

COMPULSION VERSUS LIBERTY IN EDUCATION (2):

THE BRITISH ROAD FROM FREEDOM TO DESPOTISM

DAVID BOTSFORD



The more one reads about the history of this island, the more one is inclined to question the view that the period between 1688 and 1914 was a golden age of individual freedom, the rule of law and limited government. A study of the treatment inflicted by the British state on the people of the Scottish Highlands after the defeat of the 1745 revolt, for example, will give anybody second thoughts about a unreserved acceptance of the “Whig interpretation of history”.

Nonetheless, it is fair to say that particularly in the five decades which followed the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the importance of individual liberty, private property rights and a free market economy was recognised in Britain, even though these principles were by no means applied to all aspects of law, economy and society, or accepted by all the powerful groups within society. The question, then, is when Britain made the transition from being a country in which, on the whole, the individual enjoyed freedom of action in so far as he did not violate the equal freedom of others, to one in which the individual became essentially a tool of the state. As late as the outbreak of the First World War, this former view remained so influential that the Liberal government refused to introduce military conscription for the first two years of the war, and 1916 is a date often given as the turning point in the history of the relationship between the individual and the state in Britain.

A stronger case could be made, however, for the period between 1870 and 1902, in which the state gradually transformed the education system in Britain from a decentralised, voluntary, free-market process into one in which the state owned and operated the overwhelming majority of schools, and forced young people to attend either one of the state’s own schools, or a “private” school to which the state’s powers of imposing violence had been devolved. This constituted a far more significant transformation of the relationship between the individual and the state — in favour of the latter — than military conscription ever did.

SCHOOLING, THE STATE AND ECONOMIC CHANGE

Mass compulsory state schooling was introduced in the wake of the economic, social and political changes ushered in by the agricultural revolution of the 18th century, which greatly enhanced the productivity of the land and led to a massive increase in population, and the process of industrialisation which followed it. These changes greatly altered the pattern of life of the majority of people. Before, the greater part of the population lived in small rural communities, in which many aspects of the individual’s life were controlled by such factors as the communal influence of fellow villagers, the landlord, the priest and countless “customs with the

force of law”, as well as written laws themselves, which in some countries restricted the mobility, property ownership and other rights of peasants. These changes brought ever-increasing numbers of individuals out of these small communities and into swelling towns and cities, where they found themselves faced with all the possibilities and choices — and indeed new problems — of the extended market order. The individual both obtained greater opportunities for individual choice and at the same time became a part of a new social phenomenon, the mass, to which he or she related in a different manner than to individuals in a small community. The lives of those who remained in rural communities, too, were radically altered by this extension of the market order, as agriculture became more mechanised and varied, population and mobility grew, transportation became more available, and increasing goods and services became available to villagers. The group on whom these changes had the most profound effect was children. Before the agricultural revolution, the children of the rural poor had generally started working in the fields almost as soon as they could walk. With agricultural production extraordinarily inefficient by today’s standards, the children’s labour was needed to maximise yields. The increase in agricultural productivity, the movement of population to urban areas and the increased financial resources available to the mass of the population meant that the labour of children became less necessary, and that parents could instead provide them with a formal education, something which had hitherto been largely the preserve of the wealthy minority in society.

These economic transformations were quickly followed by corresponding political ones. The appearance of the masses called for new methods of rule, as well as new opportunities for plunder, on the part of the state. The idea that “the people” were sovereign attained universal acceptance. The state therefore increasingly used propaganda as a means of directing the attitudes, opinions, self-image and patterns of behaviour and relationship to other people of the individual within the mass, thereby obtaining ever-greater control over him or her. In order for such propaganda to be effective, it was essential to establish conditioned reflexes and myths in the mind of each individual, which would channel his or her thinking and behaviour in a manner which conformed to the requirements of the ruling elite. The state therefore had to take control over many institutions of society for propaganda purposes, not least the educational system. As Professor Jacques Ellul, of the Institut d’Etudes Politiques of Bordeaux, writes in his definitive study of the role of propaganda in modern society:

Education and training are inevitably taken over, as the Napoleonic Empire demonstrated for the first time. No contrast can be tolerated between teaching and propaganda, between the critical spirit formed by higher education and the exclusion of independent thought. One must utilise the education of the young to condition them to what comes later. The schools and all methods of instruction are transformed under such conditions, with the child integrated into the conformist group in such a way that the individualist is tolerated not by the authorities but by his peers.¹

The purpose of compulsory state schooling was and is to shape the individual’s attitudes, perceptions, conditioned reflexes and entire psychology in such a way as to make him or her a useful tool of the political authorities, a tool whom those authorities can manipulate and control by means of propaganda in adult life. By this method, in the 19th and early 20th centuries, states in different countries imposed conformity, and created an “average type”, with certain conditioned attitudes, out of masses of individuals who had hitherto been subject to diverse regional, linguistic, cultural and economic influences. By 1900 a clear stereotype of a “typical Englishman”, “typical Frenchman”, “typical German”, “typical American”, “typical Japanese”, and so on, united with his compatriots by certain characteristic attitudes and behaviour patterns, had emerged; in 1800, such stereotypes had hardly existed: they were created largely by state-imposed compulsory schooling. The traditional purpose of Western education had been to broaden and enhance the individual’s unique traits and differentiation from other individuals. Now this purpose was reversed, and the school was used to impose psychological uniformity and narrow the pupils’ horizons to those patterns of behaviour and thinking which made them most susceptible to political control. As early as 1859, John Stuart Mill wrote:

That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating.

Educational Notes No. 16

ISSN 0953-7775 ISBN 1 85637 158 1
An occasional publication of the Libertarian Alliance,
25 Chapter Chambers, Esterbrooke Street, London SW1P 4NN
www.libertarian.co.uk email: admin@libertarian.co.uk
© 1993: Libertarian Alliance; David Botsford.



David Botsford is a freelance writer and desktop publisher, and a trainee hypnotherapist.

The views expressed in this publication are those of its author, and not necessarily those of the Libertarian Alliance, its Committee, Advisory Council or subscribers.

Director: Dr Chris R. Tame
Editorial Director: Brian Micklethwait Webmaster: Dr Sean Gabb

FOR LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY

All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity in opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body.²

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE EDUCATION IN BRITAIN

In Britain, however, several factors hindered — if only temporarily — the establishment of such a system. The first was the role of the churches in education. In 1807 the House of Commons passed a bill for the establishment of universal state schooling, but it was rejected by the Lords, under the influence of the bishops. For centuries, charitable church schools for the poor had flourished, supported by private sponsors. In 1719, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was raising £10,000 in London alone for its educational work. In the early 19th century the churches were rapidly increasing the number of schools they were establishing. The National Society, created in 1811, built Anglican schools; the British and Foreign Society, established in 1814, built Nonconformist schools; and Roman Catholics established the Catholic Poor School Committee. By 1882, the churches had established 11,620 primary schools, entirely financed by voluntary contributions. A large proportion of these contributions were made by working-class parents intending to send their children to the church schools. The churches had no desire to see these activities undermined by the establishment of state schools.

The second factor was the historical background against which English law operated. Among the fundamental principles of English common law, dating back to before the Norman conquest, were that no individual could be incarcerated without charge or trial, that an individual could be imprisoned only after being convicted of violating an already existing law, and that every individual had a right to trial by a jury before being sentenced to imprisonment. Neither Magna Carta nor the Bill of Rights of 1688 contained anything which allowed the king to violate these principles, even if he claimed to be “educating” his subjects during the process of incarceration. The idea that the state should have powers to force young people to attend state institutions for a period of years, on pain of violence being used against them or their parents if they chose not to avail themselves of this service, was profoundly repugnant to those who valued the tradition of English common law as it had developed down to the 19th century. And this freedom was valued as much by enlightened foreigners as by informed Englishmen and women. As late as the 1860s, for instance, Tolstoy wrote of compulsory schooling in the German states as a heavy burden, and praised by contrast “free England, where the promulgation of such a law has been and always will be unthinkable”.³

Third, from the time of the industrial revolution onwards, the common people were already having their children educated in a vast network of varied private educational institutions, entirely without state intervention. The ground-breaking work of the late Professor E.G. West has shown how the state gradually replaced this private, voluntary and decentralised process with a taxpayer-financed system, characterised by compulsion, nationalisation, virtual state monopoly and the replacement of individual consumer choice with political control by bureaucrats, a process which, moreover, did not increase the proportion of gross domestic product allocated to education. The facts will be familiar to libertarian and classical liberal students of education, but a brief survey of the main developments is in order for those whose knowledge of history has been gained exclusively from school and university. It’s a sure bet that nothing in the following paragraphs will ever appear in the “historical” component of the National Curriculum.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS LITERACY

In the first third of the 19th century, the British government deliberately attempted to suppress the spread of literacy among the common people by imposing severe taxes on paper in order to price publications out of their reach. Many powerful figures were concerned about the spread of radical — and, incidentally, largely

libertarian — literature among the “lower orders”. In 1803, for example, the Reverend Thomas Malthus, the political economist, complained that “The circulation of Paine’s *Rights of Man* ... has done great mischief among the lower and middle classes of this country.”⁴ *The Rights of Man* is estimated to have sold as many as 1.5 million copies in Britain in this period. The government attempted to restrict the circulation of William Cobbett’s newspaper *Cobbett’s Register* by closing down public reading-rooms, and withdrawing licences from public houses, inns and coffee houses which received copies of the paper. The authorities knew that, in the words of the ‘weaver-poet’ Samuel Bamford, Cobbett’s writings “were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts of South Lancashire”.⁵ Decades before the 1870 Education Act, the vast majority of the British people were fully literate, as was demonstrated by the massive circulation of religious tracts, ‘penny magazines’, serialised fiction, and other publications. In 1839 a survey in Hull showed that out of the 14,526 adults (aged over 21), 14,109 had attended day or evening school, and only 1054 could not read: 92% of the population, in other words, could read. These adults would almost all have learned to read prior to the beginnings of state subsidies to private schools in 1833, subsidies which in any case remained very small throughout the 1830s. The development of steam printing in the 1830s dramatically reduced the cost of producing newspapers, which greatly expanded their circulation, despite restrictive taxes. After advertising duties were removed in 1853, stamp taxes in 1855 and excise taxes on paper in 1861, newspaper sales increased still further. Despite the state’s efforts to prevent them, working-class people had succeeded in establishing near-universal literacy, through the use of private education, long before the state established a single school of its own.

While state subsidies to schools steadily increased between 1833 and the 1870 Education Act, two-thirds of school expenditure was still coming from voluntary sources as late as 1869. Literacy was achieved from a variety of educational establishments: the Mechanics Institute, the Literary and Philosophic Societies, Sunday Schools, home tuition and private schools, as well as church schools. In 1813 James Mill, the classical liberal philosopher and father of John Stuart Mill, described

the rapid progress which the love of education is making among the lower orders in England. Even around London, in a circle of fifty miles radius, which is far from the most instructed and virtuous part of the kingdom, there is hardly a village that has not something of a school; and not many children of either sex who are not taught more or less, reading and writing. We have met with families in which, for weeks together, not an article of sustenance but potatoes had been used; yet for every child the hard-earned sum was provided to send them to school.⁶

Parliament’s Report on the Education of the Lower Orders in 1818 concluded that “There is the most unquestionable evidence that the anxiety of the Poor for education continues daily increasing...and the means of educating the Poor are steadily increasing.”⁷ A Parliamentary survey published in 1835 showed that the numbers in schools had increased from 478,000 in 1818 to 1,294,000 in 1834 “without any interposition of the Government or public authorities”.⁸ In 1835, Henry Brougham, head of the Select Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the Education of the Lower Orders expressed concern that the new system of state subsidies would lead to higher taxes on working-class parents and thus reduce their ability to buy education and remove choice from them:

[W]here we have such a number of schools and such means of education furnished by the parents themselves from their own earnings, and by the contributions of well-disposed individuals in aid of those whose earnings were insufficient, it behoves us to take the greatest care how we interfere with a system that prospers so well of itself. ... Let the tax-gatherer, or the county-assessor, or the parish collector, but once go his rounds for a school rate, and I will answer for it, that the voluntary assistance of men in themselves benevolent, and, indeed, munificent, instead of increasing, will soon vanish away; that the 1,144,000 now educated at unendowed schools will speedily fall down to almost nothing; and that the adoption of such a fatal and heedless course will sweep away those establishments which, at present, reflect so much honour on the community, which do so much good and are calculated, with judicious management, to do so much more.⁹

SUBSIDIES TO PRODUCERS, NOT CONSUMERS

Significantly, these state subsidies for education were handed not to the consumers — the individual families who were to purchase education — but to the producers — the large organisations in charge of establishing schools. Subsidies were granted in return for the recipient school accepting state inspection of its facilities, with the grant being withdrawn if the school failed to satisfy the inspectors. As taxation at that time was highly regressive, with three-fifths of taxation falling on food and tobacco, the net effect of state subsidy was that working-class parents were having to pay ever higher taxes in return for the gradual removal of consumer sovereignty over the education of their children.

The report of the Newcastle Commission on Popular Education, published in 1861, gave a detailed survey of education throughout England and Wales at that date. The survey had been conducted by five commissioners and ten assistant commissioners, who took three years to produce the report. They found that the typical age range of school pupils was between 5 and 11 years, and the average duration of each pupil's attendance at school was 5.7 years. The report said:

Wherever the Assistant Commissioners went, they found schools of some sort, and failed to discover any considerable number of children who did not attend school for some time, at some period in their lives.¹⁰

It concluded that there were no serious gaps in the provision of schools, and no need for the nationalisation of schools, and recommended that the existing system of subsidies to private schools be maintained:

There is no large district entirely destitute of schools and requiring to be supplied with them on a large scale, nor is there a large section of the population sharply marked off from the rest, and capable of being separately dealt with, as requiring some special and stringent system of treatment.¹¹

THE EDUCATION ACT 1870

In 1870, however, in introducing the Elementary Education Bill, the purpose of which was to establish state schools for the first time, W.E. Forster, vice-president of the committee of the privy council for education, misrepresented the facts about the situation. Ignoring the findings of the Newcastle Report, Forster relied on a different survey, carried out by two inspectors from the Department of Education in 1869, which took only a few months to complete and covered only the cities of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham. By claiming that the "typical" school age was between 5 and 13 years, rather than 5 and 11 as it actually was, this second report was able to claim that there was serious under-attendance of schools.

In his speech introducing the Bill, Forster said that he felt no "need to detain the House with any reason for bringing an Education Bill forward". He then claimed that the 1869 Department of Education report showed that half of all children received no education, but that he could not be specific because "I have not myself had the opportunity of reading that Report, for I did not keep it in my hands for a single hour", but he understood that "with regard, at all events, to Liverpool, the numbers of children between five and thirteen who ought to receive an elementary education is 80,000; but 20,000 attend no school whatsoever, while another 20,000 attend schools where they get an education not worth having."¹² Lord Montagu, the opposition spokesman, pointed out that the actual ages of school attendance were between 5 and 11, rather than 5 and 13. On Forster's own figures, there were 60,000 children in Liverpool aged between five and 11, and 60,000 children attending elementary schools. These figures actually proved, then, that Liverpool had 100% school attendance for this age group. On such a transparent piece of sleight-of-hand, Forster introduced a system that gradually destroyed the free market in education and replaced it with the nationalisation, bureaucratic control, compulsion and central planning we know today.

The 1870 Act introduced nationalised board schools, the purpose being to "fill the gaps" in the private provision of schooling. There was no intention under the Act to replace those existing private schools which were adequately providing elementary education with state schools. Indeed, the private sector continued to expand rapidly after the 1870 Act, in step with the burgeoning population. For example, in 1870, the churches had 6,382 primary schools; by

1882 this figure had reached 11,620, which were financed by collecting £10 million in gifts between 1870 and 1891. 4,402 board schools appeared between 1870 and 1886: 1,124 of these were formerly subsidised schools which had been nationalised, and a further unknown number had been unsubsidised profit-making educational establishments which had also been taken into state ownership.

The new board schools, however, had several overwhelming advantages in their competition with private schools. They had access to virtually unlimited taxpayers' funds, and spent these funds lavishly. And the Education Department soon established the rule that where school boards existed, they had the first right to supply any new requirement for schools which arose from the increase in population. The poet and literary critic Matthew Arnold, who was at that time a schools inspector, reported on the London School Board in 1878 as follows:

It cannot be right, it is extravagant and absurd, that the London boys' education should be so managed as to cost three times as much as that of the Paris one. ... Both in London and elsewhere, school boards are apt to conceive what is requisite in these respects rather as benevolent, intelligent, and scientific educationists in Utopia, than as practical school-managers. I am quite sure that their conception of what is requisite in the way of accommodation, studies, salaries, administration, is pitched too high.¹³

The ever-increasing rates and taxes that the common people were having to pay to finance these schools made it more difficult for them to pay in addition for their children to attend private schools. Also, the board schools, with their large subsidy from the taxpayer, were able to charge lower fees than the private schools, which enjoyed no comparable support. A school inspector named Fitch reported on Lambeth in 1878 as follows:

In the densely-peopled districts of Walworth, Kennington, and North Camberwell there are few or no rich residents; the inhabitants are chiefly shopkeepers and others who form precisely the class most keenly sensible of the pressure of the rates, and most likely to regard the existence of the education rate as a reason for withholding all subscriptions from the Church or other voluntary schools. The clergy of these parishes assure me of the increasing difficulty of obtaining local aid; and complain, not unnaturally, that as soon as they get a skilled and successful teacher he is tempted to leave them by the higher pay and more assured position offered by the Board.¹⁴

THE "MENACE" OF THE BOARD SCHOOLS

In 1876, the Reverend Thomas Daniels, rector of St Paul's Church, Hulme, wrote to the Manchester School Board in reply to a request by the latter body that St Paul's Church of England School be taken over by the board. He complained that the board schools were making it increasingly difficult for St Paul's and other denominational schools to remain in existence:

I refer, first of all, to the low fixed charge, by these Board Schools, of 3d. per week, for boys and girls, whereas in St Paul's, and in all the denominational schools in the neighbourhood there is a scale of fees, rising from 3d. to 6d. per week.

I refer next to the Board Schools supplying free of charge Books, Copy Books, Slates, etc. for school use, and home lessons, which is not done in any of the denominational schools in the neighbourhood.

The case is simply one of under-selling, and it requires no argument to prove that any denominational Schools situated at a *reasonable* distance from the Board Schools must have a hard struggle to keep up their numbers under such unfavourable and unfair competition.

But in the case of St Paul's Schools the Board School is not placed at a reasonable distance but is in the same street, and is distant not more than a *hundred yards*. ...

Let it not however be imagined that I am opposed to giving a cheap and good education to the people. If their circumstances require it, I would gladly aid to the utmost of my power in providing for the education of their children at the lowest possible charges. But I submit that their circumstances do not require it. They are well able to pay, as they have done heretofore, 6d. and 8d. per week. ...

Under these circumstances I would ask whether it is right to pay out of the public rates for the education of children where parents are well able to pay for themselves? And is it right to members of Christian Churches, which have made great sacrifices of time and money to erect schools in connection with their places of worship, to set up rival schools which, as rate-payers, they are compelled to support, in addition to their having to support their own denominational schools? ...

[W]e cannot accede to the proposition of the Chairman and Mr Hughes to hand over these Schools to the School Board, involving as it would a breach of trust.

They were subscribed for as Church of England Schools ... so that if even the menace, or so I regard it, to erect another Board School in the immediate neighbourhood takes effect, why then the only alternative remaining will be for us to close these Schools of ours.¹⁵

The next two steps in the transition to an essentially totalitarian school system were the introduction of compulsory school attendance for all young people in 1880, in violation of the provisions of Magna Carta, and the abolition of fees in state schools under the Education Act 1891.

Until 1891 all schools, private and state-owned, charged fees, except for pupils from the poorest families. The church schools had originally offered free schooling to all, but found that the introduction of fees increased attendance and dedication among pupils. The British and Foreign Society introduced fees in 1816, the National Society in 1828, the Congregationalists in 1848 and the Wesleyans in 1854. The clerical superintendent of the National Society told the 1834 parliamentary committee that his society had been reluctant to introduce fees, but that after fees were introduced parents valued the education provided more highly and gave more encouragement to their children to apply themselves. By 1890 the increasingly beleaguered private schools were completely dependent on these fees.

TIGHTENING THE NOOSE

In 1890, introducing the new Education Bill which abolished state school fees, A. Acland admitted that it was “the regular fee payers who are the regular attendees, and it is very often the free children who are the most irregular.”¹⁶ In the subsequent Commons debate, J.G. Talbot recognised that “The motive is not the remission of fees. The real object is to abolish the voluntary schools.”¹⁷ The 1891 Act sounded the death knell for the voluntary education system. Rates and taxes on parents were raised further to cover the abolition of fees in state schools, and thus parents were even less able to pay for private schooling. The fact that the state schools were “free” (that is, entirely taxpayer-financed) further strengthened their position in competition with the private schools.

Another provision of the 1891 Act was that private schools which abolished fees were to be reimbursed by Whitehall with 10 shillings per pupil per year. The large majority of the private schools were compelled to accept this payment in order to attract pupils and avoid closure. In 1893, compulsory school attendance was extended to make it full-time for all young people up to the age of 11. In 1899, the minimum school leaving age was raised to 12, and this age was increased further over the ensuing decades until it reached 16 in 1970, where it remains today.

Under the 1902 Education Act, the government nationalised all the private schools which had abolished fees under the 1891 Act, by forcing them under the control of the local education authorities, on the grounds that the state was maintaining them and should therefore control them. These local authorities were also empowered to establish state secondary schools and further education institutes. A process which had begun in 1870 as a measure to establish state schools solely in order to “fill the gaps” in situations where private provision of education was supposedly insufficient had, in the space of 32 years, grown into a virtual state monopoly of schools. With young people at that time being forced to undergo seven years’ school attendance, the state, by a highly devious and dishonest series of moves, had obtained virtually complete control over the lives and learning processes of the population for seven of the most significant years their lives.

The Education Act 1944 further extended the range of state control and abolished nearly all the remnants of consumer choice in education. Fees were abolished in all secondary schools; the minimum school-leaving age was raised to 15; the state also began to provide

nurseries for children under five and colleges for young people between 15 and 18, with part-time attendance compulsory; and every young person was compelled to attend a secondary school from the age of 11. West comments on the 1944 Act:

New generations had now appeared who had never experienced the exercise of choice by the payment of fees for their children’s education. There can be no doubt that by 1944 many people had been so conditioned by long experience of state dependence that they had begun to believe in the image of a beneficent state, which gave them services for which they did not have to pay. This, of course, was an illusion. Certainly many people recognised that the money had to come from taxation. But for some peculiar reason, when most people think of taxation they think primarily of personal income tax. Yet ... this tax supplies only a little more than one-third of government revenue; many people forget that they are paying taxes every time they buy such things as beer, tobacco, television, gramophone records, cosmetics, sugar and petrol, and that, as their incomes and spending increase with the progress of time, so does the revenue received by governments. ... [N]obody has yet shown that ‘free’ education services provided for typical families are not substantially paid for out of revenues collected also from the same typical families.¹⁸

From the 1960s onwards, socialists in both Labour and Tory governments have used the system of central planning to impose their ideas of “equality” through the school system by forcing young people into “comprehensive” schools. The term “equality”, which is meaningless in educational terms, designates in this context a rigidly hierarchical system in which a small group of powerful individuals impose their ideas of “equality” by force on everybody else. No equality of power exists between the tiny handful of planners and the large number whom they plan into “equality”. The present Conservative government is now bringing the central planning system to an unprecedented level of detail, first, by introducing the National Curriculum, under which every pupil in every state school must, by law, be taught exactly the same body of knowledge, the content of which has been decided by a government committee, and, second, by investing despotic powers in the person of the Secretary of State for Education. In the words of a recent (1992) newspaper report:

John Patten is well on his way to becoming the most powerful Education Secretary we have ever had. He already has the right — as he has graphically demonstrated — to decide what schools should teach (Shakespeare to 14 year olds) and even how they should teach it (the use of phonetics in reading).

Soon he will be able to decide which schools should remain open and which should close and how much money each should receive. Indeed, it seems there will be no part of the state system in which he cannot intervene, from the way teachers are trained to how they organise their classrooms. Even the examining system, until now the responsibility of independent boards, will fall under his control.¹⁹

From 1833 to 1992, then, the education of young people in this country has moved from a free market to the effective personal despotism of one man. George Orwell’s classic story *Animal Farm*, in which the pigs gradually, by a series of almost imperceptible steps, established a tyranny on the farm while claiming that they were acting for the benefit of the animals there, could have been written as a history of the British educational system over the past 160 years. Truly the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

NOTES

1. Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda*, translated by Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner, (first published 1962), Vintage Books, New York, 1973, p. 13.
2. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, (first published 1859) in John Stuart Mill, *Three Essays*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1975, p. 130.
3. Quoted in David Head (editor), *Free Way to Learning*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1974, p. 10.
4. Quoted in E. G. West, *Education and the State*, (first published 1965), Institute of Economic Affairs, 1970, p. 42.
5. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 127.
6. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 136.
7. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 136-7.
8. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 138.
9. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 139.
10. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 142.
11. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 143.
12. Quoted in *ibid*, op cit, p. 152.
13. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 153.
14. Quoted in *ibid*, pp. 157-9.
15. Quoted in *ibid*, op cit, p. 159.
16. Quoted in *ibid*, p. 162.
17. *Ibid*, p. 184.
18. *Ibid*, p. 67.
19. *Daily Telegraph*, 7th October 1992, p. 8.