

CODE RAD04110®

EDUCATORS AND EDUCATION RESEARCHERS NEGOTIATING
A WAY THROUGH THE PUBLIC GOOD/PRIVATE GAIN DIVIDE: A
MARXIAN DIALECTICAL CRITIQUE®

Helen Raduntz

Adjunct Research Fellow, University of South Australia

*Paper RAD04110 presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education
Conference
Melbourne, Victoria
November 28 - December 2, 2004*

Abstract

The paper argues that the tensions arising in education and education research between doing the public good and submitting to the demands of an increasingly market orientated education system, derive from the capitalist market economy's expansionary pressure as a means of resolving its endemic contradiction, namely, that its quest for private profit maximisation constantly undermines the public good on which that profit making depends.

If this contention is accepted then educators/researchers are positioned at the juncture of a polar opposition between public good and private gain, a situation in flux which is filled with possibilities for and against the development of a socially responsive education provision. They are therefore well placed in practical terms to negotiate their way through the public/private divide. However, this is dependent on a critical research analysis that will enable them to make informed and practical judgements regarding their role in influencing educational change in a direction that will overcome the barrier that privatisation imposes on doing the public good in the sphere of education.

It is the aim of this paper by means of a Marxian dialectical critique to make a contribution towards this project.

Introduction

The impact of education's marketisation has made educators and education researchers¹ aware that they are expected to comply with contradictory demands deriving on the one hand, from a private capital gain driven market economy, and on the other, from the social considerations articulated as the public good. These demands raise questions concerning educators' positioning within the public-private division and how they respond to the demands within their workplaces.

A positive outcome for education, for the students they serve and for themselves in the performance of their work depends, first, on developing a critical method of inquiry; second, employing the method to seek the root causes of their dilemma and to evaluate the implications for the future of education; and lastly, based on the results of the inquiry, to formulate a theory of effective, practical action directed toward the eventual resolution of the public-private contradiction. It is the intention of this paper to make a contribution towards this project by outlining the dynamics of the situation.

The conclusion arrived at is that there is a fundamental opposition within education between the aims of delivering, on the one hand, a socially responsive quality education for the public good, for the population as a whole, and on the other, a delimiting and impoverished education to serve the pursuit of private capital gain by a minority, and that because educators are located at the interface of this divide they are in a position to negotiate and shape a course of action leading to a resolution. The ability to negotiate, however, is dependent not only on an understanding of the nature of the dynamics which have given rise to the contradictions they face but also on the development of an adequate critical method for the project.

It is to be noted that because the immediate focus of the paper is economic and because for purposes of clarity the discussion is carried on at a high level of generality, this is not to discount other issues which impact on the problem of educators' positioning, nor to ignore that for a full account a critique must also include references to particular education contexts and specific instances relating to the contradictory demands in the classroom for example.

Framing a critique for negotiating the theory-practice relation

In framing a critical approach to resolving their dilemma educators' will want to know what has caused the appearance of the public-private divide in education, what is the nature of the divide, why it is a problem for education and educators, and how might the problem be negotiated and resolved.

The search for an explanation as well as a resolution refers us to the theory-practice relation which it is the task of a Marxian dialectical critique to negotiate. In order to define a critique with reference to the subject of our

inquiry, it is necessary to review not only the marketisation of education but also existing theories which seek to explain the changes in education that have occurred.

The effects of marketisation on educators' position

The changes impacting on educators and their work derive from the introduction of corporate best practice business principles. These principles are designed to maximise cost efficiencies and to raise education's productivity in the delivery of education commodities, namely, intellectual property and skilled intellectual as well as manual labour power in order primarily to support and maximise private capital gain.

The changes not only cut across the aims of education in terms of the public good to deliver a socially rather than a market responsive education service, they also adversely affect the organisational structures and social relations of education, educators' working conditions, their relative autonomy and powers of discretion, as well as professional standing. The situation has posed difficulties for educators who, confronted by their students, must somehow find ways of tailoring prescriptive curricula demands to students' needs while at the same time fulfilling a high level of mandatory administrative tasks required under new education regimes.

Critical accounts of the changes have been forthcoming but the question is do they offer an explanation which can guide educators in seeking a resolution of their current position.

A critique of critical education change theories

An examination of most theories critical of the changes in education tend to be descriptive rather than explanatory, and because for the most part they do not ask why of all possible models education is being shaped for marketisation, few theorists venture outside the parameters of education to examine the connection between education and the economy. In this regard the works of Ball (1994) on education reform, Hill & Cole (2001) on equity issues in schooling, Marginson (1997), on markets in education, Reid (2003) on teachers' work, and Lingard (2001) on repositioning research in education, can be regarded as representative examples.

While the intention of many critical education theorists is to provide a basis for a reversal of current trends in education, without investigating the contemporary economy situation, their theories turn out to be one-sided and therefore inadequate accounts on which to base transformative action. At this level of inquiry it is virtually impossible to grasp the dynamics operating within the education-economy relation which would account for the problems educators face. Without such an explanation reforms would be purely cosmetic with little prospect of effecting fundamental, qualitative change.

However, critical theorists make a positive contribution by raising the level of critical consciousness among educators and by providing a basis on which to frame a mode of critique adequate to the tasks before them.

Developing a Marxian dialectical critique

We can see from the above that a critique must be developed which can negotiate three interrelated aspects, the theory-practice, the public good-private gain and the education-economy relations. A Marxian dialectical critique is best qualified for the task because it focuses not only on understanding the dynamics of movement and change but also on assisting the formulation of theories of practical action.

Its nature can best be comprehended in terms of Hegel's aphorism the unity of unity and difference in which the first term refers to the overall theoretical frame of reference, in this case Marx's materialist conception of history. Within this frame, unity and difference, the second and third terms, are regarded as polar opposites but interrelated aspects referring on the one side to the principles of the dialectic², and on the other to the mode or form of critique to be formulated in accord with whatever is its subject matter. The unity of the relationship between Hegel's dialectical principles and Marx's mode of critique for capital is one example of the relationship between unity and difference within the overall unity that describes the capitalist mode of production.

The dynamics involved and the functioning of the various aspects can best be understood as a totality analogous to a living organism, the parts of which interact and shape each other and whose functions cannot be understood without reference to the whole organism. Thus, for instance, education is a part of capitalist society and its function can be understood fully only with reference to the particular structural characteristics which constitute that society as a functioning whole. In order therefore to grasp the nature and dynamics of education and its relationship in this paper with the capitalist economy for instance, the critique must consider the structural relations entailed as well as the change process these relations engender.

By way of another analogy. The structures and processes under investigation can be seen in terms of a movie which technically is composed of a succession of frames through which the story progressively unfolds. According to Hegel, in order to obtain the truth of a phenomenon we must examine it dialectically, first, as a frozen moment in time captured in a movie frame, as it were, and then, as part of an ongoing story. If we examine the story frame by frame abstracted from the movie reel as a whole we observe only static representations. It is only when the movie is set in motion do we grasp the significance of each frame and its position in the whole, in which case the frame's discreteness disappears.

On these understandings of the nature of the critique it is now possible to put it to work on negotiating the dynamics of the education-economy relation.

Negotiating the dynamics of the education-economy relation

The appearance of the public good-private gain contradiction in education as a consequence of its increasing marketisation is indicative of a fundamental change in the relationship between education and the economy, a relationship which formerly had been negotiated through the State. In seeking an explanation for the change it is necessary to examine the dynamics within the education-economy relationship as it is now being negotiated by the market. The examination must include the role of educators which as a result is being more closely aligned to and shaped by the demands of the market driven economy.

The inner dynamics of the capitalist market economy

While the exchange of goods surplus to subsistence requirements has been a long standing feature of most societies, the capitalist market economy is unique among them because its mode of production, driven by the imperative to accumulate and expand private capital wealth, is directed primarily towards the production of commodities for their exchange value, though these commodities must possess use value if exchange is to occur. The market therefore plays a dominant mediating role in shaping what is produced and how, which means also a change in the social conditions associated with the public good within which production takes place.³

In general terms from the standpoint of the materialist conception of history, productive activity, as it takes place within a variety of social settings, is the means by which people maintain, express and define themselves as human beings. The necessity to produce for subsistence needs carried out under social conditions corresponding to the level of development acquired by the forces of production is, of course, primary (Marx, p. 1968, p. 181), but the drive to become free from that necessity is the impulse which accounts for human historical development. The relationship between necessity and freedom constitutes the essential contradiction and tension and therefore the dynamic underlying the human condition. Two notions follow from this account, one, that in producing for their subsistence people make their own history but in circumstances not of their choosing, and two, that capitalism since it is a consequence of human productive activity is subject to human transformative action.

Focussing on the nature of productive activity there are two aspects to be considered which we referred to above, one, the structural relations composed of producers and their means of production working within a particular collaborative, social relationship. In this context producers in fulfilling their subsistence and social needs, exert control both mentally and physically over most aspects of the production; and two, in the actual labour process the

producers' labour power becomes embodied in the articles produced so that each article becomes an expression of their identities and production aims.

By way of illustrating the dynamics involved, which also has relevance in understanding the role of critique, we can adopt the analogy of a sculptor for instance confronting a block of marble which s/he has in mind to shape according to a preconceived idea. With appropriate tools work commences but the materiality of the marble 'resists' the sculptor's attempts to recreate exactly his/her original image in stone. It causes the sculptor at intervals to re-evaluate not only her/his handiwork but also the original idea, and so on until the work is completed. As a result of this dialectical interaction the end product represents a compromise in which the sculptor's idea and what is being sculpted, as polar opposites shape and are shaped by each other.

In contrast to the analogy capitalism's market conditions are characterised by the separation of producer-workers from their means of production (the block of marble and the tools in the above analogy), and a labour market in which workers relinquish formal control over their labour time for the duration of a contract in exchange for a wage (Bowles & Gintis 1976, p. 57). The separation gives rise to a structural relation between owners of capital and workers who must sell their labour in order to survive. On the basis of these structural relations and to demonstrate how the value of wage labour's productivity ends up as private gain, it is necessary to grasp the dynamics emanating from capitalism's production-exchange relation.

Observing the fluctuations in market prices it is not immediately apparent that the cause has its source in the necessity for an individual capitalist enterprise to include in the price of its commodities a profit margin above the cost of production in order to guarantee a return on its investment. The effect is to inflate the value of commodities above the average which is measured in terms of the amount of labour time necessary in the production of commodities under average productivity conditions. The prices based on these inflated values cause problems when commodities are presented for exchange on the market which demands price equalisation as a condition of that exchange. The price differential and the instability this causes in the market place is attributable to capitalism's particular market conditions which are based on freedom to trade, an equality between purchaser and vendor, and private property rights.

Under these conditions commodity production is not organised and enterprises tend to make production decisions independently based on the need to maximise their market share, if they are to remain viable in a competitive market place, without reference to the level of consumer demand or to the production output of competing enterprises. It is only when their commodities are presented for exchange is it apparent, as indicated by price variations from the average, that they have over or under produced. Because the law of exchange demands an equalisation of commodity values if there is

to be exchange at all, overproduction causes a fall in value and therefore in price which in turn reduces an enterprise's profit margin and market share.

To withstand the competitive pressures an enterprise must eliminate what is now obsolete stock, seek new ways of reducing its production costs and raise the productivity of the labour it has hired so that they can increase the volume of commodities produced at a cheaper price. Consequently, an enterprise will embark on investing in and applying new labour saving technology, which inevitably involves organisational restructuring, to gain greater efficiencies. In the process the enterprise reduces the labour power, in terms of time and wages, which actually creates the surplus value on which its profits depend. To elaborate: The profit of an enterprise depends on the amount of surplus value it can extract from the labour power it has purchased. This is accomplished by the simple expedient of recouping the cost of that labour in less than the contracted time. It is therefore in an enterprise's interests to maximise the time devoted to the production of surplus value and to minimise the time devoted to recouping labour costs.

It is this incentive in response to competitive pressures which is the essential motive accounting, on the one hand, for capitalism's phenomenal technological advances, its massive productive capacity, its surpluses of investment capital and expansionary tendencies, and on the other, for the degradation of workers' working conditions, for the loss of ownership of their means of production and of control over their work processes, and for their subjugation as appendages to a mechanised assembly line in accord with the technocratic and instrumental rationality of the market economy.

The market advantage these efficiencies afford an enterprise is only temporary, however, because rival enterprises are forced to introduce similar efficiencies in their own workplaces if they also are to remain viable. For example, when automation becomes generalised throughout industry all enterprises are reduced to the same level of efficiency in which case profit margins of one enterprise against another disappear. The ensuing game of leapfrog, as one enterprise after another attempts to gain and then loses market share tends to enlarge the productive capacity of society as a whole beyond the ability of consumers who can pay to absorb. The problem highlights another of capitalism's contradictions. The drive to save labour costs by keeping wages to a minimum renders workers as consumers too impoverished to buy the volume of commodities flooding the market so that the conversion of the surplus value into capital cannot take place.

These contradictions account for the widespread economic crises which have periodically characterised capitalism's history. However, despite the social and economic devastation that accompanies these crises, they are in fact the means by which capitalism saves itself from self-destruction. For they serve to force the economy to restructure as a means of re-establishing stability in the face of the instability created by individual enterprises in striving to out do each other in market share.

Paradoxically, it is this roller coaster pattern, as expressed in cyclical periods of economic 'boom and bust', through which capitalism is able to survive and actually thrive. Rather than overcoming the social barrier represented by the capital-wage labour relation which is root cause of this pattern capitalism strives to maintain a semblance of balance through territorial expansion and the attempted colonisation of all spheres of social life in search for new markets. Globalisation and the marketisation of education can be seen as outcomes of this strategy. Try as it might, however, capitalism does not overcome its contradictions. It merely displaces and re-creates them on a different plane (Harvey 1982, p. 326). Hence, the appearance in the domain of education of the public good-private gain contradiction.

The penetration of the market economy directly into the domain of education can be traced to the economic crisis of the late 1960s. The crisis activated corporations to restore their profitability by means of, one, destroying the power of unions and restructuring their labour processes for a leaner and meaner production regime; two, aggressively seeking new avenues of capital accumulation, particularly in the new capital growth knowledge-based industries such as electronics, computers, telecommunications, biotechnology and nanotechnology; and three, pressuring governments at all levels to cut public spending not related directly to capital accumulation (Yates 2000). These strategies had an additional effect in containing the threat posed by postwar reform movements in their demand for a greater and more equitable share of the socially produced wealth at the expense of profits. The tension highlights the nature of the relation between the public good and private gain, for the latter in order to resolve the instability it creates, depends on appropriating public goods. In the process, however, it tends to undermine the public good which is a condition of its existence.

As these strategies impacted on education, particularly on its tertiary sector, education administrators began to solicit corporate funding to compensate for their budgetary shortfalls. The close liaison that developed alerted business to the potential education presented as a lucrative field of investment which depended for its realisation on education's marketisation. As cost saving efficiencies are applied education will inevitably be subjected to limitations in the delivery of quality education as a public good if counter measures are not taken. These consequences are borne out in an examination of the inner dynamics of modern education.

The Inner Dynamics of Modern Education

In its essential structures and processes education can be identified as a mode of production like any other. The vital difference is in the form of its social relations and its basic functions which are to generate, transmit and disseminate knowledge on the one hand, and on the other, to produce generations of knowledgeable, skilled and encultured citizens. The two functions, transformative and reproductive, are basically contradictory. In its

functioning education has close links not only with society's economy but also with its social, political and intellectual aspects. Education therefore holds a powerful position in shaping society.

Historically, education has operated within class based societies reproducing the class structures and serving the political, social and cultural ends of successive ruling classes. It has not been until the modern era that education has entered the economic realm of the market place to serve the interests of the bourgeois ruling class, a development which has occurred on the back of education's transformative function, namely, the development of new ideas through scientific inquiry. The appearance of modern systems of education can be traced to the demands of capitalism's rapid industrialisation in the early nineteenth century for scientific knowledge, technological expertise and a skilled and compliant labour force. Subsequent trends in education can be traced to the shifting demands of an expanding capitalist economy.

The changes now shaping education derive from the economic and industrial imperatives of the knowledge-based economy dependent on information and communication technologies and the necessary restructuring of the economy to accommodate it, thus confirming the claim (Bowles & Gintis 1976, p. 11) that the defining characteristics adopted by modern education are those which define the capitalist economic system, namely, the market, private property and the power relations arising from the capital-wage labour class division.

Prior to these developments, however, when education's relation to the economy was mediated by the state rather than the market, there existed an opportunity for the development of social democratic approaches to education based on mutually supportive and cooperative social relations, and ideals of equality of opportunity, development of human potentialities, freedom of inquiry, and the free exchange of ideas. As an expression of the public good these ideals surfaced to become the basis of education reform in the post World War II era. Despite their reversals in the current economic climate and while within the schema of capitalism's overall historical trajectory the reform movement can be seen as a temporary departure, the reforms did provide a window on what a quality education for the public good might look like given the right social conditions. It was a vision that has remained to become a standard against which current changes in education can be critically evaluated.

In the meantime capitalism has moved on to embrace the new knowledge based economy in which education is being groomed to play a leading role as it becomes transformed into a specifically capitalist education mode of production. In this event the technocratic and instrumental rationality underlying the capitalist market regime acquires full expression as pressure mounts to replace labour intensive pedagogical practices with capital intensive online learning processes centred on protocols based on information

and communication technologies which for Noble (2001) heralds the age of education's automation and the appearance of the digital diploma mill. The intense efforts to subjugate education to the regime of the market, however, tends to ignore the fact that, while this might extend the reproduction of the capitalist class relation, education also has a vital role in serving the social and intellectual needs of citizens whose time is not totally engaged in working for private gain.⁴ Thus, the tensions derived from the public-private divide reassert themselves in the realm of education.

At the centre of these contradictions are the educators and education researchers.

Educators as negotiators of the public-private divide in education

The impact of the steam roller effects of the changes in education and the introduction of technocratic organisational and instrumental learning regimes have left many educators overworked, demoralised and marginalised with little time or room in which to exercise the discretion they need to carry out their work successfully in shaping it according to the needs of their students and the public good.⁵ It is therefore difficult for educators to visualise themselves playing a significant negotiating role in resolving the public-private divide. Yet, by the very nature of their work and their structural location at the interface of the divide, this is indeed their role whether they realise it or not.

As a body, educators are confronted with the dismemberment of an education system largely funded out of public revenue. As a result the most lucrative sectors are being privatised and marketised while the remnants, particularly the state funded formal education sectors because they are low on market value except as consumers of education goods, are being subjected to serious funding shortfalls. For the same reasons a division has arisen between educators' research and teaching roles.

These separations and divisions effectively create conditions under which competition, inequalities and social divisions among educators can thrive, conditions which present major difficulties for educators as a body to develop and maintain a sense of solidarity. These conditions also conceal the reality that educators are essentially waged workers whose intellectual and/or pedagogical labour is being exploited either directly as employees of privatised education enterprises or indirectly as employees of government sponsored education services.

Their exploitation arises because the value of their labour time becomes embodied in the products of their work, their intellectual property, or as a component of the total value of wage labour and hence a component of the surplus value produced by the latter. On this account educators have an association of interests, the ideology of professionalism notwithstanding, based on the commonality of their exploitation not only within the sphere of

education among each other, but also in the wider economy with wage workers in whatever sphere they happen to work. It is a community of interests which reveals that like all workers educators have a stake in quality education not only on their own account but also for the public good.

However, as Harris (1994, p. 103) points out, because educators through their own schooling, pre-service education, and teaching/researching expertise have been exposed to sources of knowledge above the average in society as a whole, and as bearers of knowledge are skilled in the craft of research and the generation, transmission and dissemination of knowledge, they are potentially well placed at the nexus of the public-private divide to play a leading role in shaping the socially responsive quality education of the future. Such a role, however, is dependent on a consciousness of their role and on the formulation of a theory of practical action.

It has been the aim of the above inquiry to raise this consciousness, and so fully aware of the issues we can now begin to formulate a practical theory for action.

Formulating a theory of practical action: Resolving the public-private divide

The focus on practical action signifies a shift from theory to the practical side of the theory-practice equation. From this vantage point and based on a critical evaluation of our theoretical inquiry we can identify courses of effective action. There are at least three parts to the formulation of the theory, a critical review of the results of the inquiry, the effectiveness of the critique, and a theory on courses of action.

Critical review of the inquiry

Some of the conclusions of the inquiry relevant to the planning of transformative action are as follows: One, the problems confronting educators in their work derive from the contradictory demands of the public good-private gain divide which has its source in the dynamics of the economy based on the capital-wage labour class relation. This means that transformative action if it is to be effective in attacking the root causes of the divide must be conducted not only according to an individual's circumstances and within the particular context of education but also at all levels of society and internationally; two, while capitalism is a highly volatile and unstable economic system it actually sustains itself by alternating cycles of instability and stability, so that for instance social and labour unrest is countered by divide and rule tactics, evidenced more recently by the advent of sophisticated social and labour self management strategies. As Lebowitz (1992, p. 85) points out, a necessary condition for the existence of capitalism is its ability to divide and separate workers in order to defeat them.

Awareness of these characteristics, I propose, means that while spontaneous protests and sectional industrial action have their place in developing critical mass movements, these must be complemented by strategically planned and organised modes of action based on rigorous critique of situations, as well as a vanguard leadership, a role which, as has been pointed out, educators are well placed to participate in.

Critical review of the dialectical method of critique

There are two parts to the review, one, the effectiveness of the method developed for its immediate task, and two, a review of the critique as a general methodological approach. First, in the limited space of the paper the critique was able to make some contribution at least towards raising educators' awareness that a positive negotiation and resolution of their problematic is dependent on a dialectical critique which seeks to get beyond their immediate work experiences in order to formulate a theory on which transformative action can be planned. However, in order to be totally effective, the critique must complement its generalised account with reference to particular education contexts as well as to specific instances of the problematic.

Second, it must be recognised that the development of the Marxian dialectical critique as displayed in this paper represents an embryonic attempt to demonstrate its power as a dynamic force in shaping the theory-practice relation. It is hoped that the attempt makes a contribution towards the study of the Marxian dialectical critique because it is one of the most underdeveloped areas of critical investigation. Nevertheless, there are signs of a movement back to a reappraisal of the Hegelian-Marxian project as an effective means of understanding contemporary capitalism, and changing it.⁶ The effectiveness of the attempt in this paper, however, must be for others to determine.

Guided by some of these conclusions it is now possible to outline the elements to be considered in theorising courses of action.

Theorising courses of Action

The elements of a theory of action include motivation and goal, moments of transition and the course to be taken.

The motivation for action among educators has been their confrontation with the effects of education's marketisation and the contradiction which has entered their work in the shape of the public good-private gain divide. The confrontation leads to an impulse to resolve their problem and the formulation of a goal which sets them on a path through a series of transitions towards understanding the nature of the problematic and how it might be overcome. Part of this transitional process is to determine based on social criteria the positive aspects of the subject matter which can form the

ground on which action can be mounted in shaping a more socially oriented education. The negative barriers to this progression can then be identified and become the target of specific political action (Mészáros 1970, p. 129). In negotiating their way through the positives and negatives educators are defining their position in the public-private divide as it relates not only to education but to society as a whole.

In considering courses of action attention must be paid to the reasons for previous reform failures to avoid for instance being too prescriptive in aims in a manner that is utopian, to devising ways and means of collaborating, and to recognise that, while the ultimate goal is overcoming the capital-wage labour relation in order to regain the economic freedom and autonomy it abrogates, transformative change is a stage by stage process populated at each stage by necessarily short to medium term ends, rarely is the process an all at once revolution, and that any course of action must remain open for future change actors to determine how they might carry on the struggle.

Conclusion

It has been the intention of the paper to make a contribution towards the project of assisting educators and education researchers to negotiate their way through the public good-private gain divide. The process has involved demonstrating how a Marxian dialectical critique might be developed for its subject matter; how it operates in analysing the education-economy relation wherein lies an explanation of the dilemmas facing educators in their work; and finally how a course of transformative action might be theorised.

One of the major conclusions is that whether they are aware of it or not, educators are positioned structurally at the interface of the relation between the public good and the private gain, as that relation appears in education and in the wider market economy. They are therefore in a position to shape the direction of education as well as the economy if they realise that as waged and salaried workers they have a commonality of interests to join with workers world wide to reclaim the economic freedom and autonomy that has been denied them by the limitations placed on them by capitalism's class relation.

Notes

¹ For convenience I use the term educators on the understanding that it includes both educators and education researchers. While it has become customary to make the distinction between educators and education researchers, in a dialectical relational sense they are in effect two sides of what it means to educate. Since the paper is conducted at a

high level of generality the content for the most part is applicable to the position of both educators and education researchers.

² The theory of the dialectic is drawn from Hegel's logic which has had a chequered history. Nevertheless it continues to be the subject of commentary and analysis as evidenced in the works of Arthur (2002), Fraser (1997), Hartmann (1972), Houlgate (1991), Johnson (1988), Norman (1976), Ollman & Smith, T. (1998), Smith, T. (1990; 1993), and Taylor (1975). An acceptance of the basic principles of the dialectic is essential for a grasp of Marx's work, for the development of a dialectical critique, and for an understanding of the dynamics of change.

³ Besides Marx's analysis of capital, the account that follows draws on the works of Harvey (1982) and Rubin (1972), Noble (2002) and Raduntz (in press).

⁴ Lebowitz (1992) points out that Marx's analysis of capital and its capital-wage labour relation is one-sided because Marx did not complete his planned analysis of the wage labour side. It is an important omission from the standpoint not only of the domestic economy's relation but also of education's relation to the capitalist economy. In this regard Lebowitz provides some interesting insights.

⁵ Much of what follows has been articulated in more depth in Harris (1994) though from a slightly different frame of reference.

⁶ In this regard the following references may be helpful: Rees (1998) and Wood (1997) on revisiting Marx with new insights; Dunayevskaya (2002) and Mészáros (1970) theorising on practical action; while Allman (1999), Brosio (2000), McLaren (2001) and Rikowski (1996; 1997) focus on critiques of Marxist education theory and the development of critical education.

References

Allman, P. (1999) *Revolutionary Social Transformation: Democratic Hopes, Political Possibilities and Critical Education.*, Bergin & Garvey, Westport, Connecticut.

Arthur, C. J. (2002) *The New Dialectic and Marx's Capital*, Brill, Leiden.

Ball, Stephen. J. (1994) *Education Reform: a critical and post-structural approach*, Open University Press, Buckingham, Eng.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London.

Brosio, R. A. (2000) *Philosophical Scaffolding for the Construction of Critical Democratic Education*, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, New York.

- Dunayevskaya, R. (2002) (Eds, Hudis, P. and Anderson, K. B.) Lexington Books, Lanham, Maryland.
- Fraser, I. (1997) Two of a Kind: Hegel, Marx, Dialectical and Form *Capital & Class*, 61, 81-106.
- Harris, K. (1994) *Teachers: Constructing the Future*, The Falmer Press, London.
- Hartmann, K. (1972) In *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*(Ed, MacIntyre, A.) University of Notre Dame Press, London.
- Harvey, D. (1982) *The limits to capital*, Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd, Oxford UK.
- Hill, D. and Cole, M. (Eds.) (2001) *Schooling and Equality: fact, concept and policy*, Kogan Page Limited, London.
- Houlgate, S. (1991) *Freedom, Truth & History: An introduction to Hegel's philosophy*, Routledge, London.
- Johnson, P. O. (1988) *The Critique of Thought: A re-examination of Hegel's Science of Logic*, Avebury, Aldershop, England.
- Lebowitz, M. A. (1992) *Beyond 'Capital'*, Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd, Basingstoke UK.
- Lingard, B. (2001) Some Lessons for Educational Researchers: Repositioning Research in Education and Education in Research *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 28, 3, 1-46
- Marginson, S. (1997) *Markets in education*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, Australia.
- Marx, K. (1968) In *Selected Works*Progress Publishers, Moscow, pp. 180-184.
- McLaren, P. (2001) Education, Struggle, and the Left Today: Interview of Mike Cole, Dave Hill, and Glenn Rikowski *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 10, 2, 145-162.
- Mészáros, I. (1970) *Marx's Theory of Alienation*, Merlin Press, London.
- Noble, D. F. (2001) *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

- Noble, D. F. (2002) Technology and the Commodification of Higher Education *Monthly Review*, 53, 10, 26-40.
- Norman, R. (1976) *Hegel's Phenomenology: A philosophical introduction*, Humanities Press, New Jersey.
- Ollman, B. and Smith, T. (1998 Fall) Introduction: Dialectics: the New *Frontier Science & Society*, 62, 3, 333-337.
- Raduntz, H. (In press) In *Globalising public education: policies, pedagogies and politics*(Eds, Apple, M. W., Kenway, J. and Singh, M.) Peter Lang Publishing, Inc, USA.
- Rees, J. (1998) The Return of Marx? *International Socialism*, 79, 3-11.
- Reid, A. (2003) Understanding Teachers' Work: is there still a place for labour process theory? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24, 5, 559-573.
- Rikowski, G. (1997) Scorched earth: Prelude to rebuilding Marxist educational theory *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18, 4, 551-574.
- Rikowski, G. (1996) Left alone: End time for Marxist educational theory? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17, 4, 415-451.
- Rubin, I. I. (1972) *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*, Samardzija, M. and Perlman, F., Black & Red, Detroit US.
- Smith, T. (1990) *The Logic of Marx's 'Capital': Replies to Hegelian Criticisms*, State University of New York Press, Albany N.Y.
- Smith, T. (1993) *Dialectical social theory and its critics: From Hegel to Analytical Marxism and Postmodernism*, State University of New York Press, Albany N.Y.
- Taylor, C. (1975) *Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.
- Wood, E. M. (1997) Back to Marx *Monthly Review*, 49, 2, 1-9.
- Yates, M. (2000) Us Versus Them: Laboring in the Academic Factory *Monthly Review*, 51, 8, 40-49.