**Chapter 1**

**Education as an Instrument of Social Policy**

The chapter aims at defining social policy as distinct from the welfare policy and establishing a link between education and social policy. Having done so it primarily focuses at deriving a conceptual framework relating education to social policy. This conceptual framework would later serve as the basis for analysing education as an instrument of social policy in Israel. The chapter takes into account the different viewpoints that have so far looked into the role of education in fulfilling societal needs and objectives. The relation of state and education has also been picked up for discussion in detail given the fact that the state plays central role in controlling and regulating the education system.

The first logical question that the study poses is why study “Education as an instrument of Social Policy?” In almost all the modern democratic set ups today it is seen as a part of the taken-for-granted thing. However, if one carefully goes through the debates surrounding the introduction and subsequent extension of compulsory education in most of the countries in the post World War II phase with democratic form of government, or in those which adopted a democratic form of government, the introduction and subsequent extension of compulsory education demonstrates quite clearly that it was intended to be a means of achieving social goals and objectives. Most of the societies were going through a period of flux, trying to come to terms with the war ravaged state of affairs and also with the emergent social complexities that the post war period left for them. In this context most of these societies attached immense significance to education to facilitate the process of reconstruction. Israel is no exception to this premise. The centrality accorded to education in this phase in all
these democratic countries to fulfill social objectives can be considered as one of the reasons to study education (policy) from the social policy perspective. To put it in more general terms 'education has been used as an instrument of social policy by governments of all kinds – with varying degrees of commitment or reluctance, and with different and conflicting intentions. Marshall has called education along with the National Insurance Act and the National Health Service Act as one of the three pillars of the welfare state.\(^1\)

The use of education for social policy is a contested arena where different ends can be pursued by a variety of means. The decision regarding the means in a democratic country is liable to be influenced by political parties and pressure groups but a focus on analyzing education from this perspective highlights such peripheral aspects of educational system which otherwise might escape the eyes of the educationists or at best look peripheral. More importantly concerns such as attempts to equalize access to education, and to produce more equitable educational outcomes, for children of different backgrounds are cast in a different light when placed in the broader context of social policy designed to produce greater social justice by democratic reform.

The definition of Social Policy itself has been a subject of debate (to be discussed in detail later). There seems to be in no way a consensus regarding what constitutes social policy and the conception of it normally differs based on the ideological and political inclination of the individual trying to arrive at a definition\(^2\). However, in the context of this study two things can be outlined, about which there is a broad

consensus: a) educational policy is not simply aimed at imparting knowledge to citizens/individuals to equip them with the means to become productive beings in their own right or for the benefit of individuals alone. It performs functional role from the societal point of view in which his skill is going to be absorbed. This means the education policy is intricately intertwined with social policy and is an important component of it. b) Social policy is not just limited to the actions of the government. Welfare services can be provided by charitable bodies, by individuals caring for members of their family in their own homes, or on a commercial basis (private pension plans or private medical schemes etc.). However, as far as education is concerned, the state is primarily responsible for funding and controlling it. These two aspects are important when we consider the use of education as social policy in Israel during the course of the study.

**Defining Social Policy: as distinct from Welfare Policy**

The policy makers normally use the term social policy as synonymous with the welfare policy. Whether social policy and welfare policy are identical is however debatable. The term welfare policy is variously defined but it is generally agreed that a welfare state is one, which acts according to the principle that it is the duty of the state to provide social security and social advancement to all. Operationally, welfare policy comes down to a minimum of security – free or token payment health and welfare services, a certain number of years of free education, a minimum income in defined contingencies, and sometimes also subsidized housing. The major tools of welfare policy are the services in kind, the most important being health services, formal and informal education, personal, family and community services. In addition,
it offers a system of social security (transfer payment), and long-term social benefits (such as old age and family allowances).

In contrast to welfare policy, social policy is a much broader term. At first, let's have a look at the various definitions of the social policy before coming to the broad impact of it as different from the Welfare Policy. Kenneth Boulding has defined Social Policy as 'that which is centered in those institutions that create integration and discourage alienation'. David Gill defines social policy as composed of all the policies designed to influence the overall quality of life in a society; the circumstances of living of individuals, groups and society as a whole. The British Report, 'A Joint Framework for Social Policies' defines social policy as 'all policies which are concerned with the distribution of resources and opportunities among the community and with ways of changing this distribution'. For a very long time the pre-dominant perspective in the study of social policy was the social democratic, or Fabian Socialist, emphasizing government intervention to produce greater equality and social justice, through peaceful reform within the context of prevailing capitalist economic structure. More conservative alternatives (called 'anti-collectivist' by George and Wilding) emphasize freedom and individualism and a necessary degree of inequality. Rather different accounts produced by Marxists and feminists have gained momentum in recent years. These tend to emphasize on the negative aspects of welfare, showing that apparently benign reform may in fact have the consequence of further disadvantaging those whom they purport to assist.

These varieties of viewpoints give rise to a range of concepts which suggest that social policy can be seen as action designed by government to engineer social change; as a mechanism for identifying human needs and devising the means of meeting them; as a mechanism for solving social problems; as redistributive justice; as the means of regulating subordinate social groups etc. These themes would be discussed in the case of Israel particularly in relation to its educational policy during the course of the study. Still some logical questions remain unanswered from the discussion so far: first, why does the state so significantly engage in the provision of education? Second, what kinds of social policy ends are pursued through education, overtly and covertly? Third, in whose interests are they pursued and who actually benefits? To start with the last question, it may be stated that there are problems with both the approaches. The social scientists who argue that education as an activity is designed primarily to meet ‘society’s needs’ and is ‘really’ about moulding and controlling individuals in the interests of the economy and the state, and the individual benefits accruing from it is merely an illusion, perpetrated to ensure cooperation, naively treat society or state as a single entity with clearly identifiable interests rather than made up of different individuals and groups with widely varying interests. The other approach emphasizing that education is about opportunities offered to individuals, from which they derive personal benefits and that any demonstrable inequalities (e.g. of access) are simply unfortunate and can be eradicated is hardly credible when many children appear to derive so few benefits of any kind from their educational experiences, and when inequalities of access and outcome have proved so intractable. This brings us back to the question – whose interests are pursued and who benefits? To my understanding, social policy is just a tool, while the definition of the criteria according to which
resources should be distributed is largely influenced by the conception of justice, which prevails in the society, and by pressure groups and power struggles.

The Role of State in Education

The second and the third questions are inter-related and for convenience I address them together. Whatever be the nature of the society our vital concern is the problem of order. And ‘order is the first requirement of the diverse, specialized, interdependent activity of modern man, and this order the state alone can maintain’.

Education is one of the instruments that the state uses to achieve order. Durkheim has emphasized that education is basically and essentially a social function. According to him education ‘must in some degree be submitted to the state’s influence’. Though he supported the existence of the schools other than those for which the state was directly responsible, he argues that ‘the education given in them must remain under its control’. Durkheim felt that the role of the state was mainly one of outlining certain basic and essential principles in education, and of ensuring that these were followed in all schools. Such principles involved respect for reason, for science, for ideas and for sentiments which are ‘at the base of democratic morality’.

Maintenance of order is intricately linked to the successful transmission of acquired skills, knowledge and values from one generation to the other, which in turn is fundamental to the continuity of any society. In simple societies, enculturation as well as teaching/learning of other basic tasks such as food gathering took place within a relatively undifferentiated social framework. In her study of the development of children in the New Guinea society of the Manus, Margaret Mead has shown how their education is both a
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familial and socially collective responsibility. But in complex societies the educational institution shares the primary burden of rationalizing and organizing a portion of the enculturation process. Schools are sponsored by authorities in order to impart to youth skills and ideas deemed of central importance. From this point of view a school is an institution established for the specific purpose of exposing persons—assembled voluntarily or by compulsions of law—to formal curricula. The curricula deal with technical and social skills as well as explanations of the past, present and the likely future of one’s role in it. In formal terms, this is what takes place in the classrooms, at assemblies, on outings, during sporting events and at other activities commonly associated with schooling in our society. Through symbols, inherent in song, dance, written and oral history, and literature the individual is supplied with stimuli which helps shape his goals and plans in life. Thus, we see that education performs the important ‘functional role’ of assigning individual roles or the function of role allocation and simultaneously also keeps the cycle going by replacing the older generation by the newly enculturated members of the society. Simultaneously, the active role played by the state ensures that the children learn and imbibe values central to the existence of the state and as some sociologists would say to suppress the spirit of questioning established rules and to produce law abiding citizens under already established laws. The state however primarily uses these symbols to serve the purpose of fostering national integration by bringing out shared commonalities.

A discussion of the role of state in education would be incomplete without analyzing the interrelationship of politics and education. While dealing with the political function of education, P. W. Musgrave draws a general conclusion that ‘education
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may not be a sufficient condition for democracy, but it certainly is a necessary condition for its survival. Completely contrary to this lies the contention that Hitler, in his 'systematic disorganization of society', employed a group strategy which, as a form of 'education', was a necessary condition for the survival of Nazism. Mannheim has pointed out that man is most easily influenced through his group ties, and he saw Hitler’s group strategy as an attempt at breaking down the traditional groups of civilized society, and at rebuilding rapidly on the basis of a new group-pattern. Mannheim believed that this group strategy, used by Hitler for the destruction and disorganization of his society, could be used for constructive purposes. Mannheim’s arguments underline the fact that, whatever political or social ideal we may adopt and seek to maintain, 'a necessary condition for its survival' is an educational system and pattern geared to that political aim. In short, consensus has to be planned; it doesn’t happen automatically. It is only obvious that the state should intervene in such a major way in an activity, which can be central to legitimizing its existence. Governments of all forms have used the education system to legitimize the existing order, be it democratic, monarchical or authoritarian regimes. For instance, Grant, in his study of Soviet educational process, has observed that the total picture that emerges is one of commitment to education as ‘a matter of first-rate national importance’. The use of education as a legitimizing instrument of the existing order, however, cannot be held against the existence of an organized education system. The reproduction of the political order through education cannot be regarded as invariably successful when educational systems quite frequently are responsible for producing political radicals.

Coming back to the need of a separate social policy as distinct from welfare policy it may be noted that when welfare services are expected to achieve additional social goals alike diminishing inequality and increasing integration, solidarity, participation and mobility they do not help in achieving these goals. Experience has shown that the development of welfare services has not led to any significant advancement in diminishing of social gaps and social integration. Peter Townsend's research in the area has shown that the better-off in the society make better use of the universal services and that the standards of the services is higher when they are geared to the more affluent sectors of society (e.g. National Health services are better in middle-class areas than in poor areas).

Thus equating social policy with welfare policy is incorrect and interpreting developing of social policy as providing more services is untrue. Interpreting social policy this way by the policymakers eludes them from the significance of the role of social policy when the resources are scarce. The most important side effects of welfare policy are the encouragement of a culture of dependency and demands, and the creation of huge and sometimes alienating bureaucracy. The psychological effect on the citizen is that it makes them increasingly dependent and demanding of central services.

Societal Needs and Education

This section of the chapter in a way traces the evolution of sociology of education. It has been discussed under three different perspectives. Before taking up these in detail, a general discussion on the relationship between societal needs and education is being undertaken. John Dewey was one of the first to appreciate the essential relationship between the school and society. For Dewey the school was a community in miniature, a micro-society which both reflected the larger society outside and also sought, in the long run, to improve upon that society. In this way Dewey sought to make the importance of the home and environment explicit in the educational process. The sociological approach to education was furthered by Emile Durkheim, about whom we shall see later, and Karl Mannheim. In Man and Society, Mannheim stated:

'Sociologists do not regard education solely as a means of realizing abstract ideals of culture, such as humanism or technical specialization, but as part of the process of influencing men and women. Education can only be understood when we know for what society and for what social position the pupils are being educated.'

By analyzing the society, and categorizing its ills, Mannheim felt, we might be able to plan our educational programme for a new and better society. Mannheim’s Diagnosis of Our Time was an attempt to demonstrate the possibility of a Third Way between the extremes of laissez-faire and totalitarianism. His Third Way was a way of consciously directed planning in order to preserve freedom and democratic way of life. According to Mannheim, the social environment should be regarded as a set of
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patterns to be explored for their educational significance. Since the prime need of our society was for consensus, the first task of a really social education was to achieve this. Mannheim's advocacy of the sociological approach to education highlighted 'the fact that neither educational aims nor educational techniques can be conceived without a context, but rather, that they are to a very large extent socially directed. Who teaches who for what society, when and how, as the sociological questions were once framed.\textsuperscript{21} This sociological emphasis did not mean that Mannheim was blind to other aspects of education; education for social integration did not, in itself, imply the elimination of other concepts such as 'self-realization'. But there can be no self-realization \textit{in vacuo}.

Clarke developed further the theme of planning for freedom in an English society, which he likened to the Platonic educative society. An 'educative society' is one 'which consciously directs its activities and organizes every department of its life with a view to the emergence of citizens bearing the characters of the preferred type'.\textsuperscript{22} Clarke, nevertheless, agreed with Hocking that, whilst education should be geared to the production of a certain type, it should also make possible development 'beyond the type'.\textsuperscript{23} Clarke maintained that a true culture would emerge from the common life and experience of a healthy society; a common purpose of that society would define itself, and this should be heeded both within the school and outside.

As mentioned above, this section is broadly discussed under three different perspectives with major emphasis on the Marxist perspective because it challenges the

\textsuperscript{21} Mannheim, K. and Stewart, W.A.C., \textit{An Introduction to the Sociology of Education}, Routledge, 1962, p.159.
very basis of the introduction of the education system and has been the most effective in raising questions hitherto unconsidered. It has sensitized the opinion of the policymakers towards various intriguing features of educational policy which belie the objectives set to be attained through it, or even challenges the foundations of the policy and the set objectives, which is the main theme of this study. Sociologists are to a great extent a product of the dominant ideology and values of their time and in their writings one can easily discern the craving of the society of their times which are a result of the circumstances prevailing in their times. This section would in brief put the functionalist and liberal perspective of education policy before taking up in detail the Marxist perspective and then analyze education as a means of fulfilling societal needs.

**Education – a Functionalist Perspective**

The functionalist perspective has already been highlighted to some extent in the preceding paragraphs. Here we give it a more detailed treatment. The functionalist view of education tends to focus on the positive contributions made by education to the maintenance of the social system. The chief proponents of this perspective in relation to education have been Emile Durkheim, Talcott Parsons and Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore. Durkheim saw education as a ‘social thing’, and he argued:

> ‘it is society as a whole and each particular social *milieu* that determine the ideal that education realizes. Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from the beginning, the essential similarities that collective life demands. But on the other hand, without a certain diversity all cooperation would be impossible; education assures the persistence of this necessary diversity by being itself diversified and specialized.’

It was this view of education as an eminently social thing that led Durkheim to argue that there was not just one form of education, ideal or actual, but many forms; indeed, there were as many different forms of education as there were different milieus in a given society. Thus society as whole, and each particular milieu, would determine the type of education that was realized. Thus for Durkheim education was a means of organizing the individual self and the social self, the I and the We, or the homo duplex, into a disciplined, stable and meaningful unity. Any transformation in a society, therefore, according to Durkheim, necessitates corresponding changes in the national education.

According to Durkheim, the major function of education is the transmission of societal norms and values. He maintains that society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity which is brought about by fixing in child from the beginning the essential similarities which collective life demands. Without these 'essential similarities', co-operation, social solidarity and therefore social life itself would be impossible. A virtual task for all societies is the welding of a mass of individuals into a sense of belonging and a feeling that the social unit is more important than the individual. According to him, ‘to become attached to the society, a child must feel in it something that is real, alive and powerful, which dominates the person and to which he also owes the best part of himself. Education, and in particular, the teaching of history, provides the vital link between the individual and society. His views are reflected in the educational policy and curriculum of most of the democracies where by forging common identity among people from diverse background a unique identity is created which leads to solidarity.
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and feeling of oneness. Parsons arguing on similar lines contends that after primary
socialization in the family, the school takes over as the 'focal socializing agency'.
School acts as a bridge between the family and society as a whole, preparing the child
for his adult role. Within the family the child is judged and treated largely in terms of
'particularistic' standards and through school he moves to the 'universalistic'
standards of the wider society. Both Durkheim and Parsons contend that school is a
society in miniature, which prepares young ones to get used to social relations outside
and also performs the function of role allocation.

This perspective has been criticized from a number of viewpoints mainly by the
Marxists (as we shall see later). The perspective assumes that the norms and values
transmitted by the educational system are those of the society as a whole rather than
those of a ruling class or ruling elite. It has a conservative bias, a prejudice in favour
of maintaining things as they are. These views often look similar to the 'official
versions' of the governments and are lacking in analysis of the possible dysfunctional
aspects of education as shall be seen later.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{The Liberal Perspective}

This perspective in some respects parallels functionalist arguments but is at the same
time critical about it. According to it education fosters personal development and self-
fulfillment\textsuperscript{28}. It encourages the individual to develop his mental, physical, emotional
and spiritual talents to the full. By providing free schooling for all, education gives
everyone an equal opportunity for developing these capacities and talents. According

\textsuperscript{26} George H. in \textit{Mind, Self and Society}, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1934; 13\textsuperscript{th} impression 1965. Also see
Mead, op.cit.
to it, academic credentials are awarded on merit in a system of fair competition. In the same way, jobs are awarded on merit, and there is a strong relationship between educational qualifications and occupational status. It argues that since school provide equality of opportunity for all members of society, regardless of their position in the stratification system, a more 'open' society and therefore a higher rate of social mobility will result. The expansion of education will also reduce inequality in society. In particular, as the educational attainment of members of the working class rises, their bargaining position in the market will improve and as a result their income will rise. Admitting that schools haven't fully realized these ideals, they believe that things are moving in the right direction and that the promise of education is steadily being fulfilled. These ideas triggered a lot of reforms in the educational system. Designed programmes for the underprivileged were considered the answer to fighting poverty. As the discussion follows ahead the lacunas in this perspective get vividly portrayed.

The Marxist Perspective

This section of the chapter focuses on some features and interpretations of educational provision in which the interests of individuals (and potential benefits to them) are a fairly low priority. Instead, education is provided because it serves the needs of the society, the economy or the 'national interest' — whether implicitly or explicitly. At the most general level, the whole of education can be regarded, as William Beveridge argues, as a communal investment, likely to bring a variety of benefits to the whole society. There are different versions of what constitutes these wider interests but during the period following mid 1970s, political rationales for educational provision

have more explicitly emphasized the ‘needs of the economy’. However, a close scrutiny of the government policies belies this ‘narrow view.’

First of all, there is no clear and obvious consensus about what constitutes the ‘needs’ of the economy or the ‘national interest’, or about what significance they should be accorded within the educational system. However, different versions of the ‘society’s needs’ argument have different policy implications and they are not necessarily repressive, directive and constraining as we will see later. The discussions on the societal needs rationale in education looks very different from 1980s onwards than in the 1970s to accommodate changes in the capitalist economy. In such circumstances, as Gough notes, policies in the educational sphere were likely to adjust to adapt to the labour force and the potential labour force more effectively to be in tune with the needs of the labour market, and hence the discussion about the need to produce a more relevant, basic and disciplined educational system.

Changes in the educational climate and the direction of educational policies were paralleled in the 1970s by changes in the dominant modes of analysis of the educational system, especially by writers who approached it from the Marxist viewpoint. The move to conceptualize the relationship between school and society in new way, according to Hall, was a consequence of the acknowledged failure of liberal policies like equal opportunities and compensatory education i.e. the reforms based on redistributive and efficiency criteria. The essential point of departure was, according to Young and Whitty that the left began to question whether school was unequivocally a ‘good thing’ for the working classes. They began to realize that the
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political right also realized: that schooling has a great potential for control rather than liberation. To put in his words, 'gentling the masses'.

The exercise of unraveling the education-society relationship has taken many different forms. It is variously argued that no one should be fooled into thinking that education is a service designed largely for the benefit for those who receive it; labour recruitment, industrial discipline and political pacification of the working classes are all importantly accomplished through education. Education acts as an agent of social control even when often it does not appear so. Its indirect support for the social order is more powerful and important than its part in adapting, training and sorting the future labour force. The following discussion focuses on the three key concepts in Marxist writings on the education-society relation: reproduction, regulation and control.

Reproduction

The concept of reproduction has been central to many neo-Marxist analyses. Gough defines the welfare state as 'the use of state power to modify the reproduction of labour power and to maintain the non-working population in capitalist societies'. When used in the context, 'reproduction, does not refer primarily to biological reproduction but to the continuation of specific patterns of social and economic life over time, and between one generation and the next. Most importantly, labour power needs to be reproduced if a capitalist industrial economy is to be sustained.

The preparation of the next generation entails adapting its productive capacities to enable it to fill different positions in the labour forces and also socializing people into appropriate habits, ways of behaving, and so on, so that they will fit into the social relationships required in capitalist production. Clearly education has a major potential contribution to make to this process of ‘reproduction’. However, these Marxist writers have given different accounts of what is being reproduced and we briefly discuss them here.

Reproducing the Labour Force: The idea that the education system supplies the labour force needed by industry is by no means confined to Marxist analyses. For example, other writers on social policy employ the concept of ‘social capital’ to refer to those elements in the social services which are in the interest of the industry and contribute to economic development. Education, it is argued, has made a very significant contribution to social capital by expanding to cater for a whole range of technical and white-collar skills within higher and further education. What distinguishes many Marxist accounts is that they see the education-economy relationship as intimately linked with other features of social and political life. ‘As the mode of production in a given society is seen also as the basis of social structure, economic relationships give rise to political and social relationships, and an ideology which justifies these arrangements.’ This directs our attention to the reproduction of both ‘skills’ and the social relations of production. Relating it to education it has been argued that the concept of ‘skills’ was central to the social democratic consensus which dominated the education policy in the 1960s. Post war society, it has been
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argued, demanded a wider diffusion of skills and an expanded education system which could supply them. Gleeson and Mardle’s in their study of technical training in the field of further education show that the overt purpose of apprentice education is direct instruction in skills relevant to work, however, in practice, competing groups (unions, employers, teachers themselves and so on) make varying demands upon the syllabus, and a simple ‘fit’ between training and the workplace is rarely achieved. Certainly not from the students point of view, who often remain unclear about the relevance of what they are being taught. However, although students may not be acquiring job skills often they acquire something just as central to the reproduction of labour force: they get initiated into patterns of social relationship and into associated habits and attitudes which are appropriate for the workplace. The same has been argued for schools. They have been supposed to play an important role in reproducing the relations of production, through their emphasis on hierarchy, authority and discipline.

The most well known account from Marxist perspective of how schools reproduce the social relations of production has been illustrated by Bowles and Gintis. Their argument concentrates on the form rather than the content of the educational encounters. Drawing explicitly on Marx, they argue that the relations developed variously between teachers, administrators and students correspond to, or mirror, the relationships of the workplace. The fragmentation of the learning process, the student’s lack of control over their own work and the attitudes required of them, all
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reflect the capitalist productive process. Thus, schools prepare young people for the social relations of production by imposing equivalent relations upon them from an early age. Looking at the process of reproducing the social division of labour in an empirical study, Willis has illuminated the process by which ‘working class kids get working class jobs’. Although the official ideology of the educational system emphasizes equal opportunities (or at least equal access), it is, he argues, an ‘absolute requirement’ that the same ideologies and aspirations are not passed on to everyone, since the outcome would be chaotic.

Such accounts, however, have to be treated with caution. At a theoretical level they look like an oversimplified functionalist model of social life. Specifically, any assumption that there is a straightforward relationship between the ‘needs of the economy and the form and character of educational provision, leaves out of account the many other pressure groups and various other centers of power. Further, such accounts imply a one-way determinism (i.e. the economy determines education) which overlooks the way in which the economy itself depends on the knowledge and skills accumulated in and transmitted by educational institutions. Finally, historical and comparative studies reveal that the relationship between education and the economy can vary significantly in different societies. Reviewing a wide range of literature on schools and socialization into work, Ryrie shows that schools commonly attempt other kinds of preparation for adult life than simply managing the school-work transition. Moreover, he argues it is not clear that all teachers give preparation

for work increasing priority in the classroom, at a time when many of their pupils cannot realistically expect a lifetime of continuous paid employment.41

Reproducing the Class Structure: There are two distinctive senses in which the class system has been seen to be reproduced through education: through intergenerational class placing and through reproducing structure itself. In the first case, increased social mobility of the children of the working classes up the occupational hierarchy has been a major (but largely unachieved) aim of educational reformers in the twentieth century. Evidences have been produced to show that education has become increasingly important in keeping one generation in a similar class position to their parents. According to Halsey, 'education is increasingly the mediator of the transmission of status between generations'.42

The second sense in which reproduction of the class structure takes place is that the structure itself is reproduced through education. Since education prepares people for different positions in the social division of labour, it recreates the class structure based on that division for each succeeding generation. That structure can remain intact even if people get recruited to middle-class jobs from working-class backgrounds, and vice versa. In a sense, the structure itself is almost independent of how individuals get slotted into it.

Yet another feature worth highlighting here is that though the education system extends free and compulsory education to everyone till a certain age their are requirements inherent in the very process of education, which discriminates against

the poor and is not free. Free education means free of school fees but 'free' schooling has many unavoidable expenses, which fall on parents like: say transport, essential clothing, meals, pursuing the curriculum etc. These costs can be debilitating in case of the poor families. The hidden costs of schooling are a very clear instance of how the educational system discriminates against the poor. There is good reason to suppose that this situation has worsened in recent years. Most of the studies have also revealed a marked disparity of provision between schools serving the affluent and poor areas.

Reproducing Sexual Division: Recently feminists have demonstrated that the educational system is also responsible for reproducing the sexual division of labour between men and women. This applies in two senses: education reproduces the conventional division of labour in the family, whereby men are in paid employment and women do unpaid work, they tend to be concentrated in particular types of jobs and at the lower level of organizational hierarchies. The contribution of the educational system in sustaining both these processes, they claim, is significant and helps to account for difficulties experienced in some positive action programmes.

The traditional concentration upon teaching domestic subjects to girls, it has been argued, demonstrates that the main benefits of their education are meant to accrue to homes and families, rather than to the girls themselves. It has been argued that it is in the interest of the capitalist mode of production to prepare girls for a future of work, in the home, where they will care for male wage-workers and raise the next generation[^43].

[^43]: Halsey, A. H., Towards Meritocracy? The case of Britain, in Halsey and Karabel (eds.), Power and...
The argument that girls are being prepared for a specific future has been pursued at two levels: in terms of skills and in terms of relationship relevant to the productive process. First, following Deem’s argument, schooling can be seen as essentially a preparation for domesticity, either instead of or as well as for waged work. This process operates even when girls are obtaining similar formal educational qualifications to boys, because girls are seen as a group who can always, if circumstances in the economy make it valuable, be ‘returned’ to non-waged work at home, and therefore they provide a very flexible source of labour for capitalist employers. Extending this McDonald concludes that the social relations of schooling not only prepare the working classes for class obedience, but they also prepare women to be subordinate to men.  

Cultural Reproduction: The fourth type of reproduction, which it is argued, takes place through the educational system is cultural reproduction: that is, reproduction of ideas, beliefs, values and meanings. In the sense in which ‘reproduction’ has been used in recent literature, this does not imply that there is an infinitive variety of types of ideas and values, any of which could be passed on through schooling, depending upon the personal preference of the teachers or the way that textbooks are written. Rather cultural features are seen as tied quite firmly to structural features of a capitalist society. Thus a particular type of ‘culture’ is reproduced through schooling, which serves the interests of dominant groups (seen variously as capitalists, the ruling classes, or whites against other ethnic groups) and maintains the status quo to their advantage. Thus the act of cultural reproduction is closely linked to the other types of

reproduction considered before: it facilitates the reproduction of the social and sexual
division of labour, of the class structure and of the political status quo.

The first writer to focus on the transmission of cultural capital was Pierre Bourdieu,
whose work puts emphasis on how ‘cultural capital’ is distributed and transmitted
between generations. Bourdieu’s account of these processes runs broadly as follows:

the education system itself embodies the beliefs, practices, norms of the dominant
culture. It therefore demands of children a certain competence in the appropriate
cultural practices. Therefore, it is only children from what he calls ‘cultured families’
who have the necessary competence to receive the message of education and to make
use of it. This means that such children are the most successful within the terms set by
the education system. Those terms, however, operate in such a way that it does not
appear the children are being rewarded for coming from the ‘right’ kind of families:

the educational system accords places in academic, not social hierarchies, and those
places are apparently awarded on the basis of individual ‘gifts,’ merits, and so on.

This means that the cultural families can use the educational system to ensure that
their children achieve the same advantaged position in adult life, but without it
appearing overtly that the rules of the games have been fixed in their favor. Just as the
ruling class have devised various strategies for transmitting economic capital to their
own children, so too they have successfully devised the means of transmitting their
cultural capital. Bourdieu recognizes that the system does not always work perfectly in
their favour, not can it, since it must give the appearance of being open and fair in
order to work successfully. However, he argues that it remains overwhelmingly the
case that those who possess economic capital still also have a much greater chance of
possessing cultural capital. The final twist is that, even if the economically privileged do not possess cultural capital as well, they can probably manage quite successfully without it; whereas cultural capital on its own is a weak currency, since its value is confined to the academic market.

A study by Halsey Heath and Ridge, however, have shown that the concept of cultural capital can be a ‘useful umbrella term for a set of mechanisms through which families influence the formal educational experience of their children’. It should not however be pressed too far: cultural capital, it has been argued, can be disseminated more widely than before, as well as concentrated and preserved46. The study falls back for support on the figures of successful students before and after the promulgation of the National Education Act of 1944 in Britain. The study showed that a lot of successful students belonged to the first generation in the academic sector.

Bordieu’s account of the transmission of cultural capital suggests the importance of concealment in the process of cultural reproduction. Mechanisms for transmission are accepted as legitimate because they seem to be based on democratic notions of fairness: if the actual process of reproduction were more apparent, they might be resisted. This idea that education produces the means by which many people consent and endorse their own subordinate position is explicit and central to the second version of cultural reproduction, the idea of hegemony, given by Gramsci. Hegemony refers to the domination of one class over another, but not by force or by economic means. It is rule by moral and cultural domination, in which power is founded upon
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producing consent and acquiescence among the ruled class\textsuperscript{47}.

Education is clearly important in the process of producing acquiescence to ruling ideas. Gramsci believed that schooling provided the means of transmitting a particular consciousness necessary to maintain a particular class rule\textsuperscript{48}. The way in which it is achieved is not a straightforward indoctrination of children, it is according to Apple, a saturation of consciousness by the meanings, values and practices which are already deeply embedded in the social structure in which we live partly because these are already part of the life lived around us, accepting them makes sense of social reality and therefore is easy\textsuperscript{49}. At the same time these ‘ruling ideas’ are reinforced and reproduced in the next generation. Further these processes of cultural reproduction facilitate and reinforce other aspects of reproduction through education, enabling them to operate more smoothly by producing a consciousness in which they seem legitimate.

The idea of cultural reproduction through education is powerful, provided again that it is not presented in an over simplistic way. The reproduction through education of beliefs and values is by no means always successful, as can be seen in relation to political beliefs.

**Reproducing the Political Order:** Winston Churchill in an interview during war when asked about the possibilities that education could change people’s nature sounded skeptical but is reported to have said, ‘I should not object if you could

\textsuperscript{48} ibid. p.16.
introduce a note of patriotism into our schools'. The use of education to reproduce the political status quo has been a common theme from the introduction of compulsory schooling, when there was some concern to offer at least minimum education to all those who had been granted the right to vote.

The structures of power and domination in the economic and political spheres overlap considerably. Nevertheless, it is important, according to Hall, that the school's function in reproducing the relations of productive life in capitalist societies must be clearly demarcated from its political function in cementing particular forms of class domination. Tapper and Salter see a crucial role for education in maintaining the power of the ruling classes through cultural hegemony, especially by legitimizing their control.

In what way is the political order reproduced in schools? Firstly, it is produced in by the ways in which children are taught about the society in which they live. This may not involve any 'indoctrination' of an overt and crude kind, but within the hidden curriculum of the school tacit messages are given about how issues like conflict, authority and hierarchy in social life are to be understood. Writing of the way that conflict is dealt with in schools, Apple says that most teachers neglect to take the creative potential of conflict or its possibilities for producing desirable change; nor is it presented as a systematic product of the changing structure of society. Rather it is treated as an abnormal and undesirable state. The hidden message is that society is to

be understood in terms of consensus, the maintenance of order, and that happy cooperation is the normal way of life\textsuperscript{52}.

Apart from the tacit messages of the hidden curriculum, many schools express the aim of preparing their children to play a full part in the adult world, in terms like education for citizenship in a democracy. This sounds innocuous enough, but the way in which it is accomplished almost always depends upon one particular version of political life, which prepares young people to accept and accommodate themselves to the structures of political power as they currently exist, and certainly does not give them a basis upon which to challenge those structures. Moreover, it is not simply a matter of ideas. Through their dealings with hierarchies and process of authority which exist within the school itself, young people are learning to relate to and deal with structures of authority in their wider world\textsuperscript{53}.

So education can be important in reproducing the existing political order and thus leaving the power of the politically dominant groups unchallenged. Such an outcome is not, however, always and invariably successfully. As Entwistle has pointed out, many political radicals are the product of conventional education systems; and in some ways, paradoxically, education system seem to foster oppositional potential, say in periods of student radicalism\textsuperscript{54}. This essentially contradictory relationship between politics and schooling again calls into question any explanations based upon a simple notion of ‘correspondence’ between the two spheres. As Tapper and Salter comment, ‘education is not the automatic servicing agency of the ruling class that some Marxists

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., pp.84-5.
believe it to be; it is an instrument of class control, but not one that operates in a blanket fashion to the permanent and inevitable advantage of that alleged ruling class'. This point can be applied equally to other aspects of reproduction through education. It leads on to important questions about how far one can push the notion that processes like reproduction, regulation and control constitute the 'real purpose' of education; and whether the state straightforwardly represents the interests of dominant or powerful groups when it acts in the sphere of education, and indeed other social policy.

**Regulation and Containment**

This section focuses on the use of social policy as a mechanism for reducing and containing social conflict, essentially an exercise in the political regulation of the population. The idea of 'regulating the poor' has been demonstrated by Piven and Cloward who argue that social policies (the granting of financial relief to the poor) have to be understood in terms of the functions they perform for the social and political order. They argue that historically relief has been initiated and expanded during periods of mass unemployment when civil disorder was seen as an actual or potential threat, and then contracted when order was restored. Expansive relief policies, therefore, can be seen as attempt to mute civil disorder.

In what way can these arguments about social policy be applied to education? It cannot be quite so direct a bribe as financial payments, but some scholars have traced links between the development of educational institution and securing political peace.

---

44


The introduction of compulsory education in the nineteenth century was intimately bound up with issues about political control. As discussed earlier, the extension of the franchise to give many working-class men the right to vote was seen by some as making a minimum level of universal literacy essential. Hurt, in his review of the period says that it is only a part of the picture. There was also a 'much more primitive emotion, the fear of the mob, a fear which extended back through the memory of the propertied classes to the sturdy beggar of Tudor England and earlier. Industrialization and urbanization had created a new mob in the 'residuum' of the slums and rookeries of England's towns and cities. It was the fear of those classes, according to Hurt, that triggered four attempts to include the whole of the working classes in schooling. Contemporary examples of the use of education in ways, which apparently either reduce or avert potential social conflict, can be found in the use of education as a palliative, and its use as the means of legitimizing inequality.

Education as a Palliative: Education can be used as a palliative in circumstances where it is offered to people in lieu of some other commodity or opportunity which is what they really need. Since they are receiving something which may be of benefit (even though limited), this reduces the likelihood that social conflict will ensure because they are not receiving the desired commodity. Scholars interpret it as a easy ploy to control the unemployed youth. The mismatch between school leavers and employer's need is interpreted as a consequence of the 'poor quality' of school-leavers. The 'blame' is laid on young people who allegedly lack motivation and willingness and thus the problem of youth unemployment is defined as a problem of education. These authors further argue that the special educational and training
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schemes for the young unemployed can be seen as a part of the process of ensuring that unemployed school-leavers do not spend their time generating political unrest. As Corrigan puts it: 'Adolescence was always seen as a period of greatest moral peril, for it was during adolescence that the first signs of the combination of moral decadence and political instability showed itself'.

Legitimating Inequality — Credentials and Education: The Educational system has increasingly provided a publicly available explanation for the social and economic inequalities, which accounts for and legitimates the basis of inequality in individual meritocratic terms. Those who occupy more privileged positions are defined as people who deserve to be there, and the occupants of less advantaged social and economic positions by implications 'deserve' their own status and material circumstances. The effect of this publicly available legitimation, pressed home to each individual through their own experience of schooling, is to obscure the other processes at work in the distribution of rewards and resources (e.g. the capacity of the privileged to pass on economic and cultural capital to their own children) which have nothing to do with individual merits, however defined.

Also, despite the great increase in the number of people gaining formal educational qualifications, the class related basis of educational 'achievement' has not been seriously undermined. This is partly, according to Collins, because of inflation of credentials. Credential inflation, as he explains, refers to the process whereas more and more people gain educational qualifications, employers begin to ask for higher

---

London, 1979, pg.68.
qualifications as an entrance requirement to given occupations. By the 1960s, according to him, the ‘credential price for jobs’ had risen so much in the US that credentials which formerly had been quite highly valued no longer guaranteed an elite job – or even in some cases a respectable one.

Halsey and his co-authors have argued that credentials in effect ‘sabotage egalitarian reform’ because ‘as the working class clears one hurdle, another is set up in their path, leaving service class always one flight ahead’\(^6^0\). The way in which employers both perceive and use qualifications are by no means straightforward. Maguire and Schton have demonstrated that some employers adopt selection strategies which place comparatively little emphasis on qualifications and a good deal on ‘background’ and ‘personality’ factors which implicitly favour middle-class applicants\(^6^1\).

Another way of looking at credentials is that they give access to certain jobs but offer no guarantee of securing them. They give individuals the eligibility to compete in a specific sector but the rules for competition for every individual is not the same. In Bordieu’s terms, young people from the working classes may not have the requisite cultural capital to match their educational credentials. Further, girls do not compete on the same terms as boys, nor in most cases do black and Asian children compete on the same terms as whites. Corrigan characterises this view as: ‘if you behave properly yourself, you are more likely to work hard; if you do well, you will get good qualifications and a good reference; if you can get a good reference, you can get a good job; if you can get a good job, you are likely to get lots of money’\(^6^2\).
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So the mechanism of credentials is one powerful tool developed through the educational system, which has the effect of defusing potential social conflict by making social and economic inequalities appear ‘fair’. It also has the important consequence of legitimating the activities of schools, and can act as a mechanism of control within their walls. Here it can however also be emphasized that more often not the things taught at school are not synchronized with the requirements outside and so a lot of students cannot identify themselves with it, a problem which shall be discussed later while dealing with Israeli case in particular.

Control of Lifestyle

It has been argued that there is a sense in which schools' attempt to mould the lifestyle of their pupils is part of a fundamental struggle for the control of the young. This is not to imply that control is straightforwardly imposed on the young immature beings who are infinitely malleable. Far from it the young people themselves put up various kinds of resistance. Nevertheless adults do make efforts to control the young and as Jenny Shaw says the battle lines are clearly drawn between them: 'It is all too easy to ignore the divisions within the adult world and assume that in the matter of subordination and care of children that agreement as to what is best obtains. This obscures the stresses and the strains of the process euphemistically known as 'socialisation', and which includes a conflict for the control of the young. In the course of such conflicts appeals to legitimising ideologies are made and various agencies
developed\textsuperscript{63}. Of course the control of the children is one part of the process: their subordination and their care are intimately linked.

Historically, some contend, one theme in the control of the young was that the state needed to take over from some unsatisfactory parents and place the responsibility of the children on the teachers. This idea that the teachers should act as substitutes has been very well documented by Grace, who shows how the popular development of education in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Britain was very much built on the idea that teachers were meant to act in the role of 'social and cultural missionaries-a kind of secular priesthood, dedicated to the idea of civilisation'\textsuperscript{64}. In this way, according to Grace, teachers are the agents of symbolic control of the urban working classes. But although part of the massive apparatus of control, they were never entirely puppets of it. Grace's work demonstrates that in order to accomplish this outcome, teachers themselves had to be regulated and controlled, to ensure that they were passing the right messages.

Forms and regulation can vary from the very crude to the subtle, the explicit to the indirect. Jenny Shaw, also looking historically at education in Britain, suggests that gradually the consent and cooperation of the parents in the process of schooling became more reliable and schools then shifted to milder and gentler forms of control which were not possible when the assent of the families could not be relied upon. Denzelot has called this 'colonisation of the family' by professionals through whom the state acts, in partnership with the mother, as the child's social guardian\textsuperscript{65}. He

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
regards teachers as the colonisers of the family, especially in relation to the delinquent youth. So, in the struggle for the control of the young the family may be either 'substituted or colonised'.

To conclude, we can say that the different viewpoints regarding the control of lifestyle by the educational system emphasize the control exerted through it by making education compulsory for the young. It is argued that by making education a compulsion, a publicly defined phase of childhood has been created which has been progressively extended as the school leaving age has been raised. Secondly, disciplinary procedures are laid down at the school. Finally, all these lead to the long term aim of preparation for parenthood, family life and personal relationships.

Evaluation: Conceptual Framework for the Study

There is no doubt that the rich text of Marxist literature has played a very important role in bringing out the glaring negative aspects of the welfare programmes. The criticisms mounted by the Marxist scholars have forced a number of governments to review their policies and have also led to protests from the disadvantaged classes and their reassertion with an ideological tool in hand. Still in some ways the approach sometimes implies a very mechanical view of social life which does not take seriously the unintended consequences of actions, which has little to say about conflicts and struggles in the arena of social policy. Mishra divides the functionalists aspect of Marxist explanations into two types: system integration and social integration. By system integration he means ‘the various measures necessary for the continuation, stability, and efficient working of the capitalist system. Much of the material

66 ibid. p.71
considered under the 'reproduction' section of this chapter falls into this category. By social integration he means 'the other main function of the bourgeois welfare state which has to do with the maintenance of order and reduction of social conflict and tension.' The regulation section of this chapter, and part of the 'control' section could fall into this category. Any explanation, he argues, which holds that the needs of the economy determines everything else, do not fully match evidence in the development of the welfare state. The reality is much more complex. At the same time, there is evidence, especially in recent years, that the 'core' institutions of the capitalist state can reassert themselves. The process of democratization and the increasing participation of the masses has given a new dimension. The Israeli case sometimes puts forward examples which not only negate the 'control of capital' hypothesis in the field of educational services but (as we shall see) under political pulls and pressures of the coalition politics behaves contrary to expectations.

So the guiding principle of these Marxist explanations (namely that the institutions of welfare must be seen in relation to the capitalist system as a whole) cannot be faulted but the degree to which the welfare systems are determined by the needs of the capitalist economy can be overstated. It is, then, a question of building into these explanations of welfare some space for the accounts of conflicts over policies, outcomes which do not exactly match intentions, victories for groups other than capitalists, and successful examples of resistance to unwelcome features of social policies. Political radicals may be fostered precisely by those educational systems which are meant to be securing the political status quo; and the attempts to control the
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lifestyle of the working classes ‘winning hearts and minds’\textsuperscript{68} is conspicuously unsuccessful in many cases.

One of the other problems with the crude ‘serving the needs of the economy’ account of social policy is that welfare services are not, for the most part provided directly by capital. They are provided variously by charitable bodies as well. The crudest version of a Marxist account would imply that governments are simply a tool in the hands of the capitalists acting on their behalf. However, discussions about the state in Marxist literature suggests versions which are much more subtle and complex. These debates as they apply specifically to state in the field of welfare, are well summarized by Gough. He argues that the state cannot be seen as simply an instrument in the hands of the dominant class. It should be seen as having necessarily a degree of separation and autonomy from the interest of capital, although ultimately being constrained by the imperatives of the capital accumulation process. Within these constraints there is room for competing strategies and for reforms to be won which are not straightforward in the interest of capital.

These ideological viewpoints are significant in understanding how education has been visualised by the educational sociologists. It also equips us with a lot of valuable knowledge which would be helpful in analysing the educational policy vis-a-vis social policy in the Israeli case. The Marxist approach comes handy in approaching the government policies from a critical point of view and so would normally be taken recourse to for the purpose of the study. However, the criterion according to which the policies are shaped and the societal resources are supposed to be justly distributed in a

\textsuperscript{68} Gough, I. \textit{The political Economy of the Welfare State}, Macmillan, London, 1979, pp. 43-44.
welfare state is what has normally escaped the eyes of most of the social scientists. This to my view should be seen in the conception of normative justice prevalent in a society. This link being drawn between social policy and social justice would later be applied in the case of Israel to see what is the conception of social justice in the Israeli society and how it affects the education policy.

Social Policy and Social Justice
The general literature available on social justice and social policy treat the two as quite different from each other with no whatsoever relationship. For the sake of this study we would take into consideration the definition suggested by the British Report (dealt earlier in the section defining social policy) which defines social policy as all policies which are concerned with the distribution of major resources (wealth, power, education etc.) and opportunities among the community and with ways of changing this distribution. This definition has a vast sweep and almost encompasses all the aspects highlighted by other definitions. The factor of integration is embedded in the definition as a number of scholars have held that the social gap and integration are two sides of the same coin. The social gap reflects the given situation while integration is one of the mechanisms proposed for closing it. However, this definition also does not look a normative one as it refrain from saying how the resources should be distributed. That is why this definition by itself is meaningless as a guideline for social policy, and in order to make it a meaningful one, a normative conception of social justice has to be connected to it. That is to say, the criteria according to which the resources will be distributed have to be defined. These criteria are normative and constitute a conception of social justice. Social Justice (or distributive Justice) deals
with the criteria for allocating resources, and the result of the advocated distribution is regarded as creating a more just society.

The first question that arises while dealing with the concept of social justice is whether social justice is a universal or a relative concept. In other words, does social justice mean the same thing in all societies at all times, or does it mean different things to different societies? According to Perelman the only common element to different conceptions of social justice throughout the history is the formal element: to treat similar cases alike and different cases differently\(^{69}\). The moral issue, i.e., how do we divide society is left open: are all citizens ‘similar cases’ and therefore required to be treated alike in matters connected to the distribution of resources; or are citizens not similar cases, to be divided into groups according to say ethnicity, caste, religion etc., and thus only those with similarity in these respects should be treated alike while difference in treatment should exist when treating people with different origin.

The answers to the normative issue, says Perelman, are derived from the moral basis of the conception of justice existing in each society. The moral basis, however, of the conception of justice can differ from one society to the other. For example, the following conceptions of social justice have a different normative foundation and therefore inevitably, also advocates different criteria for the allocation of resources: to each according to his needs; to each according to his work; to each according to his merit; to each according to his class. Obviously the first three conceptions of justice exist in the democratic countries. The moral values, which enjoy consensus in a society, determine which conception of justice will prevail. In each of the
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democracies various ideologies, each with a different conception of social justice compete for the support of the electorate. To further highlight how the conception of social justice affects the policy let us take an example. The conception of social justice which emphasizes the criteria of distribution: 'to each according to his merit' keeping 'to each according to his needs' secondary or even ignoring it, would mean to be emphasizing quality and would mean to have accepted that inequality is unavoidable and even desirable. Somebody emphasizing on the criterion: 'to each according to his needs' 'keeping the criterion' to each according to his merit' secondary is emphasizing on equality and fellowship.

How this different conceptions affect policy is very well brought out by Bilski's example from the school system in Britain. The Labour party's conception of social justice as the distribution of the resources of education as equally as possible, spurred the campaign against the segregation of children at the age of eleven-plus into three different caliber secondary schools. It also engendered the adoption of the comprehensive school policy, which means that all children go to the same secondary schools and are streamed or set within them. The aim was to enhance equality and integration. The conservatives because of their conception of social justice see in education a resource, which should not be distributed equally but according to merit. Thus it fought against the idea of the comprehensive school and for the existence of elitistic frameworks such as public and grammar schools. In other words, the differences between the ideologies and consequently between the social policies of, say, the conservatives and Labor in Britain, depends on the relative weight given by the parties to each of the two criteria: 'to each according to his need (emphasizing
equality) and ‘to each according to his merit’ (emphasizing the right of the individual to develop his personality freely and get rewarded for it). In each of these ideologies the relative importance of the different criteria of distribution is a result of the overall normative view of the party in the light of which the conception of social justice is formed. The democratic socialist conception of social justice is formed in the light of the values of equality, fellowship, solidarity and integration.

Modern conservatism is based on the conception that men are not, and must not, be equal and thus the role of organized societal action is limited to the encouragement of individual achievement and to some protection of the weak who cannot compete in the free market system. The modern liberal view does not demand re-allocation of resources in order to increase equality, but neither does it agree with the conservative view regarding the minimal role of the state in implementing social justice. Rawls demands that when unequal distribution of resources occurs, organized society attempts to better the position of its lower strata. Inequalities, according to Rawls, are just only if they result in improving the expectations of the less advantaged.  

In societies where party ideologies do not contain a clear conception of social justice we can reasonably expect that the social policy would be primarily a result of the relative strength of various interest groups and of power struggles and electoral considerations. It is thus impossible to speak about the concept of social justice as though it has always the same meaning; one must be specific. In societies where there is an explicit conception of social justice it is possible to show how it influences policy. However, there are societies in which the concept of social justice is heavily

---

clouded. While looking at education as social policy in Israel in the next chapter we would see in detail how the conception of social justice or the lack of it affects the nature of social policy and how it affects the education policy. An ambiguity in social policy normally reflects ambiguity in the education policy as well.

Aftermath, op. cit. pp.74-83.