol.XVIII No.4.
- Sivanandan A. (1978) 'From Immigration to 'Induced
Repatriation'' in Race and Class Vol.XX No.1
- Sivanandan A. (1981) 'From Resistance to Rebellion: Asian and
Afro-Caribbean Struggles in Britain' in Race and Class,
Vol.XXIII Nos.2/3
- Sivanandan A. (1983) 'Challenging Racism: Strategies for the
80's' in Race and Class, Vol.XXV No.2.
- Sivanandan A. (1985) 'RAT and the Degradation of Black
Struggle' in Race and Class, Vol.XXVI No.4.
- Solomos J. et al. (1982) 'The Organic Crisis of British
Capitalism and Race: The Experience of the Seventies' in
The Empire Strikes Back, [CCCS/Hutchinson]
- Stone M. (1981) The Education of the Black Child in Britain,
[Fontana]
- Straker-Welds M. (ed.) (1984) Education for a Multicultural
Society, [Bell and Hyman]
- Syer M. (1982) 'Racism, Ways of Thinking and School' in Race,
Migration and Schooling, Tierney J. (ed) [Holt, Rhinehart
and Winston]
- Taylor M. (1981) Caught Between - A Review of Research into
the Education of Pupils of West Indian Origin, [INFER
Nelson, Windsor]

- Taylor M. & Hegarty S. (1985) The Best of Both Worlds...?,
[NFER Nelson, Windsor]
- Tierney J. (1982a) Race, Immigration and Schooling, (Holt,
Rinehart & Wilson)
- Tierney J. (1982b) 'Race, Colonialism and Migration' in Race,
Migration and Schooling, Tierney J. (ed.) [Holt, Rinehart &
Winston]
- Thompson E.P. (1980) The Making of the English Working Class,
[Penguin]
- Tomlinson S. (1980) 'The Educational Performance of Ethnic
Minority Children' in New Community, Vol VIII. No. 3.
- Tomlinson S. (1981) 'Inexplicit Policies in Race and Education'
in Education Policy Bulletin, Vol.9 No.2.
- Tomlinson S. (1983) Ethnic Minorities in British Schools,
[Heinemann]
- Townsnd H.E.R. (1971) Immigrant Pupils in England: The LEA
Response, [NFER, Windsor]
- Townsend H.E.R. & Brittan E. (1972) Organisation in Multiracial
Schools, [NFER, Slough]
- Troyna B. (1982) 'The Ideological and Policy Response to Black
Pupils in British Schools' in The Social Sciences in
Educational Studies, Hartnett A. (ed) [Heinemann]
- Troyna B. (1984a) 'Fact or Artefact? The "Educational
Underachievement" of Black Pupils' in British Journal of
Sociology of Education, Vol.5 No.2.
- Troyna B. (1984b) "'Policy Entrepreneurs" and the Development
of Multi-Ethnic Education Policies' in Educational
Management and Administration, 12.
- Troyna B. (1985) 'The Great Divide: Policies and Practices in
MCE' in British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol.6
No.2.
- Troyna B. (1986) 'The Controversy Surrounding Raymond
Honeyford' in Social Studies Review Vol.1 no.4.
- Troyna B. & Ball W. (1985a) 'Styles of LEA Policy
Intervention in Multicultural/Antiracist Education' in
Educational Review, Vol.37 no.2.

- Troyna B. & Ball W. (1985b) Views From the Chalk Face: School Responses to an LEA's Policy on Multicultural Education, [Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, Coventry]
- Troyna B. and Williams J. (1986) Racism, Education and the State, [Croom Helm]
- del Tufo S., Randle L. & Ryan J. (1982) 'Inequality in a Schools System' in Community Work and Racism, Ohri A., Manning B. & Curno P. (eds), [RKP]
- UNESCO (1980) Sociological Theories: Race & Colonialism, [UNESCO, Paris]
- Verma G. and Bagley C. (eds.) (1979) Race, Education and Identity, [MacMillan]
- Willey R. (1984) Race, Equality and Schools, [Menthuen]
- Williams E. (1966) Capitalism and Slavery, [Capricorn Books, New York]
- Williams J. (1979) 'Perspectives on the Multi-Cultural Curriculum' in The Social Science Teacher, Vol.8 No.4.
- Williams R. (1983) Keywords, [Fontana]
- Willis P. (1977) Learning To Labour, [Saxon House, Farnborough]
- Wilson W.J. (1978) The Declining Significance of Race, [UCP]
- Woodroffe B. (1982) '1977-1982: Multi-ethnic Education in the ILEA' in Multi-ethnic Education Review, Vol.1 No.2.
- Wright C. (1985a) 'The Influence of School Processes on the Educational Opportunities of Children of West Indian Origin: 1, Learning Environment or Battleground?' in Multicultural Teaching Vol.4. no.1.
- Wright C. (1985b) 'The Influence of School Processes on the Educational Opportunities of Children of West Indian Origin: 2, Who Succeeds at School and Who Decides?', in Multicultural Teaching Vol.4. no.1.
- Zubaida S. (1970) Race and Racism, [Tavistock]

Government Acts and Statutes.

Education Act 1944, [HMSO]
British Nationality Act 1948, [HMSO]
Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962, [HMSO]
Race Relations Act 1965, [HMSO]
Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968, [HMSO]
Race Relations Act 1968, [HMSO]
Immigration Act 1971, [HMSO]
Race Relations Act 1976, [HMSO]
British Nationality Act 1981, [HMSO].