1œ´ÂÃöllpppC:\MS\WORD\NORMAL.STYHP3qG—ïZllpµTHE PRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUALITY THROUGH EXAMINATION

Introduction:

Foucault writes  prolifically  about the exercise of power on the modern individual.  He describes power as having a 'capillary' nature in that it operates through everyday myriad social practices to the extent that power is everywhere and in everyone.  It is for these reasons that Foucault finds Marxist and neo-Marxist accounts of state-centred and/or economistic, political, ideological orientations of power to be problematic because they  are depicted  as  being  'top-down',  repressive forms of  power (Fraser,  1989:26).  Considering that Foucault offers an  account of power which is creatively  different, it is interesting  that, in  the Afterword of Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982:208), he states that the goal of his work

> ...has not  been to  analyse the  phenomena of power
> nor  to  elaborate  the  foundations  of  such  an
> analysis.  My objective, instead, has been to create
> a history  of the  different modes  by which, in our
> culture, human beings are made into subjects.

Thus he  contends that it is  the subject which is the central theme of his research.  The critical effect of modern power to constitute people as subjects and then to objectivize them is what Foucault is especially concerned with, especially in his later works.  This objectivization of the subject exemplifies the productivity of modern power.  Explaining how modern power is  productive, Foucault (in Morris and Patton, 1978:36)

1

writes:

> What gives  power its  hold, what makes it accepted,
>
> is quite simply the fact that it does not weigh like
>
> a force  that says  no, but that it runs through, it
>
> produces  things,  it  induces  pleasure,  it  forms
>
> knowledge,  it  produces  discourse;   it  must  be

considered   as   a   productive   network   which   runs

through the   entire social   body much   more   that   a

negative instance whose function is repression.


One 'mode of objection' exercised by modern power is where the
'subject is   either divided   inside himself   (sic) or   divided
from   others'.     This    occurs   through    the    effects    of
'micropractices'   (Dreyfus     and    Rabinow,    1982:209)    in
institutional sites,  such as  schools.    In  Discipline  and
Punish (1977),  Foucault provides   links  and  analogies  with
schooling which  are most useful to this analysis, although he
does not set out to write a genealogy of the school.   Foucault
refers to   such practices as 'dividing practices' (Dreyfus and
Rabinow, 1982:209).    Dividing  practices include examinations,
testing, profiling,   streaming, tracking which are at the very
heart of  school organisation.    In   short, dividing practices
are central   to the   formation of   scholastic identity   on   an
individual basis (Ball, 1990).


Dividing    practices     stem     from     Foucault's    notion     of

'disciplinary power'.    It   is this   form of   power which   has

become 'a technology of the body as an object of power, gradually formed in disparate, peripheral localizations' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982:134) and this is the main theme of Discipline and Punish. The growth of such technologies for the manipulation of individuals into docile bodies is undoubtedly linked to the rise of industrial capitalism where the working classes and the poor presented as a growing social problem which needed to be controlled (Jones and Williamson, 1979:61). Schools, along with asylums, prisons, hospitals, workshops became institutional sites for the exercise of disciplinary power since their potential productivity needed to be tapped (Foucault, 1978).

Just as disciplinary power is part of bio-power, so also is Foucault's notion of 'power/knowledge'. This is another important means of manipulating the human subject. Power produces knowledges which are used in practices of domination and inequality at local, specific levels e.g. manifested in dividing practices in schooling. So pervasive is power/knowledge that:

> It is the whole nexus of such objects, criteria,
> practices, procedures, institutions, apparatuses,
> and operations that Foucault means to designate by

his term 'power/knowledge regime' (Fraser, 1989:20).

Local and piecemeal in application through 'microtechniques',

3

'micro-tactics' and 'micro-practices', power/knowledge is both
synoptic and individualising. Foucault (1977) refers to its
presence as 'le regard' or 'the gaze' (1977). An example of
the kind of synoptic gaze which Foucault envisages can be
found in Bentham's panopticon where the nature and effects of
surveillance are so central to its operation. His comments
about 'the gaze' and schooling are telling when he states that

> surveillance, defined and regulated, is inscribed at
> the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an
> additional or adjacent part, but as the mechanism
> that is inherent to it and which increases its
> efficiency (1977:176).

The 'efficiency' of schooling has been shored up by the
deployment of the gaze through dividing practices. In this
paper two specific dividing practices will be discussed.
Firstly, the State Scholarship Examination, and secondly,
standardised tests for 'vocational guidance' purposes. It is

not only  the nature  and function of these practices but also

their part  in producing  individuality  which will be a major

focus.


MODERN POWER AND THE PRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUALITY

In Discipline  and Punish  (1977), Foucault  writes  of

disciplinary power  as a  force which 'makes' individuals.  He

4

describes this power as the scientific technique that 'regards

individuals  both  as  objects  and  as  instruments  of  its

exercise' (1977:170).  Through this emphasis on the individual

Foucault calls  into question  the status of the individual in

modern  Western  culture  and  furthermore,  he  attempts  to

demonstrate the  ignoble origins  of  the  modern  individual.

Although individualism  has been  a characteristic  of Western

culture since  the time of the ancient Greeks, it only is only

in relatively  recent times - the last two centuries - that it

has assumed  its place  of dominance  in all  aspects  of  our

culture (Jones,  1990:81).   Writing  of  the  centrality  of

individualism to American culture, Cagan (1978:229) states:

     Perhaps no  other aspect  of American social thought

and culture  is as  widely acknowledged  and  deeply

felt as  that  of  individualism.    The  moral  and

political primacy  of the  individual over the group

in often  presented as the cornerstone of democratic

society.

At the  same time,  she acknowledges  that  '...individualism,

shaped by capitalism, ... generates competitive, egotistic and

atomised social  relations'.   Obviously her  comments can  be

applied to  Australian society   which bears many similarities

to American  culture.  Moreover it is the liberal, progressive

rhetoric of  schooling that  heralds  individualism  as  being

desirable  pedagogy  with  educators  striving  to  cater  for

'individual differences' in their treatment of children.

5

Thus it  is a  relatively recent  phenomenon that  individuals

have been  singled out  for individualised treatment.  In pre-

industrial times, individualization of ordinary people was not

common practice.  Ordinary  folk were  part of  a  family,  a

community but  not  knowable  in  the  sense  of  having  an

individual identity.   It  was those  closest to the sovereign

who were  knowable individuals  - the  wealthy, the  holy, the

noble.   These were the people whose lives were recorded.  But

as Foucault (1977) demonstrates so clearly, it was the individualizing gaze of the nineteenth century which illuminated the entire social fabric, by shedding its light on those previously obscured i.e. the mad, the indigent, the delinquent, the criminal, the sick, the poor, the young, all of whom were a problem to the new order. With the provision of mass schooling in Western democracies it also came to shed its light on the 'normal' population and in this instance it was students in schools who were targetted. Thus the gaze was designed to make knowable the entire population for it is only through knowing that society can be tested for its ills and solutions can be found. Interventions by way of the techniques of 'moral statistics' resulted in new forms of social investigation and political calculation (Hunter, 1988:53). By knowing the individual, one could train, change, classify, normalize, exclude, by the use of time and space (Foucault, 1977).

Individuals could be 'normalized' in institutional sites such as schools as part of the disciplinary appartatus. This could

be done through detailed and continuous evaluation which

established a grid of codeability of personal
attributes. They act as norms, enabling the
previously aleatory and unpredictable complexities
of human conduct to be charted and judged in terms
of conformity and deviation, to be coded and
compared, ranked and measured (Rose, 1990:133).

Such information could be recorded and stored so that each
individual became a 'case' with a case history. It was as if
a human sorting house were needed to assess individuals and
determine to what regime they were best suited and also to
organise individuals in occupations (Rose, 1990:133), for the
value of individualism has become the norm (Henriques,
Hollway, Venn and Walkerdine, 1984:11).

The individual was thus a target of social control mechanisms
at the time when industrial capitalism and individualism
fused. Turner (1988:60) describes this effect as the
'Foucault paradox', the point where individualism produces a
double-edged impact because there are both benefits and
disadvantages attached to the practical application of
'control' and 'individual behaviour'. This situation occurs
when the self-regulating individual of the liberal tradition
is undermined by bureaucratic regulation, termed
'individuation'. Furthermore, it is the separation of

individuals into 'calculable' people (Foucault, 1977) that

7

invokes subsequent consequences for the individual through
bureaucratic processes e.g. surveillance. Thus modern power
as a capillary, intrusive, surveilling, disciplinary force is
in fact more invasive than earlier forms of power. Yet
practices/techniques of management of individuality do not
work principally or exclusively to repress or dominate the
individual but their effect is to create subjects of a
certain form, because it by moulding, shaping and organizing
the psyche, that subjects are produced with particular desires
and aspirations (Rose, 1988:196). Thereby modern power,
rather than being repressive on the body, produces individuals
to the extent of constituting the 'very modern form of
individuality' (Henriques, Hollway, Venn and Walkerdine,
1984).

Divide and Rule: The Effects of the State Scholarship
Examination

As a dividing practice for almost a hundred years in
Queensland education, the State Scholarship Examination needs

to be  discussed in  its socio-historical context, but firstly

some time  needs to  be spent  in analysing the notion of 'the

examination' as a focal point of disciplinary power.  Foucault

(1977) refers  to the  examination as  a  'slender  technique'

which  combines   the  two   aspects  of  disciplinary  power,

hierarchial  observation  and  normalising  judgement.    This

technique possesses  a normalizing  gaze, a  surveillance that

8

makes it  possible to  qualify, to  classify  and  to  punish.

Moreover, it establishes over individuals a visibility through

which one differentiates them and judges them (1977:184).

Hoskin (1982:213-236)  traces the  history of the examination,

especially in  the area  of 'schooled science', as a technique

of modern  power.   He sees  the modern written examination as

one of  the most significant transformations in the history of

educational practice  and  refers  to  the  examination  as  a

particular and  special micro-technology  which in  Foucault's

words 'combines  the deployment of force and the establishment

of truth'.  The written material makes it possible to generate

a  'history'  of  each  student  and  also  to  classify

9

students en masse into categories and eventually into
'populations' with norms (Hoskin, 1979:137).


It is this 'formalization of the individual within power
relations' and the manner in which an individual is
'described, judged, measured, compared with others, in his
(sic) very individuality' which Foucault abhors (1977:191).
What is most insidious about the examination as a
power/knowledge technology is that it is 'at the centre of the

procedures that constitute the individual as effect and object

of power, as effect and object of knowledge' (1977:192).


The State  Scholarship Examination  is inextricably  linked to

the earliest  forms of secondary education in Queensland where

provision for  its inception  was provided  for in the Grammar

Schools  Act  of  1860.   This  was  a  remarkable  piece  of

legislation in a new colony which was really nothing more than

a 'motley  assortment of 28 000 people' (Goodman, 1989:1), but

it reflected  the power  base of  the squatters  who dominated

both houses  of parliament  and who were anxious for secondary

schools to  be set up in the British tradition for their sons.

In effect  this act  provided  state aided  education  for  a

small, socially elite minority, at a time when even government

funded elementary  education had  not been  established  at  a

level  to  meet  the  needs  of  all  the  Colony's  children

(Sullivan, 1974).  At first a few scholarships were awarded in

the  sentiment  of altruism,  and these  symbolised  the

'scholarship road to success', for ordinary children who might

otherwise  not  be  financially  able  to  have  a  secondary

10

education in  a grammar school  (Research and Guidance Branch,

1951:33).   This arrangement  was in  accord  with the general

nineteenth  century  social  attitiude  that  some  poor  but

talented  children   should  have  a  chance  of  a  secondary

education.   However apart  from philanthropic initiatives and

because the  grammar schools  in Ipswich and Brisbane were off

to a  shaky start  in the struggling colony,  they needed more

enrolments.   To meet  this need,  in  1873,  an  examination,

thereafter commonly  known as 'the Scholarship',  was held for

the      purpose      of      selecting     grammar      school

11

candidates.  The Scholarship, with some changes survived until 1962, despite  criticism of  its effects  of  individuals,  on pedagogy and on the progress of education generally.

In contrast  to the  thrust for grammar school education for a social  and   academic elite,  the  provision  of  universal secondary  education   by  the   state  followed  a  slow  and circuitous route.   In  1910, state secondary education  began as an  adjunct of the technical colleges, but it was not until 1912 that  the  state  addressed  the  task  of  making  state secondary education  available to all Queensland children.  To enter a  high school  with free  tuition, one could either sit for the  high school  entrance exam, which was somewhat easier to pass  than the  Scholarship or the Scholarship itself, with its  background  of  social   and  academic  elitism.   This alternative  was  provided  for  a  short  time  to  encourage ordinary children  to participate  in secondary  schooling  to some degree.  In 1914,  the  competitive  principle  of  the Scholarship was  changed to  a  'qualifying'  one  whereby  an overall 50%  of  marks  was  needed  for  a  candidate  to  be successful.  Again, in 1923, a  change  was  made    when  a compulsory pass  in English  and Arithmetic  was part  of  the

requirements for an overall 'pass' (Goodman, 1968:270).

The Queensland  government, despite some opposition, continued to be  very protective  of its  grammar schools,  because they were the preserve of the influential and wealthy. In addition, the educational  significance of these schools lay in the fact that  they  exerted  an  hegemonic  influence  on  secondary

12

education.  For instance,  high schools  and high 'tops' were opened  in  towns  that  did  not  have  a  grammar  school. Furthermore,  the academic  curriculum of the grammar schools was handed  on to  high schools  in its  place  of  dominance, although, in  the interests of national efficiency, vocational subjects were offered also.  In 1925, at the Central Technical College  in  Brisbane,  three  distinct  high  schools  were officially  designated  -  the  Commercial  High  School,  The Domestic Science  High School  and the Technical High School - to provide vocational education at the secondary level.

This step  is of  significance because it marked the beginning of 'tracking'  in secondary  education in  Queensland and  the point where  the Scholarship  assumed  a new  importance as a dividing practice  because it  was  instrumental  in  deciding which  curriculum  tracks  children  should  follow.  For  all

intents and purposes, the Scholarship was operating
surreptitiously as a test of intelligence by making the
assumption that the 'brightest' children should pursue the
academic courses which led to university and the professions,
while the less clever should be placed in vocational courses.
Boys and girls destined for non-academic courses were tracked
according to gender, but boys, often at the expense of girls,
were encouraged to choose the academic track, since this was
the path to the professions. In fact 'Queensland was a man's
world' and 'girls were not regarded as having the same place
in high school education as boys' (Goodman, 1968:223). This
reflected a wider societal view that education was to fit
girls for home duties (Council for Public Education, 1918:252-

13

3).

Despite the provisions for broadened curriculum offerings,
most children still finished their education at the end of
primary school. For instance, in 1914 secondary enrolments in
Queensland were 2,284 compared to 1007,377 students in the
State's primary schools (Report of the Secretary for Public
Instruction, 1914:6). Retention at the secondary school
remained low, although legislation had been passed as far back
as 1900 making a scholarship tenable at state, grammar or

other approved  schools (this was in recognition of the growth in Catholic  secondary education).   There  was still a strong feeling that secondary education was for a select few, and for this reason  many children  did not  avail themselves of their Scholarhip.

The  State Scholarship Examination, by dividing students along social and  academic lines,  was the  critical filter  of  the Queensland  education  system at  the  entry  to  secondary education.  It yielded  largely class based results.  A 'good' Scholarship mark  depended  heavily on  'good' schooling  and 'good' family  background.   The prescriptive  nature  of  the syllabus at  the end of primary school was aided by efficient, experienced teachers  who were most likely to be found in well established schools in large centres (Queensland Department of Public Instruction,  1928:37).   The overall  content  of  the syllabus reflected  the cultural capital of the middle classes and hence  the children  of middle  class  parents  were  more likely to  be successful  because the subjects examined in the

14

Scholarhip   were academic in orientation, and did not reflect working class  culture to  the same  extent  as  middle  class culture.  All of  this was despite the rhetoric of meritocracy that declared:

> an industrious primary school pupil of average
> intelligence has awaiting him (sic) free tuition in
> ...approved secondary schools,... if he (sic) cares
> to seize the opportunity (Queensland Department of
> Public Instruction, 1928:39).

The percentage one gained in this examination came to be seen
as a measure of one's intelligence and was central to the
formation of one's scholastic identity. The fact that in any
one year a large percentage of children would fail this exam
and so be excluded from free state education [e.g., from 1913-
1950 just over half of the candidates passed, (Wyeth,
1949:110-111)], coupled with the fact that teachers only
nominated those whom they thought had a fair chance of being
successful, together illustrate the power of this dividing
practice not only to hierarchize and classify, but also to
exclude. Rewards were given in varying degrees depending on
one's success and simultaneously punishments were dealt out to
those who did not gain a Scholarship. The social effects were
immense.

Psychological Testing and Vocational Guidance as Dividing
Practices

15

The next dividing practice to be discussed involves psychological testing and therefore at the outset, psychology needs to be placed in its context within the human sciences. Psychology was created as a science of the individual as a offshoot of psychiatry, one of the human sciences which emerged from the medical gaze of the eighteenth century (Venn, 1984:132). It is generally accepted that psychology, roughly in the period from 1875 to 1925, developed as a coherent and individuated theoretical field (Rose, 1979:6). However it is important to note that apart from the discipline of psychology, a 'psychological complex' has been established over time. Rose describes this complex which refers to the development of institutions and departments forming a specifically psychological community as:

> A heterogeneous but regulated set of agents, of practices, of discourses and apparatuses which has definite conditions of existence and specificable effects (1979:6).

As part of its far reaching effects, the psychological complex has claimed the right to produce and disseminate scientific

theories of  intelligence which  in turn have spawned theories of the  science of  individual  differences  and  psychometric tests to  measure these  differences (Kamin, 1974; Blum, 1978; Gould, 1981).   The  psychological complex has been central to normalization processes in the wider society and in schooling. Furthermore the  psychological complex  has  legitimated  such

16

treatment because  normalizing actions have been suppported by a general faith in psychology and its methods.  In relation to schooling, psychology  has had  a  very  strong  influence  on educational policy  and practice to the extent that psychology has 'captured' educational  thinking (McCallum, 1985).  Whilst it is  not being  suggested that psychologism has the inherent power to  enslave individuals,  it is  being argued  that  the power of  psychology  on  the  public  mind  has  ensured  its acceptance as  a legitimate  means of producing and specifying particular individuals.   As  a result  of this,  according to Foucault (1977:193):

> All the  sciences, analyses  or practices  employing
> the  root  'psycho-'  have  their  origin  in  this
> historical  reversal  of  the  procedures  of
> individualization.

17

Although psychologism  developed slowly  from the beginning of

this century,  it gained apace in schools from the 1930s. Rose

(1979:194) sees  the psychological  test as the main technique

use  by  the  psychologist  as  a  'mini-laboratory  for  the

inscription of  difference' and  also as  'a central procedure

in the  practices of objectification and subjectification that

are so  characteristic of  our modernity'.  It  follows  that

teachers, like  other members of the general public, have been

influenced by  psychology's ability to identify 'problems' and

provide 'explanations'  (Henriques et  al., 1984).   Of  more

consequence, is   that  they have been co-opted into acting as

'scientists in  the classroom' (McCallum, 1990).  In fact, the

stranglehold  of  psychologism  on  educational  practices

continues  to  mean  that  'no  pupil  escapes  the  amateur

psychologising of teachers' (Kapferer, 1990:42).


Schools,  in  the  period  under  scrutiny,  taught  not  only

obedience,  conformity  and  the  overt  curriculum  but  in

conjunction with  it, they  also 'taught'  who was intelligent

and  who  was  not  in  the  sentiment  of  'difference  with

deference'.  This focus  on  intelligence  as  an  individual

attribute stemmed  from British  and American leads and became

apparent in  Australia in  limited ways  from the  end of last

century, but  more especially  since  the  Depression  of  the

1930s.  From that  time onwards, testing procedures were used

in schools  for selection purposes  in the interests of social

efficiency, national  efficiency, social  cleansing and social

control (Bacchi,  1980; McCallum,  1985; Miller,  1986; Lewis,

1987; Seddon, 1990). Normalization measures were first applied

18

to  the  'abnormal'  and  testing  for  placement  in  special

classes/schools was promulgated as socially beneficial because

there was  thought to  be a causal relationship between mental

deficiency  and  poverty  and  crime  (Lewis,  1987:6).   The

official descriptors  used were  'dull or  backward', 'border-

line  deficients'   'feeble-minded  or   moron',  'imbeciles',
'idiots'  (Cunningham  ,  McIntyre,  Radford,  1939:264).
Queensland was  later than  most of the other states in making
provision for  the education  of such  pupils, with  the first
initiatives being  taken after  some teachers were sent to New
South Wales  to investigate  methods used there (Wyeth,
1955:183).   Following  their  report,  two  categories  for
separate classes  of children  were decided  upon, namely  for
'backward' and  'mentally defective'  children.   From  1923
onwards,  psychological tests were used to determine entry and
it is  interesting to  note that  in 1926,  the stigma already
attached to  these classes  led to  the official  labelling of
them euphemistically  as 'opportunity  classes' with  teachers
being reprimanded  for using  the term 'dunce's class' (Report
to the Secretary for Public Instruction, 1926).

The influence  of the  psychological  complex  on  educational
matters was  formalised in  1948, with  the setting  up of the
Research and Guidance Branch in the State Department of Public
Instruction.   It was  through this  branch that psychological
tests were  administered, not  only  to  those  considered
'backward' or 'mentally defective' and who therefore needed to
be excluded  from the  regular classroom,  but to  many  other
'normal' pupils as well in their final year of primary school.

In fact, the main attention of the Research and Guidance Branch was devoted to the development of suitable psychological tests for use as instruments to guide students in their decision to leave school or to continue on to appropriate secondary schools (Logan and Clarke, 1984:6). In 1932, as a result of vocational guidance being accepted as a necessary adjunct of schooling from the late 1920s, pupils in four large metropolitan schools underwent tests of intelligence and of mechanical and clerical aptitude. Parents and students also completed questionnaires and a radio station provided a series of talks on guidance and occupations on a weekly basis (Research and Guidance, 1951:33).

The last year of primary schooling was the time when decisions had to be made about whether a child's education should finish or whether secondary education should follow. In this decision making, The Education Office Gazette (EOG) expressed the importance of the role which the Research and Guidance Branch was to play through vocational guidance:

> The seventh grade year is a critical one in a child's schooling ... A choice has to be made between secondary education and immediate employment (51,4,1949:62).

The same EOG listed the following ways that guidance officers
operated.  It stated that in schools, guidance officers would
apply a battery of psychological tests to seventh grade pupils
and that they would provide information on secondary courses

20

and on choice of occupation.  Seventh grade pupils were to be
interviewed by guidance officers and the guidance officer was
to be present with the head teacher when parents were
interviewed.

Locally devised  intelligence tests  were administered to many
final year  primary students  as part of an intensive guidance
program (McDonnell,  Radford  and  Staurenghi,  1956).   For
instance, in  1954 educational  and  vocational  guidance  was
provided to  2,460 pupils  in twenty-six state primary schools
and 740  students in  metropolitan and country state secondary
schools.   Testing was  supplemented with personal interviews,
along with  relevant data  provided by  classrom, talks, films
and pamphlets.  Apart from guidance officers visiting schools,
guidance was  provided to  960 students from country districts
and non-government  schools at  branch headquarters (McDonnell
et al., 1956).

Action based  on psychological  testing  was  endorsed  by  a

prominent  educator,  Professor   Fred  Schonnell   of  the

University of  Queensland, who,  in his  address to  delegates

attending the  62nd Conference  of  the  Queensland  Teachers'

Union, stated:

> we are  beginning to  realize how much, for example,
>
> the stage  is set  or determined by the intelligence
>
> of the  children we  teach.  We cannot do much about
>
> the degree  of intelligence with which children have
>
> been endowed  at birth,  but  we  can,  through  our

21

> methods  and   our  organisation,   make   effective
>
> provision   for   those   differences   (Queensland
>
> Teachers' Journal, 1952:11).

Thus intelligence  as an  individual attribute  was to used to

divide children  since Intelligence  Quotient (IQ)  tests  are

'procedures for  the production  of difference  in an  ordered

form' (Rose,  1979:194), but  the popular  view put forward by

the psychological  complex to   the  wider  community,  and

especially educators,   was  the fundamental need to cater for

'individual differences'.   The very fact that such techniques

as testing  devices were  in themselves  producing  difference

escaped notice  in a  society where  underlying eugenicism was
too valuable to discard.


A  further  example  of  the  eugenicist  influence  on  the
interpretation that  the psychological  complex  gave  to  its
understanding of  intelligence is  obtained form  a psychology
textbook  prepared  especially  for  teacher  trainees  in
Queensland.  Its author  strongly advocates  the practices of
vocational quidance,  based on  ideas  of  individual,  innate
levels of intelligence when he writes,


Each child  who is given such vocational guidance is
assessed  with  respect  to  his  (sic)  general
intelligence, education standard, special abilities,
special interests  and  hobbies,  temperamental  and
moral qualitites as well as his (sic) health and his
(sic) general  physical condition.   Of  these  six

22

factors general  intelligence is  usually  the  most
important, because,  if this is known, the choice of
possible occupations  is immediately  limited  to  a
certain  range.   This  is  possible  because
psychologists have  arranged many key occupations in
an order  which shows the intellectual power that is

needed to  carry on  these occupations  successfully

(Haine, 1961:190).


Haine (1961:190)  then proceeds to furnish the outline used by

psychologists to  link occupations  with the IQ level required

for each.   They  range from  'university professors, doctors,

highest posts  in science  at 133+' down to 'packer and sorter

at 85+'.   Most  significantly,  he  emphasises  the  overall

importance of  IQ testing  to 'predict with a very high degree

of accuracy  the range  of occupations  within which ... final

choice will  be made'.  It is significant to note that Haine's

textbook, Classroom  Psychology (1961),  was used for the next

decade in  Teacher Training  Colleges in  Queensland where all

primary teachers  in  the  state  were  trained  and  where  a

significant number  of secondary  teachers received the second

year of  a two  year preparation course (Queensland Department

of Education,1966).  Therein lies an example of how psychology

influenced 'educational and pedagogical training and practice'

which in  turn led  to 'the  rise of the power of the experts'

(Kapferer, 1990:42), to the extent that the discourse produced

by the  psychological complex  seduced teachers into acting as

amateur  psychologists   in  the  classroom  (McCallum,  1990;

Kapferer, 1990).

Queensland abolished the State Scholarship Examination in
1963. From an Australian perspective this was hardly an
educational innovation since similar decisions to abandon
entrance examinations to secondary schooling had been taken
over ten years previously in the last of the other states
(Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, 1954:433). But
there remained the problem of selection and control. Without
an entrance examination to secondary education considerable
control over individuals and the courses they took was lost.
The Scholarship had fulfilled two specific functions as a
selection process; it identified which students should
receive a free state secondary education and it helped sort
successful students into secondary courses. It was a dividing
practice par excellence for hierarchizing, classifying, and
excluding students. It was also a most important milestone in
a student's life, not only in determining life chances through
schooling, but also in the production of scholastic identity
and therefore as a key factor in the individuating process.
The percentage one gained in Scholarship was viewed by
teachers, administrators, parents, students themselves, the
general public and employers as a specific, reliable measure
of a person's worth in things academic. In other words,
examinations, such as the Scholarship, introduce a new
principle of individual accountability by affording a

numerical 'objective' judgment on the person, thus 'substituting for the individuality of the memorable man (sic) that of the calculable man (sic)' (Hoskin and Macve, 1986:107). For instance, it is evident that people, many

24

years removed from their school days, remember and are remembered by others for their Scholarship mark. An example is provided by Hugh Lunn (1989:138-141) in his autobiography, Over the Top with Jim, where he discloses his very mediocre score along with an account of the terror felt by students as they prepared and sat for this examination. Lunn writes:

> Overall I got 57.1 per cent, but in English I scored
> just 76 out of 150 ... one mark less and I would
> have failed and my name wold not have appeared in
> the paper, because if you didn't pass English you
> didn't pass State Scholarship.

Lunn also writes of the consequences of all this for his initiation into secondary school where classes were allocated on the basis of one's Scholarship pass,

> with the top passes going into the 'A' class, so
> they would not be held back by dumb boys; the next

group into the 'B' class, so they could all progress

through the  text books  together; and  all  of  the

dunces into  the 'C'  class.  So naturally, I was in

the Cs.

The Scholarship  was indeed  an important  milestone in  young

lives and  set in train differing life chances. Fortunately it

became  increasingly  unpopular,   mainly  for  educational

reasons,   and finally   was  removed after  1962.   Yet  the

efforts of  the Department of Education to control high school

25

entry were not entirely thwarted. In 1963 a program of testing

of Grade  7 pupils  in their  second  last  month  of  primary

schooling was  introduced.   It is  interesting that teachers,

and not guidance officers (because of the prohibitive costs of

many personnel traversing the vast distances of this state, no

doubt) were  to administer the tests.  Details of this program

were first  published in  the EOG  in August,  1963 (65,8:224-

226).  Here the purpose of the program was explained to school

principals  and  teachers.   The  testing  program  in  fact

fulfilled  a   function  left   void  by   the   Scholarship's

abandonment.   It  provided  information  whereby  secondary

schools could  sort the  heterogeneous intake of students into

homogeneous groups  within the  school for  teaching purposes.

Although the  first year  of secondary schooling was organised
as an  'exploratory year'  in terms  of  curriculum  (Goodman,
1968:363) the  tests were  able to  supply the  data by  which
schools  could  eventually  place  students  in  tracks  (EOG,
65,8:224) and streams (EOG,66,7:229).

These tests became known as the October tests and continued to
be used  in one  form or  another from 1963 until 1990. By far
the best  remembered is  an Australian  Council of Educational
Research (ACER) test called 'Test of Learning Ability 6' (TOLA
6).   This test yielded a score out of 15 which was to be used
as a  reference, often  recorded next  to students'  names  in
teachers' mark  books.   In addition a master sheet of results
was sent to the Department to provide an indication of student
achievement relative to others throughout the state.   Thus the
statistical nature of the testing program served to legitimate

26

its use.

Unexpectedly, in  August, 1991,  the EOG (93,16:176) announced
that the  testing  program  would  be  discontinued.    It  is
interesting that  this  information  came  as  a  surprise  to
primary school  principals and  teachers and that no rationale
was given  for the  the discontinuation  of a  testing program

which had been in operation for twenty-seven years.
Significantly, it appears that educational and social reasons
were not major considerations, because, further the same EOG
states:

> Existing TOLA 6 testing materials (including test
> booklets, answer sheets, score keys and manuals) in
> primary schools are the school's property for
> disposal or use as required. Secondary schools
> wishing access to the materials should make
> arrangements with their local primary schools.

Whilst the test may not officially be given in the primary
school, there is still scope for its use in the secondary
school! In addition, it seems that there could be a
coincidence in that plans for National testing plan are
underway (Stanaway, 3rd September, 1991) and could well
replace the function of the October tests.

Therefore what remains problematic is that teachers through
the influence of psychology in their preparation courses and
in its widespread acceptance in society involve themselves in

the discourse of the psychological complex to the point where

they welcome standardised tests as a way to treat the
uniqueness of the individual child.  The individuation process
and the issues of social justice and desirable pedagogy escape
their notice  in their  quest to make each individual a 'case'
where the  acts of classifying, correcting, normalizing,
excluding is legitimized.  The individual, in terms of
scholastic identity,  is produced through schooling techniques
and practices  since difference  is codified, mathematized and
standardized (Rose. 1979:194).


Conclusion

Modern power  operating as power/knowledge is productive
through  schooling practices  and techniques  such  as  those
which are  exemplified by  the Scholarship  and  psychological
tests.  Dividing practices remain at the very heart of school
organization and  management and are instrumental in producing
difference within, between and among individuals.

28

## REFERENCES

Bacchi, C. (1989) 'The Nature-Nurture Debate in Australia, 1900-1914' in Historical Studies, 19,75, 199-212.


Ball, Stephen J. (ed) (1990) Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge, London:Routledge.


Bisseret, Noelle (1979) Education, Class, Language and Ideology, London:Routledge and Kegan Paul.


Blum,J. (1978) Pseudoscience and Mental Ability: The Origins and Fallacies of the IQ Controversy, New York: Monthly Review Press.


Cagan, E. (1978) 'Individualism, Collectivism and Radical Educational Reform', in Harvard Educational Review, 48, 226-266.


Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics (1954) Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.


Council for Public Education, 'Report of Committee on Education of Women' in Education Gazette and Teachers Aid, 18, 20 August, 1918, 252-3.

Cunningham, K.S., McIntyre, G.A. and Radford, W.C. (1939)
     Review of Education in Australia 1938, Melbourne:ACER and
     Melbourne University Press.


Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Rabinow, Paul (1982) Michel Foucault:
     Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, New York:Harvester
     Wheatsheaf.


Foucault, Michel (1972) The Archeology of Knowledge, London:
     Tavistock.


29

Foucault, Michel (1977) Discipline and Punish: The Birth of
     the Prison, Harmondsworth:Penguin.


Foucault, M. (1978) The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An
     Introduction, trans. R. Hurley, Allen Lane.

Fraser, Nancy (1989) Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and
     Gender in Contemporary Social Theory, Cambridge:Polity
     Press.


Goodman, R. (1968) Secondary Education in Queensland, 1860-
     1960, Canberra, ANU Press.


Gould, S.J. (1981) The Mismeasure of Man, Harmondsworth:
     Penguin.


Haine, H.E. (1961) Classroom Psychology, Brisbane:Jacaranda
     Press.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin C. and Walkerdine, V. (1984)
    Changing the  Subject:Psychology, social  Regulation  and
    Subjectivity, London:Methuen.


Hoskin, K.  (1979) 'The  Examination, Disciplinary  Power  and
    Rational Schooling', History of Education, 8, 2, 135-146.


Hoskin, K.W.  and  Macve,  R.H.  (1986)  'Accounting  and  the
    Examination: A  Genealogy  of  Disciplinary  Power'  in
    Accounting, Organizations and Society, 11, 2, 105-136.


Hoskin,  Keith  (1982)  'Examinations  and  the  Schooling  of
    Science' in  R.M.McLeod, Days  of  Judgement,  Driffield:
    Nafferton Books, 213-236.


Hunter, Ian  (1988) Culture  and Government:  The Emergence of
    Literary Education, Houndmills:Macmillan.


Hyams, B.K. and Bessant, B. (1972)  Schools for the People?

                        30

    Hawthorn:Longman.


Jones,  K.  and  Williamson,  K.  (1979)  'The  Birth  of  the
    Schoolroom' in Ideology and Consciousness, 6, 59-97.


Jones, Richard  (1990) 'Educational  practices and  scientific
    knowledge: a  genealogical  reinterpretation  of   the
    emergence of  physiology in post-Revolutionary France' in

31

S.J. Ball  (ed) Foucault  and Education:  Disciplines and
Knowledge, London:Routledge, 78-104.

Kamin, Leon J. (1974) The Science and Politics of IQ,
    Harmondsworth:Penguin.


Kapferer, J.L. (1990) Expert Advice: The Mystification of
    Common Sense in Discourse, 19, 2, April, 36-50.


Lewis, J. (1987) 'So Much Grit in the Hub of the Educational
    Machine' in B. Bessant (ed) Mother State and Her Little
    Ones, Bundoora: La Trobe University Press, 140-166.


Logan, G. and Clarke, E. (1984) State Education in
    Queensland: A Brief History, Monograph on the History of
    Education in Queensland, 2, Brisbane:Department of
    Education.


Lunn, Hugh (1989) Over the Top with Jim, St.Lucia:University
    of Queensland Press.


MacLeod, Roy (ed) (1982) Days of Judgement, Science,
    Examinations and the Organization of Knowledge in Late
    Victorian England, Driffield:Nafferton Books.


McCallum, D. (1985) 'The Theory of Educational Inequality in
    Australia 1900-1950', Ph.D. Thesis, University of
    Melbourne.


McCallum, D. (1990) The Social Production of Merit:
    Education, Psychology and Politics in Australia 1990-
    1950, London: The Falmer Press.


McDonnell, R.M., Radford, W.C. and Staurenghi, P.M. (1956)
    Review of Education in Australia 1948-1954,
    Melbourne:ACER.

Miller, Pavla  (1986) Long Division:  State Schooling in South

32

Australia, Netley:Wakefield Press.


Morris, M.  and Patton P. (eds) (1978) Michel Foucault: Power,
     Truth, Strategy, Sydney:Feral Publications.


Queensland  Department   of  Education   (1966)  Kedron   Park
     Teachers' College Calendar, Brisbane.


Queensland  Department  of  Public  Instruction  (1928)  State
     Education in Queensland.


Queensland, Department of Education, Education Office Gazette
     51, 4, April 1949
     65, 8, August 1963
     66, 7, July,1964
     88, 9, September 1986
     93, 16, August 1991.


Queensland, Department  of  Public  Instruction  (1928)  State
     Education in Queensland.


Queensland, Report of the Secretary for Public Instruction,
1926.


Queensland, Report  of the  Secretary for  Public Instruction,
     1914.

Research and  Guidance Branch,  (1951) 75th  Jubilee  History:
    Notes  on  the History  of  Education  in  Queensland,
    Department of Education:Brisbane.


Rose,  N.  (1979) 'The  Psychological Complex:   Mental
    Measurement  and  Social  Administration',  Ideology  and
    Consciousness, 5, 5-68.


Rose, N. (1988)  'Calculable minds and manageable individuals'
    in History of the Human Sciences, 1, 2, 179-200.


                              33


Rose, N. (1990)  Governing the  Soul,  The  Shaping  of  the
    Private Self, London:Routledge.


Schonnell, F.  (1952) 'Address  to the  62nd Conference of the
    Queensland  Teachers'  Union'  in  Queensland  Teachers'
    Journal, May, 11.


Seddon, T.  "Social Justice  in Hard  Times 'From  Equality of
    Opportunity' to 'Fairness and Efficiency' " in Discourse,
    11, 1 October, 21-42.


Simon, B. (1983) Educating in Theory Schooling in Practice:The
    experience of  the Last  Hundred Years in S. Murray Smith
    (ed), Melbourne Studies in Education, Melbourne:Melbourne
    University Press.


Stanaway, G. (1991) 'National plan to lift literacy of school
    leavers', Courier-Mail, 3rd September.

Sullivan, M. (1974) 'Fifty Years of Opposition to Queensland's Grammar Schools' in S. Murray-Smith (ed) Melbourne Studies in Education, Melbourne:Melbourne University Press.

Turner, B.S, (1988) 'Individualism, Capitalism and the Dominant Culture: A Note on the Debate', in Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 24, 1, 47-64.

Venn, C. (1984) 'The Subject of Psychology' in J. Henriques et al. Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity, London:Methuen, 119-152.

Wyeth, E.R. (1949) 'Educational Research and Reconstruction', Queensland Teachers' Journal, 21 March, 110-111.

Wyeth.E.R. (1955) Education in Queensland, Melbourne:ACER.

34

‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹ÄÂÃˇ˘‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹Ä
µy∑yπy»y y
yByÇy¬yy‹‹
AyÅy¡yyAyÅy≤y¥yÔy*y‹‹
*ey†yʻy÷yyVyïyʻyySy‹‹
Sçyèyëy≤y¥y∂yøy¡y√y˛y‹‹
˛y;y=yxyzyµy∑yÚyÙy/y‹‹
/1ylyny§y¶y®yØy±y≥yÛy‹‹
Ûıy5   y7      yw      yy      yπ      yª      y˚      y˝      y=
y‹‹
=
?
y
yÅ
y¡
y√
y
y

yE
yG
yá
y‹‹
á
â
y…
yÀ
y

y

y–
y/
y1
y3
y5
y‹‹
5
7
yw
yy
y{
y}
yû
y†
y¢
y,
y‰
y‹‹
‰
$
y&
yf
yh
y®
y™
yÍ
yÏ
y,y.y‹‹
.nypy∞y≤yÚyÙy4y6yvyxy‹‹
x∏y∫y/y‹yfiy‡y,y‰y$y&y‹‹
&fyhy®y™yÍyÏy,y.ynypy‹‹
páyâyãy∆y»yyy@yBy}y‹‹
}yÅy¡y√y≈y«y…yÍyÏyÓy‹‹
Ó.y0ypyry≤y¥yÙyˆy6y8y‹‹
8xyzy∫y°yœyˇy˚y6y8ysy‹‹
suy∞y≤yœy–y”y’y◊yŸyy‹‹
y[y]yùyüyfiy·y!y#ycy‹‹
cey●yßyØy±y≥yµy∑yπyÎy‹‹

ÎÌyÔy/y1yqysyuywyyyöy‹‹
öúyûyfiy‡y y"ybydy§y¶y‹‹
¶ÊyËy(y*yjyly¨yÆyÔy♣y‹‹
♣0y2yryty±y≥yµy♣yÚy-y‹‹
-/yjylyßy©y%yÊyιy˜y˘y‹‹
˘9y;y{y}yΩyøy˘yyAyCy‹‹
CÉyÖy≈y«yyyyy    y
y‹‹


y.y0y2yryty¥yðyˆy‾y‹‹
‾8 y: yz y| y° yœ y¸ y!y@!yB!y‹‹
B!Ç!yÑ!yƒ!yΔ!y"y"yH"yJ"yä"yå"y‹‹
å"Ã"yŒ"y#y#yP#yR#yí#yî#y'#y÷#y‹‹
÷#$y$yX$yZ$yö$yú$y‹$yfi$y%y %y‹‹
 %`%yb%yj%yl%yn%yp%yr%yt%y¥%yð%y‹‹
∂%ˆ%y‾%y˙y%y&y&y&yZ&y\&y^&yô&y‹‹
ô&õ&y÷&yÿ&y'y'yP'yR'yç'yè'y≈'y‹‹
≈'«'y…'y         (y
(yK(yM(yç(yè(yœ(y–(y‹‹
–()y)yS)yU)y~)yÄ)yÇ)yÑ)yÜ)yà)y‹‹
à)»)y )y
*y
*yL*yN*yé*yê*y–*y"*y‹‹
"*+y+yT+yV+yñ+yò+yÿ+y⁄+y,y,y‹‹
,\,y^,y`,yb,yd,yÖ,yá,yâ,y…,yÀ,y‹‹
À,
-y
-yM-y0-yè-yë-y–-y"-y.y.y‹‹
.U.yW.yó.yô.yŸ.y€.y/y/y/y]/y_/y‹‹
_/ü/y°/y·/y„/yÎ/yÌ/yÔ/yÒ/yÛ/yι/y‹‹
ι/50y70yD0yF0yH0yJ0yä0yå0yÃ0yŒ0y‹‹
Œ01y1yP1yR1yí1yî1y'1y÷1y2y2y‹‹
2X2yZ2yö2yú2yû2y†2y¢2y√2y≈2y«2y‹‹
«23y     3yI3yK3yÜ3yà3yä3yå3yÃ3yŒ3y‹‹
Œ34y4yP4yR4yí4yî4y'4y÷4y5y5y‹‹
5X5yZ5yö5yú5y‹5yfi5y‡5y,5y%5yÊ5y‹‹
Ê5Ë5yÍ5yÏ5yÓ5y♣5yÚ5yÙ5yˆ5y‾5y˙5y‹‹
˙5¸5y¸5y6y6y6y6y6y
6y
6y6y‹‹
66y6y6y6y6y6y6y6y  6yA6y‹‹
A6C6yE6yÖ6yá6yµ6y∑6yπ6yª6y˚6y˝6y‹‹
˝6=7y?7y7yÅ7y¡7y√7y8y8yE8yG8y‹‹
G8á8yâ8y√8y≈8y«8y…8y     9y
9yK9yM9y‹‹
M9ç9yè9yœ9y–9y:y:yS:yU:yï:yó:y‹‹
ó:◊:yŸ:y;y;y;y[;y];yù;yü;yfl;y·;y‹‹
·;!‹y#‹yc‹ye‹y●‹yß‹yÁ‹yÈ‹y)=y+=y‹‹
+=-=y0=yQ=yS=yì=yï=y'=y◊=y>y>y‹‹

>Y>y[>yõ>yù>y>>yfl>y?y!?ya?yc?y<<
c?£?y●?yÂ?yÁ?yÈ?yÎ?yÏ?yÔ?yÒ?yÛ?y<<
Û?ı?y˜?y˘?y˚?y˝?y˘?y@y@y@y@y<<
@          @y
@y
@y@y@y@y@y@y@y@y<<
@@y@y!@y#@y%@y'@y)@y+@y-@y/@y<<
/@1@y3@y5@yW@yY@y[@yõ@yù@y>@yfl@y<<
fl@AyAyAyAy[Ay]AyùAyüAyflAy·Ay<<
·A!By#BycByeBy●ByßByÁByÈBy)Cy+Cy<<
+CkCymCy≠CyØCyÔCyÒCy1Dy3DysDyuDy<<
uDµDy∑Dy˜Dy˘Dy9Ey;Ey{Ey}EyΩEyøEy<<
øE¯Ey˙Ey¸Ey¸Ey>Fy@FyÄFyÇFy¬FyƒFy<<
ƒFGyGyFGyHGyJGylGynGypGy∞Gy≤Gy<<
≤GÚGyÙGy4Hy6HyvHyxHy¶Hy∫Hy˙Hy¸Hy<<
¸H<Iy>Iy~IyÄIy¿Iy¬Iy˚Iy˝Iy˘IyJy<<
JAJyCJyÉJyÖJy≈Jy«JyKy    KyIKyKKy<<
KKãKyçKyÕKyœKyLyLyQLySLyìLyïLy<<
ïL'Ly◊LyMyMyYMy[MyõMyùMy>MyflMy<<
flMNy!NyaNycNy£Ny●NyßNy…NyÀNyÕNy<<
ÕN"Ny'Ny÷NyÿNyOyOyZOy\OyúOyûOy<<
ûOfiOy‡Oy Py"PybPydPy§Py¶PyÊPyËPy<<
ËP(Qy*QyjQylQy¨QyÆQyÓQy•Qy˝Qy˘Qy<<
˘QRyRyCRyERyÖRyáRy«Ry…Ry        Sy
Sy<<

SKSyMSyçSyèSyœSy–SyTyTySTyUTy<<
UTïTyóTy◊TyŸTyUyUy[Uy]Uy_UyÅUy<<
ÅUÉUyÖUy≈Uy«UyVy          VyIVyKVy[Vy]Vy<<
]V_VyaVyúVyûVyŸVy€VyWyWySWyUWy<<
UWyWy{Wy}WyWyøWy¡WyXyXyCXyEXy<<
EXÖXyáXy«Xy…Xy  Yy
YyKYyMYyçYyèYy<<
èYœYy–YyZyZySZyUZyïZyóZy◊ZyŸZy<<
ŸZ„ZyÂZyÁZyÈZyÎZyÌZy([y*[y5[y7[y<<
7[9[y[[y][y_[ya[yc[y£[y●[yÂ[yÁ[y<<
Á['\y)\yi\yk\y´\y≠\yÌ\yÔ\y/]y1]y<<
1]q]ys]y≥]yµ]yı]y˜]y7^y9^yy^y{^y<<
{^ª^yΩ^yÁ^yÈ^yÎ^yÌ^y(_y*_ye_yg_y<<
g_¢_y§_y°_yœ_y¿_y¬_y`y`yD`yF`y<<
F`Ü`yà`y»`y `y
ay
ayLayNayéayêay<<
êa–ay"ay'ay^ay¯ay˙ay:by<by|by~by<<
~bœby¿bycycyBcyDcyÑcyÜcy∆cy»cy<<
»cdy
dyJdyLdyådyédy§dy¶dy®dy™dy<<
™dÂdyÁdy"ey$ey_eyaeyzey|ey~eyÄey<<
ÄeÇeyÑeyÜeyàeyäeyåeyéeyêeyíeyîey<<
îeñeyòeyöeyúeyûey†ey¢ey§ey¶ey®ey<<

®e™ey¨eyÆey∞ey≤ey'ey÷eyÿeyfyfy<<
fZfy\fyúfyûfyfify‡fy gy"gybgydgy<<
dg§gy¶gyÊgyËgyÇhy*hyjhylhy¨hyÆhy<<
ÆhÓhy◆hy0iy2iyriytiy¶iy®iy™iy¨iy<<
¨iÏiyÓiy.jy0jypjyrjy≤jy¥jyÙjyˆjy<<
ˆj6ky8kyxkyzkyʃky°ky¸ky¸ky>ly@ly<<
@lÄlyÇly¬lyƒlymymymy*my,my.my<<
.mnmypmy∞my≤myÚmyÙmy4ny6nyvnyxny<<
xn∏nyʃny˙ny¸ny<oy>oy~oyÄoy¿oy¬oy<<
¬opypyDpyFpyÜpyàpy»py py
qy
qy<<

qLqyNqyéqyêqy–qy"qyryryEryGry<<
GrIryKryãryçryÕryœrysysyQsySsy<<
Ssìsyïsy'sy◊sytytyYty[ty]tyty<<
tÅtyÉty√ty≈tyuyuyGuyIuyâuyãuy<<
ãuÀuyÕuy
vyvyOvyQvyëvyìvy"vy'vy<<
'vwywyWwyYwyâwyãwyçwyèwyœwy–wy<<
–wxyxySxyUxyïxyóxy◊xyŸxy
yy
yy<<

yyyyyKyyMyyàyyäyy≈yy«yy›yyflyy<<
fly·yy„yy"zy$zyczyezy●zyßzyÂzyÁzy<<
ÁzÈzy
{y
{y{yN{yP{yè{yë{y»{y {y<<
 {ÿ{y/{y<{yfi{yly ly`lybly¢ly§ly<<
§l‰lyÊly&}y(}yh}yj}y™}y¨}yÏ}yÓ}y<<
Ó}.~y0~yp~yr~y≤~y¥~yf~yΔ~y»~y ~y<<
 ~
y
yLyNyéyêy–y"y,y‰y<<
‰ÊyËy#Äy‰Äy`ÄybÄyùÄyüÄy/Äy‹Äy<<
‹ÄÅyÅyÅy=Åy?ÅyAÅylÅy~ÅyπÅyªÅy<<
ªÅfiÅy‡Åy,Åy‰Åy$Çy&ÇyfÇyhÇy®Çy™Çy<<
™ÇÍÇyÏÇy,Éy.ÉynÉypÉy∞Éy≤ÉyÚÉyÙÉy<<
ÙÉ4Ñy6ÑyPÑyRÑyTÑyVÑyñÑyòÑyÿÑy/Ñy<<
/ÑÖyÖy\Öy^ÖyûÖy†Öy‡Öy,Öy
Üy
Üy<<

ÜÜyÜyKÜyMÜyàÜyäÜy≈Üy«Üyáyáy<<
á?áyAáyláy~áyÄáy¢áy§áy¶áy·áy„áy<<
„áày ày[ày]àyòàyöày'ày◊àyâyây<<
âOâyQâyjâylâynâypây∞ây≤âyÚâyÙây<<
Ùâ4äy6äyväyxäy∏äyʃäy˙äy¸äy<äy>ãy<<
>ã~ãyÄãy¿ãy¬ãyåyåyDåyFåyÜåyàåy<<

àå»åy  åy
çy
çyLçyNçyéçyêçy–çy"çy<<
"çéyéyTéyVéyhéyjéyléyééyêéyíéy<<
íéîéyñéy÷éyÿéyèyèyZèy\èyúèyûèy<<
ûèfièy‡èy  êy"êybêydêy§êy¶êyÊêyËêy<<
Ëê(ëy*ëyjëylëy¨ëyÆëyÓëy♠ëy0íy2íy<<
2íríytíy¥íyðíyˆíy¯íy8ìy:ìyzìy|ìy<<
|ì°ìyœìy‚ìyîy@îyBîyÇîyÑîyƒîy∆îy<<
∆îïyïyHïyJïyäïyåïyÃïyŒïy–ïyÚïy<<
ÚïÙïyˆïy6ñy8ñyxñyzñy∫ñy°ñy‚ñy‚ñy<<
‚ñ>óy@óy{óy}óyÑóyÜóy¡óy√óy‚óyòy<<
ò;òy=òyxòyzòyüòy°òy®òy™òyÍòyÏòy<<
Ïò‚ôy.ôyŴôyYôy[ôy]ôyòôyöôy'ôy◊ôy<<
◊ôöyöy0öyQöyåöyéöyúöyûöy†öy¢öy<<
¢ö‚öy%öy$õy&õyfõyhõy®õy™õyÍõyÏõy<<
ÏõÓõyúyúyúyTúyVúyñúyòúyÿúy/úy<<
/úyùy\ùy^ùyûùy†ùy‡ùy,ùy"ûy$ûy<<
$ûdûyfûy¶ûy®ûyËûyÍûy*üy,üylüynüy<<
nüÆüy∞üy♠üyÚüy2†y4†yt†yv†yù†yü†y<<
ü†°†y£†y„†yÂ†y%°y'°yg°yi°y©°y´°y<<
´°Î°yÌ°y-¢y/¢yo¢yq¢y±¢y≥¢yÛ¢yı¢y<<
ı¢5£y7£y9£y[£y]£y_£yi£yk£ym£yo£y<<
o£Ø£y±£yÒ£yÛ£y3§y5§yu§yw§y∑§yπ§y<<
π§˘§y˚§y;●y=●y}●y●yà●yä●yå●yé●y<<
é●…●yÀ●y¶y¶yC¶yE¶yÄ¶yÇ¶yΩ¶yø¶y<<
ø¶Ù¶yˆ¶y¯¶y˙¶y:ßy<ßy|ßy~ßyœßy¿ßy<<
¿ß®y®yB®yD®yp®yr®yt®yv®yð®y∏®y<<
∏®¯®y˙®y:©y<©y>©y`©yb©yd©y§©y¶©y<<
¶©Ê©yË©y(™y*™yj™yl™y¨™yÆ™yÓ™y♠™y<<
♠™0´y2´yr´yt´y¥´yð´y÷´yÿ´y/´y‹´y<<
‹´fi´y‡´yÏ´yÓ´y.¨y0¨yp¨yr¨y≤¨y¥¨y<<
¥¨Ù¨yˆ¨y6≠y8≠yk≠ym≠yo≠yq≠ys≠yu≠y<<
u≠w≠yy≠y{≠y}≠y≠yÅ≠yÉ≠yÖ≠yá≠yâ≠y<<
â≠ã≠yÇ≠yè≠yë≠yì≠yï≠yó≠yπ≠yª≠y«≠y<<
«≠…≠yÀ≠yÕ≠y
ÆyEÆyGÆyIÆyKÆyãÆyœÆy<<
œÆ¿Æy¬ÆyfÆyØy5Øy7Øy9Øy;Øy{ØyªØy<<
ªØœØy–Øy"Øy'Øy∞yU∞yd∞yf∞yh∞yj∞y<<
j∞™∞yÂ∞yÁ∞yÈ∞yÎ∞y+±yk±yí±yî±yñ±y<<
ñ±ò±yÿ±y≤y:≤y<≤y>≤y@≤yÄ≤y¿≤y"≤y<<
"≤'≤y÷≤yÿ≤y≥y)≥y+≥y-≥y/≥y1≥yS≥y<<
S≥U≥yí≥yª≥yΩ≥yø≥y¡≥y¥y3¥y5¥yu¥y<<
u¥µ¥y¬¥yf¥yΔ¥y»¥yµy)µy+µy-µy/µy<<
/µoµy~µyÄµyÇµyÑµyƒµy–µy"µy'µy◊µy<<
◊µðyŴðy{ðy}ðyðyÅðy¡ðy∑y∑y∑y<<
∑∑yG∑yá∑yf∑yΔ∑y»∑y  ∑y
∏yJ∏yj∏y<<
j∏l∏yn∏yp∏y∞∏y‡∏y,∏y%∏yÊ∏y#πy%πy<<
%π'πyIπyKπyсπyeπygπyiπy©πy%πyÊπy<<

ÊπËπyÍπy*ʃyjʃy™ʃy¨ʃyÆʃy∞ʃy≤ʃy¥ʃy<<
¥ʃ∂ʃy∏ʃyʃʃy°ʃyœʃy¿ʃy¬ʃyfʃyΔʃy»ʃy<<
»ʃ ʃyÃʃyŒʃy−ʃy"ʃy'ʃy÷ʃyÿʃy/ʃy‹ʃy<<
‹ʃfiʃy‡ʃy,ʃy‰ʃyÊʃyËʃyÍʃyÏʃyÓʃy❦ʃy<<
❦ʃÚʃyÙʃyˆʃy¯ʃy˙ʃy¸ʃyˍʃyªyªyªy<<
ªªyªy

ªy,ªy.ªynªyôªyõªyùªyüªy<<
üªflªy¸ªy¸ªy°y°yB°yx°yz°y|°y~°y<<
~°œ°y¸°y8Ωy:Ωy<Ωy>Ωy~ΩyœΩy¸Ωyœy<<
œœyœyœyUœypœyrœytœyvœyðœyˆœy<<
ˆœ*øy,øy.øy0øypøy∞øy¡øy√øy≈øy«øy<<
«ø¿yG¿ym¿yo¿yq¿ys¿y≥¿yÛ¿y          ¡y
¡y<<


¡
¡y¡y0¡yQ¡yS¡yu¡yw¡y†¡y¢¡y§¡y<<
§¡¶¡yÊ¡y¬y¬y¬y¬y^¬yä¬yå¬yé¬y<<
é¬ê¬y−¬yÔ¬yÒ¬yÛ¬yı¬y4√yL√ye√y|√y<<
|√ò√y≥√yµ√y∑√yπ√yˇ√yfyfyfyfy<<
f[fybfydfyffyhfy®fy¥fy∂fy∏fyʃfy<<
ʃf˙fy:≈yb≈yd≈yf≈yh≈y®≈yË≈yΔyΔy<<
Δ
Δy
ΔyLΔyÉΔyÖΔyáΔyâΔy´Δy≠ΔyØΔy<<
ØΔ±ΔyÒΔy«y«y«y«y]«yù«yµ«y∑«y<<
∑«π«yª«y˚«y;»yW»yY»y[»y]»yù»y›»y<<
›»…y5…y7…y9…y;…yz…yß…y©…y´…y≠…y<<
≠…Ì…y- ym yz y| y~ yÄ y¿ yÀy:Ày<<
:À<Ày>Ày@ÀyÄÀy¿Ày¸Ày¸ÀyÃyÃyBÃy<<
BÃyÃy{Ãy}ÃyÃyªÃyΩÃyøÃy¡Ãy√ÃyÂÃy<<
ÂÃÊÃˇˇ}ÃyÃyªÃyΩÃyøÃy¡Ãy√ÃyÂÃy<<$
1t<hx<%,2í5a;ó?ªDOKÉQ≈Wπ]dhg:n
u{¡Ä¸ÜîçFîöß†z¶v¨ÍØSµ@ʃʃ°P¬7«eÃˇˇˇˇ@ˇˇˇˇ@ˇ¨@ˇˇˇˇˇˇˇ     ˇˇ
@ˇˇ
ˇˇ
@ˇˇ
@ˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇ7ˇˇ;ˇˇˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇ@ˇˇˇˇ ˇˇ!ˇˇ"ˇˇ#ˇˇ$
(11/22/9101/01/80eÃ‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹
‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹‹