Orit Ichilov

The Retreat from Public Education

Global and Israeli Perspectives

Springer

The Retreat from Public Education

Orit Ichilov

The Retreat from Public Education

Global and Israeli Perspectives

Springer

ISBN 978-1-4020-9569-6 e-ISBN 978-1-4020-9570-2

DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008940335

Printed on acid-free paper

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

For my beloved grandchildren Adam, Ella and Amalia

Preface: About Efficiency

Memo From: Efficiency & Ticket, Ltd., Management Consultants
To: Chairman, The London Symphony Orchestra
Re: Schubert's Symphony No. 8 in B minor.

After attending a rehearsal of this work we make the following observations and recommendations:

1. We note that the twelve first violins were playing identical notes, as were the second violins. Three violins in each section, suitably amplified, would seem to us to be adequate.
2. Much unnecessary labour is involved in the number of demisemiquavers in this work; we suggest that many of these could be rounded up to the nearest semiquaver thus saving practice time for the individual player and rehearsal time for the entire ensemble. The simplification would also permit more use of trainee and less-skilled players with only marginal loss of precision.
3. We could find no productivity value in string passages being repeated by the horns; all tutti repeats could also be eliminated without any reduction of efficiency.
4. In so labour-intensive an undertaking as a symphony, we regard the long oboe tacet passages to be extremely wasteful. What notes this instrument is called upon to play could, subject to a satisfactory demarcation conference with the Musician's Union, be shared out equitably amongst the other instruments.

Conclusion: if the above recommendations are implemented the piece under consideration could be played through in less than ten minutes with concomitant savings in overtime, lighting and heating, wear and tear on the instruments and hall rental fees. Also, had the composer been aware of modern cost-effective procedures he might well have finished this work.

[*Taken from the Amusements Pages of the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra. Oxymoron Humor Archive, Merton College, Oxford UK.*]

Acknowledgments

The book reflects insights gained from my work over the years on democratic citizenship, citizenship education, and educational policy. I became keenly aware of how the implementation of markets in education transforms both citizenship and citizenship education in profound ways.

I would like to thank all those institutions and individuals that gave me their invaluable support. I consider myself fortunate to have been hosted during my sabbatical year from Tel-Aviv University (the academic year 2006/7) by the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Oxford University in the United Kingdom. The pastoral and tranquil surrounding and the warm hospitality of all staff members, academic and administrative, provided ideal conditions for writing the book.

Oded Mcdossi and Omri Rozenkrantz, my dedicated research assistants, deserve special thanks. They helped collect the documentary materials for the analysis of the rise and fall of state education in Israel. Oded Mcdossi also helped prepare the manuscript for publication. Their work with me was supported by the Israel Pollack grant for graduate students, for which I'm most grateful.

Contents

Prologue

I was born in Palestine under British rule, and was raised in Israel that came into being in 1948. This means that I have lived most of my life during the last century (the twentieth) of the past millennium. Antiquity by itself, however, does not render the past a golden age, and those years were not necessarily "the good old days." I witnessed changes that took place in Israeli society in general, and in Israeli state schools in particular as a student, mother, and most recently as grandmother. During my childhood years, the World War II was raging and it was feared that the German army that reached North Africa may invade Palestine. Italian planes air raided Tel-Aviv. The Arabs refused to accept the UN plan for the partition of Palestine into two states: an Arab and a Jewish state. Israel was attacked by its neighboring Arab countries shortly after the British had left and the birth of Israel as an independent state was declared. Massive waves of Jewish refugees arrived. From Europe came survivors of the Holocaust, recognizable by numbers that were tattooed on their arm in the death camps, and from the Middle East and North African countries came penniless refugees. Food, shoes, and clothing were rationed, but some could afford to purchase goods on the "black market" that was flourishing. It was nevertheless a time of hope and high expectations. The newly born state was regarded as a haven for the ingathering Jewish exiles, and as a place where Jews can resume their national life that was interrupted by 2,000 years of life in the Diaspora. There has been a broad consensus, among all political parties, socialist, and liberals alike, that the state must take upon itself the responsibility for providing the vast and varied needs of the ingathering exiles. Israel emerged as a welfare state, supplying its citizens with health care, education, housing, and jobs. This was considered an historic calling not an act of charity.

I favorably remember my school days. Schools provided a wide range of educational experiences and social services, and students were the apple of the eye of the national revival. The Israeli population more than tripled during the first years of statehood, and schools had to cope with the rapidly growing number of students. There were periods during which my school operated in two shifts. Sometimes my class studied from morning until noon, and at times our school day began in the afternoon. There were times when my classroom numbered 56 students. It was crowded, but no one complained, and teachers did their best to teach veteran and newcomers alike. Through my newly arrived Iraqi classmates I discovered the taste

of foods and spices that were not part of the East European cuisine of my mother, and my Iraqi friends claimed that my mother's Polish style Gefilte Fish are so sweet that they can be served as dessert. We were given each day in school a glass of milk or butter milk, and schools offered hot meals that were cooked in the school kitchen. Some vegetables came from the vegetable garden that the students cultivated. Students took turns helping to prepare and serve the meals, while also learning about good nutrition. The meals were vegetarian, simple, and nourishing. Periodical dental examinations and vaccinations, against Typhoid and Tuberculosis for example, were delivered in school. The school nurse, who had a clinic in school, injected the vaccines. Some of us were courageous and volunteered to be the first ones to receive the shot, while others tried to evade the needle and ran home. The nurse checked our hair periodically to make sure that no lice found refuge there. The school nurse was in charge of the "health society" (Agudat Ha'Briut) consisting of students from the upper grades. They made sure that each student would carry a handkerchief in his/her pocket, and that shoes are polished, and fingernails are trimmed and clean. Holidays were celebrated in school. Students and teachers took part in decorating the school and in the preparation of the various events. All students participated in the singing, dancing in big circles, and in all other activities. There were hardly ever performers and spectators. Sizable part of the curriculum was dedicated to the Bible, History, Hebrew, and literature. I can still recite verses from the Bible that we were asked to memorize, as well as poems by prominent Hebrew poets. We were also active in youth movements. Youth movements were very demanding ideologically. Upon high school graduation we were expected to join a kibbutz, or better still, found a new one. No makeup or jewelry was allowed. Listening to "foreign" music (i.e., non-Hebrew songs) and dancing "saloon" dances (such as tango or waltz) was strictly deplored, while Hebrew folk songs and dances (such as Hora) were praised and approved. Most families did not own cars, but we become acquainted with the country via school and youth movement trips and hikes. To boost Israeli economy we were encouraged to buy only locally produced goods (Tozeret Ha'Aretz) and used to sing a campaign song about the wheat that is growing on the shores of the Sea of Galilee for our bread.

My two children were also born in the last century of the past millennium, but were brought up in affluent Israel that emerged victorious in the Six Day War of 1967. Israeli society has become less cohesive, and a sense of common purpose seems to have been lost. Yerida, i.e., emigrating from Israel or living abroad for extended periods of time, that was considered an almost act of treason in the past, gained acceptance. Offspring of holocaust survivors attempt to get passports of European countries that their ancestors vowed never to set foot in again. Such passports open economic opportunities in the European Union.

A major attribute of Israeli society is the wide and deep rifts between religious and non-religious Jews, between Israeli Arabs and Jews, between the political left and right, and between the rich and the poor. These divides, that often intersect and overlap, represent contesting visions of Israel as a Jewish-democratic state and profoundly shape Israel's political culture. Rifts between the political left and right concern the future of the territories that Israel controls, and are visible even in the

discourse used to deal with this issue. Are the territories ”liberated” or ”occupied”? Should the term ”West Bank” be used or the biblical ”Judea and Samaria”? Israeli Palestinian-Arabs subscribe to the Palestinian historical narrative that clearly defies the claim of Jews to have a right to the land of Israel from days immemorial. They claim to be the indigenous people that were displaced and occupied by the Israelites in ancient times, and by those who maintain to be their descendants – Zionist Jews – in recent years (Lewis, 1975). Recently, two documents have been issued by Israeli Palestinian-Arabs, proposing the abolition of Israel as the homeland of the Jewish people and calling on Israel to divest itself of all national symbols, the anthem, and the Law of Return that allows all Jews the right to return to Israel. According to their vision, Israel must be transformed into a bi-national state. The Jewish majority will be allowed to exist only as a cultural entity operating Hebrew schools and cultivating a Hebrew culture (The National Committee of Mayors of Arab Municipalities in Israel, 2006; Adalah, 2007). It seems unlikely, however, that Israeli Jews will agree to a plan that denies Jews a national home in their ancestral homeland.

My children experienced studying in a reformed education system. The 1968 reform introduced junior high schools, as intermediary autonomous schools, situated between 6 years of elementary schools and 3 years of high school. Tel-Aviv-Jaffa was one of the first municipalities to adopt the reform, and my son’s age cohort was the first generation to go into integrated middle school after graduating from the sixth grade of elementary school. Middle schools were designed primarily to expand the number of students who acquire high school education; facilitate inter-ethnic contacts by creating integrated schools, and promoting greater equality of educational opportunities for all students. Students from low socioeconomic background were bussed to my children’s school from the Southern neighborhoods of Tel-Aviv-Jaffa. Few of them remained to pursue their high school education with my children. Appeals to the Supreme Court by affluent parents who wished to send their children to a school of their choice, instead of being assigned a school by the authorities, became frequent. Initially, the Supreme Court strongly supported the authorities in their attempts to create integrated schools, even at the expense of denying parents their wish to make a choice of school for their children. In my children’s schools, hot meals were not served, and students brought their own meals from home. Milk was no longer provided in school, as well as the services of a nurse. School counselors, a novel expertise entered schools. Parents had to pay for a host of services provided in schools that were free of charge in the past. Parents’ expenses on books and accessories swelled. However, it was felt that overall schools are on the right track to integration, and equality, and that the education reform will eventually prove triumphant. What is needed is better trained educational staff, able to teach in integrated classrooms, and students must have the professional support for staying in school and for making progress.

Our beloved grandson was born in the twenty-first century, and was 5 years old in July of 2008. Our dearly loved grand daughter who was born 5 weeks ago is still breast-fed and home schooled. Our grandson started his educational career as student in a private kindergarten catering for children aged two to four. This age group is still not universally provided with free education. In the past academic

year he attended a ”pre-compulsory” school, where afternoon care and meals were paid for by parents, and on the next academic year he will attend a compulsory kindergarten. Free education is not really free of charge, and parents’ expenses are soaring in addition to the payment of education toll, the amount of which is annually determined by the Ministry of Education. Schools are no longer guided by the vision of those who charted the Israeli education public space. Israeli society lost fate in state schooling. Parents wish to avoid state schools and send their children to quasi-private specialized schools that are supported by public funds, or start such schools from scratch. The state education system is being increasingly fragmented into schools pursuing their own unique ”credo.” The school system is becoming progressively more guided by market policies and practices, and public schooling as my generation and my children generation knew is rapidly disappearing. Schools’ celebrations, for example, are rarely produced anymore by students and teachers. Instead, corporations specializing in the production of events are contracted. Schools purchase ”summit days” – summit day Holocaust, summit day Independence, you name it – and can request (if their budget allows them to do so) colorful balloons, and various activities including quizzes, games, contests, and various performances. Celebration of holidays became commercialized, and the students and educational staff are transformed into passive consumers-spectators, instead of acting as creative and participating producers.

Our grandchildren are growing up in a society that’s a deeply divided society that seems to have lost a common sense of purpose, and compassion and tolerance for ”others.” Religious and right wing parties claim to be the custodians of Jewish national heritage, while the political left claims a monopoly over democracy and the desire for peace. Our grandchildren are growing up in a society that is no longer guided by the Zionist vision of national revival in the ancestral homeland of the Jewish people, and where post-Zionist ideology is prevalent in Arab and some Jewish circles. Israel today is driven by the global market and by postmodern and multicultural ideologies. Shopping malls dominate the urban scene, and shopping is obsessively pursued. Even the kibbutzim have been privatized. Our grandson, like his counterparts in many other countries, is already acquainted with McDonalds and Coca Cola, wears Nike shoes, and watches internationally produced children movies that are dubbed to Hebrew. It appears, however, that many Israelis do not subscribe to the advertisement slogan presenting Coca Cola as ”the taste of life”, and seek meaning in a great variety of ”new age” ventures, from Jewish mysticism, to scientology, the cult of the immortals, and a variety of far East traditions.

Readers must have sensed my displeasure with the current state of Israeli society. My criticism, however, comes out of love and concern, for the future of my grandchildren and all other children that reside in Israel, and for the future of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. I was involved in attempts to stop the spread of market-related policies in education, as member of the city council of Tel-Aviv-Jaffa (in 1993–1998), through participation in the work of various committees, and via public addresses. I sincerely hope that ”the market” will be relegated from its present iconic status and be replaced by a humanist and child-centered approach to education.

Readers may wonder what motivated me to share with them my personal memoirs and observations. There is no doubt in my mind that my decision to write the present book was greatly inspired by my personal experiences. I, therefore, felt obliged to share my subjective reflections with my readers. The book itself, however, provides scientific analysis of the invasion of the education public place by the free market.

Introduction

In recent decades the pendulum is swinging away from the idea and ideals of public education, and a new ethos increasingly takes over the shrinking public space of education.

In the 1980s markets were elevated to social and economic icons, becoming a new secular faith. Privatizing public education became a credible policy in many countries and there have been an increasing number of attempts to restructure and deregulate state schooling.

Global trade agreements foster domestic and international trade in education services treating education as a commodity to be sold and purchased, and many countries adopt various forms of market-related practices in education. These are not neutral, technical, managerial changes in the production and delivery of public education. They transform education in ways that have profound social and educational consequences.

To justify the introduction of market reforms in education public schools and educators are being defamed and accused of a series of vices, such as inefficiency and laziness. We must be reminded that public education, i.e., mandatory publicly financed schooling, that was introduced in Austria as early as in 1874 and spread to other countries, was considered the most progressive movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Public schools were established to make education universally available to all children, free of charge, and have been recognized as gateways to opportunity (Kober, 2006). Public schooling was regarded as state instrument for empowering and liberating citizens, doing away with child labor, for fostering democracy, and for promoting social equality and national unity. It was highly esteemed as a force setting people free from the constraints of gender, race, ethnic origin, and social class.

The history of public schooling varies from country to country, and greatly depends on the political and economic situation and on the class structure of a particular society. In Scotland and France, for example, public schools were secularized and freed of church control. In the United Kingdom, Scotland was first to introduce compulsory public education through The Education Act of 1872. Initially, the running of schools was transferred from the Church of Scotland to School Boards run by local committees, and in 1885 Scottish education became the responsibility of a new ministerial post the Dover House, Whitehall, in London (Stephens, 1998).

Similarly in France public education became laic, i.e., secular and mandatory in the 1880s. Jules Ferry, the then Minister of Public Instruction is regarded as the founder of "the modern republican school" (l'école republican). The Jules Ferry's laws established free education in 1881, then mandatory and laic education in 1882 (Harrigan, 2001).

Child labor was still common in the United States during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. School attendance was for only a few weeks during the winter, schools were poorly equipped and teachers untrained. Public education was introduced to do away with child labor, improve the literacy of the poor, and integrate the massive waves of immigrants that were arriving. The implementation of public education was spearheaded by Horace Mann, ardent abolitionist, social reformer, and visionary educator, who became in 1837 head of the newly created Board of Education of Massachusetts (Cremin, 1957; Filler, 1965). Compulsory attendance was first introduced in Massachusetts in 1853, followed by New York in 1854. In 1918 Mississippi was the last state to join all other states by adopting compulsory attendance law.

In England and Wales, elementary education for ages 5–12 (inclusive) was expanded through the Elementary Education Act of 1870, commonly known as Forste's Education Act. Charles Dickens was an ardent supporter of bringing the act into power, while industrialists were not keen on having to give up cheap child labor. The act allowed local school boards to examine the provision of elementary education in their district and permitted them to build and maintain schools. However, elementary education became compulsory only in 1880 for children between the ages of 5 and 10, when the government was convinced that there are enough schools to accommodate these age cohorts. Elementary education became free in 1891 (Stephens, 1998).

The creation of public schooling in Israel will be discussed in great details in Chapter 5. In a nut shell, Israel was founded in 1948, and the first education law and one of the first laws to be enacted by the Knesset (parliament) of the newly born state was the Compulsory Education Law of 1949. The law, that has been later amended to include more cohorts, initially mandated compulsory and tuition-free education for youngsters aged 5–13.

Public schools, or state schools as they were labeled in Israel, were regarded as state instrument for welding the ingathering Jewish exiles into a nation, and were involved in the renewal of Hebrew culture, the revival of the Hebrew language, the revival of independent statehood, and the education of citizens for life in a democracy.

Modern democratic theory, as will be discussed at length in Chapter 3, assigns public schooling a prominent role in securing the well functioning and persistence of democratic regimes and in developing citizenship virtues, values, and skills (Gutmann, 1987; Niemi and Junn, 1998; Converse, 1972). Public schools are expected to do more than private schools to deliver common goods and to address social problems. The central mission of public schools includes the preparation of youngsters to become responsible citizens; to foster democracy by reducing inequalities; and building a shared culture while promoting tolerance. Public education, as the case of Israel demonstrates, is also a tool for nation-building.

Public schooling is one of the most costly and extensive state-provided services. Consequently, many education reforms at this age of economic globalization can be characterized as finance-driven reforms, i.e., their main purpose is to reduce public spending on education (Carnoy, 1999). Comprehensive education reforms, such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) that was legislated in the United States in 2002, tend to gain great visibility and thus stir up much public debate. Education reforms, however, often proceed through smaller, seemingly isolated strides such as contracting out "non-educational" school services (i.e., provision of food and transportation) or allowing the operation of magnet schools alongside public schools. In such instances the general public often remains unaware of how such policies and practices are interrelated, and of their consequences for democracy, national unity, education, and the access of all children to quality education. Yet, the retreat from public education and the exposure of education to market-oriented policies and practices, whether made in one comprehensive reform or in a sequence of smaller strides, represent a major change. It is essential, in my view, to provide parents, educators, policy makers, and the general public with both information and conceptual tools for comprehending the educational and social consequences of these paramount changes.

The present volume focuses exclusively on the primary and secondary tiers of the education system, i.e., on school levels that are expected to be, and in most instances are, both compulsory and tuition free. Public higher education, in contrast, is selective, but should be made accessible and affordable for all qualified individuals. The vision concerning higher education as articulated in the International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights is

> Higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education. (ICESCR, 1966. Article 13:2c).

The history and development of higher education in various countries around the globe have been studied and analyzed in many scholarly publications. The study of patterns of change in higher education, including privatization and globalization, brings to the fore unique issues that fall beyond the scope of the present volume.

The purpose of this book is twofold: first, to provide a comprehensive analysis of the universal elements which characterize markets in education without focusing on any specific country. This includes the examination of the social conditions that facilitate the invasion of all public spaces by the free market, analysis of the various education policies and practices that embody privatization of education, and, most importantly, exploring the educational and social consequences of markets in education.

Second, I wish to examine the building process of the Israeli public education system and the ethos that guided this process. I also wish to study of the retreat from state schooling in recent years. The Israeli public (or state) education system emerged shortly after the establishment of the state in 1948. The Israeli case study provides a unique opportunity to closely examine the essence of public schooling in the process of nation-building and in the building of a democracy. In Israel, the

retreat from public education marks a retreat from the Zionist vision of education, a general decline of collectivist values and the predominance of individualistic self-centered values.

To more fully comprehend the conditions that facilitated the introduction of markets in education, and the social and educational consequences of privatization, I drew on several intellectual traditions. These included modern democratic theory, literature on social and human rights, on the welfare state, on globalization, and on postmodern and multicultural ideologies. The literature concerning the various forms of privatization in education was also thoroughly examined. This enabled me to explore education markets from several vantage points, challenging their basic assumptions and providing a comprehensive overview of their social and educational outcomes. The book also represents a pioneering attempt to study the rise and fall of state education in Israel. The Israeli case study is based mainly on the analysis of protocols of Knesset (the Israeli Parliament) deliberations, reports of committees appointed to explore various issues and propose educational policies, and on the writings of those who took a central role in the building of a state education system.

The Structure of the Book

The structure of the book can be visualized as consisting of concentric circles. The outer circles examine broad issues concerning markets in education (Chapters 1–4), and the innermost circle zeros in on Israel as a case study of the social and educational consequences of the rise and decline of public schooling (Chapters 5 and 6).

My point of departure is that the retreat from public education is a manifestation of the decline of the welfare state as guarantor of social rights. I argue that the introduction of market reforms is associated with global cultural and economic changes. In Chapter 1, "Paving the Road for Market Reforms in Education," the centrifugal forces that enfeeble allegiance between citizens and government and diminish feelings of fraternity and solidarity among citizens are discussed. These include globalization, and postmodern and multicultural ideologies. Such trends reflect changes in the ideological discourse about the locus of responsibility in society for health, education, and welfare and facilitate the decline of the welfare state. Increasingly nested within the discourse of free market policies, these novel cultural structures allow for the replacement of the welfare state by a market-oriented "enterprise culture" (Bridges and McLaughlin, 1994, p. 2). Controversies concerning the nature of public education often shape perceptions of what the legitimate forms for delivering public education are. Chapters 2 and 3 explore perceptions of what education is and/or ought to be from several vantage points. In Chapter 2 "Education: Between Social Entitlement and the Discourse of Rights" the following perceptions of education are analyzed: education as a public good, private good, positional good, social service, human right, children's right, and citizenship right. These terms are not synonymous nor are they neutral, technical definitions. They are embedded in

diverse intellectual traditions of what education is. In Chapter 3 "Visions of the Purposes of Education: Democracy, Human Development, and the Market-Managerial Approach," three different visions of education are discussed. My conclusion is that the market-managerial approach is totally alien and inconsistent with both the democratic and the child-centered pedagogical perceptions and purposes of education. In Chapter 4, "The Educational and Social Consequences of Markets in Education," various forms of market practices in education are analyzed, and their social and educational outcomes are examined. The analysis demonstrates that market policies and practices, grounded in false assumptions about the essence of education and the expected behavior of all stakeholders, do not deliver the promised results. Scores on standardized tests, for example, do not account for multiple educational purposes, reduce education into quantified outcomes, and do not necessarily reflect meaningful improvement in teaching. Similarly, competition among schools does not by itself increase diversity or encourage innovative approaches in education. The uncoordinated decisions of individual parents cannot produce an optimal output of education as a public good. In Chapter 5 the emergence of the Israeli public education system and the ethos that accompanied this process are explored. The leading ethos of state education is unfolded through the analysis of education laws that charted the education public space and the deliberations that preceded their enactment. State education was regarded primarily as a ruling instrument for achieving collective goals, such as the ingathering of exiles, for solving social problems, such as inequality, and for educating future citizens. In Chapter 6, I trace the retreat from public education that began to gradually unfold from the 1980s when market-related educational policies and practices were introduced. I argue that the education reform proposed in the Dovrat report of 2005 represents the final eradication of state education, replacing state schools with quasi-private schools that are partially supported by public funds. I demonstrate how the retreat from state education was related to social and cultural changes within Israeli society, as well as to existing social divides. I argue that the retreat from public education fosters and reproduces divisions and rifts and exacerbates inequality of educational opportunities. In Chapter 7 "The Future of Public Education," an overall perspective is provided of the educational and social consequences of imposing market epistemology, policy, and practices in education. My conclusion is that the invasion of the education public space by market-related educational policies subverts the democratic purposes of education by creating a new discourse, which robs education of values, and of a child-centered pedagogical ethos. Business considerations override social and pedagogical ones and transform schools into markets. By imposing market terminology and practices, a new epistemology emerges, transforming education from a public good into a commodity and redefining the role of teachers, headmasters, the essence and contents of education, the curriculum, and eroding state accountability for education.

I argue that the situation can be reversed and changed. To bring about change, citizens and governments must become aware of the fact that educational markets do not deliver the promised outcomes. Instead, markets exacerbate inequality of educational opportunities and subvert the democratic purposes of education as well as the pedagogical-professional vision of education. Governments must take up again their

responsibilities for the financing and operating of public education. Business should be relegated from their elevated iconic status and must not have an advantageous position in decision-making processes concerning education. Decisions concerning the definition of the education public space must proceed through democratic deliberation processes. It is also suggested that cooperation rather than competition among schools should be advanced, as well as creating content variations within schools rather than among schools and ensuring that schools would become meeting grounds for youngsters of diverse social and cultural backgrounds, abilities, and interests.

Chapter 1
Paving the Road for Market Reforms in Education

In the present chapter I argue that the retreat from state-provided public services, including education, is closely associated with changing citizenship patterns, i.e., the growing fragmentation among citizens and the widening rift between citizens and their government. The infusion of citizenship with market metaphors acts as divisive force among citizens. Schild (2000) argues that citizens are transformed into what he calls "market citizens" whose relationships are governed by the liberal norms of the marketplace. However, processes of economic bargaining and processes of civil deliberation are at odds with one another. Bargaining encourages participants to act strategically with respect to one another, even lie to one another about their preferences and beliefs when it serves their purpose, and to assume that others will do likewise. Democratic deliberation, in contrast, is founded upon trust, sharing of knowledge, and citizens' recognition of their joint involvement in a common fate (March and Olsen, 2000).

The social contract between government and citizens is also being transformed. Governments lose much of their power to care for the welfare of citizens and delegate a good deal of their control over public goods to free market forces. Governments lose the incentive to invest public funds in social services and are under pressure to transform public goods into private goods that are traded in the free globalized markets. The role of government and citizens is being redefined, and all public spaces are being invaded and transformed by market-related perceptions and practices. I claim that the retreat from public education is both a symptom and a consequence of changing public discourse about social services in general and education in particular.

I attribute these changing patterns of citizenship mainly to three processes that will be discussed in the present chapter, namely, globalization and the preeminence of postmodern and multicultural ideologies. I propose to analyze these processes that pave the road for the invasion of all public spaces by the market.

Market reforms in education and other social spheres are not merely "neutral" technical-managerial change. They represent profound political and ideological change. Earlier, in 1970, Brzezinski had characterized post-industrial society as being at the onset of becoming a "technitronic" society, i.e., "a society that is shaped culturally, psychologically, socially, and economically by the impact of technology and electronics – particularly in the area of computers and communications" (p. 9).

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_1, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

He failed to foresee, however, that the free market will dominate all social spheres and take over electronics and technology as well. Antonio Gramsci (1971; Forgace, 1988) focused our attention to see how the routine, taken-for-granted structures of everyday thinking shapes our perceptions and ideas. I argue that the introduction of markets into public spheres represents profound political and ideological change. By imposing market ideology, terminology, and practices, a new epistemology emerges, transforming the social contract between citizens and their governments and eroding the bond of citizenship among citizens. Faith in public institutions, democracy, and fellow citizens is being replaced by a secular faith that draws its inspiration not from the democratic social metaphor of community and cooperation, but from the market metaphor of individual interest and competition. "Markets" were elevated to social and economic icons, and they invaded all public spaces, notably communication and education (Cookson, 1994; Gardner, 1994; Ichilov, 2004). Let's proceed to analyze the processes which facilitate the growing supremacy of markets in all social spheres.

The Eroding Bonds of Citizenship

Achieving a shared concept of citizenship that would bridge over ethnic, national, and socioeconomic rifts is considered vital for the functioning of democracies and is a necessary precondition for the emergence and continued existence of the welfare state. Solidarity among citizens "helps to tame the divisive passions of other identities" (Heater, 1990, p. 184). It generates empathy and a sense of common destiny and willingness of citizens to support through their taxes, costly social services such as education, welfare, and health. It is generally agreed that in order to achieve solidarity, pluralism must fit within a certain kind of overarching unity and certain ultimate values must be shared (Janowitz, 1983; Etzioni, 1992; Ichilov, 2003; Ichilov, Salomon and Inbar, 2005). Traditional citizenship bonds were based on society's collective memory, cultural togetherness and nationality, and the collaborative sense of purpose in fraternity. These elements which bind people together with a common identity of citizenship have been eroding over the last decades, due to global changes, including multiculturalism, i.e., the growing ethnic, national, and cultural heterogeneity within existing societies. There has been a growing awareness of the potential tensions between cultural, national, and social, heterogeneity, and the virtues and practices of democratic citizenship and national unity (Kymlicka, 1991; Kymlicka and Wayne, 2000). To be sure, pluralistic societies have existed throughout history and are not a novelty. Multiculturalism represents a new way of thinking about and coping with cultural pluralism and minority rights (Kymlicka, 1995; Ichilov, 2003; 2004). Current multiculturalism endorses social visions that do not necessarily value unity and cohesion. While some contemporary political philosophers believe that the status of minorities can be resolved by supplementing individual rights with special collective rights (Taylor, 1994; Kymlicka, 1995), others have been suspicious of appeals for unity. "Good citizenship," for example, is seen as a demand that minorities should quietly learn to play by the majority's rules

and acculturate to majority culture (Kanpol and McLaren, 1995; McLaren, 1997). It is, therefore, argued that the call for unity should be replaced by the empowerment of minorities that are "produced" within Western forms of hegemony, to enable them to dismantle their ideological scaffolding and develop strategies and practices of resistance (Kanpol and McLaren, 1995; McLaren, 1998). Young I. M (1990) advocates social life based on the "being together" of strangers. As a result, the ideas of community cohesion and unity are not necessarily as accepted and appealing as they probably were. Such divisive perceptions erode citizens' sense of mutual responsibility, solidarity, and cohesion and may advance support for the gospel of individual freedom of choice that the market is presumed to bring forth.

Citizenship is also a bond between citizenry and a polity (Walzer, 1983). This bond, or social contract that is grounded to a large extent in an understanding that government is in control of the conditions that assure citizens a good life, is also being radically transformed. Changing citizenship patterns, I argue, are associated with immense political, social, and cultural processes that transform both the relationships between citizens and the polity and among citizens. As a consequence, internal divisions and conflicts within societies could be on the rise. Let's proceed to examine how globalization and postmodern and multicultural ideologies transform traditional citizenship bonds.

Globalization

Globalization refers to interaction across national borders unmediated by the state. The emergence of new super-national structures and the shift from an economy based on material, energy, and labor to one grounded on information and communication reduce the importance of the state as a critical player in guaranteeing the fortunes of the marketplace. The areas in which governments have a lesser amount of control include currencies and their valuation, markets and prices, businesses and their regulation, borders and the movements of people and commodities across them, and the information available to their public (Nichiporuk and Builder, 1997; Stiglitz, 2002). Governments relinquish powers to corporations and to supranational agencies that manage trade agreements – such as the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA); mutual defense alliances like NATO and the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe; regional organizations such as the European Union – as well as to extensive networks of voluntary organizations (NGOs) (Richmond, 2002). Klein (1999) claims that some corporations have grown so big that their budget supersedes that of some governments. Unlike governments, however, corporations are accountable only to their shareholders and their commitments and interests shift from a local and national to a transnational focus (Heying, 1997). Stiglitz (2002) believes that the ideas and intentions underlying globalization were good but gradually evolved into something else. Globalization is led by few international economic institutions that are dominated by the wealthiest industrial countries and by the commercial and financial interests of corporations within those countries. There is no world government accountable to the people of

every country. This situation clearly subverts democracy and excludes people from having their voice heard.

Relinquishing governmental responsibilities to NGOs also raises serious questions. The numbers of NGOs are rapidly increasing. In 1975 there were 3,000 international non-governmental organizations or NGOs. In 1997 the number has reached 25,000 (Toffler and Toffler, 1997). NGOs are often perceived as part of a "global civil society." Their popularity is often greater than that of traditional political associations. By 1990, for example, Greenpeace UK had more members than the British Labour Party (Clark, 1991). NGOs, however, represent network of interest groups rather than formal representative structures (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Higgott and Bieler, 1999). They are, therefore, often perceived as self-selected and unaccountable by those who question their legitimacy as participants in global debates (Edwards and Gaventa, 2001). As we shall see later, many governmental functions for education have been delegated to a variety of for-profit and not-for-profit NGOs.

Democratic governments may lose their ability to balance the interests of economic utility and social justice. The loss of governmental power and control and the transfer of power from elected political authorities to unrepresentative and unelected bodies, such as corporations, undermine the autonomy of individuals and nations alike and, thus, endanger the fulfillment of all citizenship rights (Rifkin, 1995; Barber, 1995; Kiernan, 1997).

Antigovernment sentiments among citizens may reflect more than disillusionment with enfeebled public institutions. In the United States, in the 1980s, for example, free enterprise and antigovernment sentiments dominated public discourse and went hand in hand. There was loss of faith in public institutions, which were often portrayed, especially by the New Right, as being expensive and incompetent. Luck of confidence in democratic institutions was indicated by how few people chose to vote in the United States in local, state, and national elections from the early 1970s to the early 1990s (Cookson, 1994; Putnam, 1995).

Globalization of Education

Carnoy (1999) claims "globalization enters the education sector on an ideological horse, and its effects on education and the production of knowledge are largely a product of the financially-driven, free market ideology, not of a clear conception for improving education" (p. 59). As a public service, education is free of charge or offered at a price that does not reflect the costs of production. Before the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Uruguay Round of negotiations that began in 1986, services were not included in international trade agreements. Some services were considered as domestic activities that are difficult to trade over borders; others, mostly of infra-structural importance, have been viewed as domains of government ownership and control; and social services, such as health and education, were seen as governmental responsibilities and as inseparable element of the exercise of state sovereignty.

The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) that entered into effect in 1995 changed the situation. Deregulating all services, including education, and allowing the operation of various modes of supply based on international competition, Article 1(3) of GATS excludes only "services supplied in the exercise of government authority." However, these are defined as services that are provided at non-market conditions. That is to say that services that are delivered on commercial basis or in competition with other suppliers are included in the agreement. Thus, the introduction of market elements in education transforms education into a commodity that can be internationally traded under GATS (Carnoy, 1999; World Trade Organization-GATS)

International trade law legitimizes the sale and purchase of education, excluding those who are unable to pay for it. Defining the nature and scope of education that should remain exempt from trade and continue to be a free public service attains increased importance when educational systems are pressured into responding to the logic of free trade. While post-compulsory education is increasingly sold and purchased for price, the liberalization commitments under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), congruent with the requirement of the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, affirmed the option to preserve compulsory primary education as a free-of-charge public service. However, the exercise of this choice by individual states greatly depends on pressures put on them by the World Trade Organization and the World Bank to reduce budget deficits. Since the education budget typically forms a sizeable part of the national budget, economic pressures often result in budget cuts, as well as introducing market practices in education. Globalization, thus, relieves governments of the necessity to allocate significant parts of their budget to education and tends to direct governments away from equity-driven reforms.

So far, education as government responsibility still enjoys substantial support among World Trade Organization (WTO) member states, and less than one-third of WTO members made commitments to liberalize their education sector. However, even the minimum requirement of elementary free education is threatened as direct charges have spread to at least 92 countries in the world (Tomasevski, 2006). Such practices clearly violate children's human rights, foster child labor, and block children's main way out of poverty. Globalized education allows domestic and global business to take on roles previously exercised by government (Mathews, 2000). Global companies may establish and/or run schools free of any public controls by democratically elected officials or public servants. This clearly divests governments of their power and responsibility for education and undermines democracy and the democratic makeup of public education.

Public education is founded in a sense of fraternity and solidarity among citizens who are willing to support universally available quality education through their taxes. The decline of government role as guarantor of social rights and the introduction of market reforms are often accompanied or preceded by forces that are weakening feelings of allegiance and solidarity among citizens as well. Multicultural and postmodern ideologies, I argue, are clearly such forces.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism represents a new way of thinking about minority rights. It is true that most organized political communities throughout recorded history have been multi-ethnic, and the growing cultural heterogeneity within contemporary societies is not a novel phenomenon (Kymlicka, 1995). However, such pluralism has been handled using different philosophies and practices. After World War II it was hoped that minority rights would be best resolved not by group-specific rights, but via the new emphasis on human rights as they were stated in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Affirmative action for disadvantaged ethnic groups was acknowledged as a justified temporary and remedial measure, but the idea that specific ethnic or national groups should be given a permanent political identity or constitutional status was generally opposed. Minorities too generally strived for integration. Martin Luther King, the leader of the Civil Rights Movement of African-Americans in the 1960s, endeavored for the integration of African-Americans into all social spheres of mainstream American society. Modern society was expected to erode the bases of traditional identities and identifications, anticipating that one's economic and class position would play a far more important role in determining one's social position. However, the growing ethnically plural composition of modern societies, and the fact that ethno-racial identity markers are still widely adhered to in virtually all the advanced, industrial nations today, refutes the above expectation (Allahar, 2001).

Multiculturalism is not exclusively associated with recent immigration trends. National identity within Western democracies often lies dormant before it is recreated and politicized. One of the more significant developments for both east European and Western political systems in recent decades has been the emergence of regionalized nationalist movements in countries long believed to have successfully integrated, accommodated, or repressed their national minorities. The following cases provide an example: Celtic Britain, the Canadian province of Quebec, and the disintegration of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Such developments challenge the widely accepted notion that national integration is a one-way street (Thompson and Rudolph, 1989; Ishiyama and Breuning, 1998; Anderson, 1991). Anderson (1991) observed that "the reality is quite plain: the 'end of the era of nationalism,' so long prophesied, is not remotely in sight. Indeed nation-ness is the most universal legitimate value in the political life of our time" (p. 3).

Current multiculturalism can be perceived as "politics of recognition" (Taylor, 1994). As Taylor puts it, "The demand for recognition. . .is given urgency by the supposed link between recognition and identity. . . [i.e.] our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others. . .nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression. . ." (p. 25). Kymlicka and Wayne (2000) claim that minority rights set off fears about citizenship. These include worries about the fragmentation or weakening of citizenship duties; fears about the erosion of civic virtue and participation; and concerns about the weakening bonds of social cohesion and political unity. Minorities and majorities increasingly clash over a variety of issues, including language rights, education, and

curriculum. For example, should minority languages be recognized as official languages used in parliaments and courts? Should each ethnic or national group have a right to publicly funded education in its mother tongue?

Citizenship may also come to represent multiple political allegiances rather than a single political identity. Citizens of European countries, for example, are also citizens of the European Union. This may raise issues concerning the centrality and salience for citizens of the various political identities and allegiance among citizens and between citizens and government. It is also possible that allegiances may be incongruent and even conflict with one another.

How should multiculturalism be addressed? Sartori (1997) dreads ethnic and national fragmentation within democratic societies claiming "in practice, to the large extent to which current multicultural demands are aggressive, intolerant, and divisive, to the same extent multiculturalism is the very negation of pluralism." (p. 62). Furthermore, some ethnic and religious traditions may be incongruent with liberal democracy, notably attitudes toward women and their role in society. Gary (1991) warns that such traditions present a threat to unity and solidarity by challenging Western democratic customs, beliefs and principles. Etzioni (1992; 2004) emphasizes the need for shared virtues of communitarian values to bind a democratic society together. In his view, pluralism must fit within some kind of overarching unity, and some ultimate values must be shared if the diversity in a democratic society is to be contained democratically. While some contemporary political philosophers stress the need for recognizing the specific identity of minority groups, and the need to supplement human rights with some special collective rights (Kymlicka, 1991; 1995; Taylor, 1994), others regard all forms of unity as a demand that minorities should quietly learn to play by the majority's rules, and acculturate to majority culture (Kanpol and McLaren, 1995; Young, I. M, 1990). It is, therefore, argued that the call for unity should be replaced by the empowerment of minorities that are "produced" within Western forms of hegemony, to enable them to dismantle their ideological scaffolding and develop strategies and practices of resistance . Young contests any attempt to bring multiplicity and heterogeneity into unity, arguing that such attempts entail a denial of difference and are, therefore, inherently oppressive. She advocates instead social life based on openness to unassimilated otherness, the "being together" of strangers (Young, I. M, 1990).

Multiculturalism represents the fragmentation of societies in ways that repudiate unity and solidarity among citizens. This situation may reinforce the tendency to shift from public goals to private ones and may nurture the decline in political participation and associational life (Schlozman, Verba, Brady and Erkulwater, 1998; Putnam, 1995; McDonnell, 2000). Putnam (1995) observes that in the United States, there is a decline in "social capital," that is, membership in voluntary associations and the interpersonal trust associated with such memberships. Virtual associations, on the Internet for example, that are gaining popularity may further reduce citizens' participation in their communities. Nie and Erbring (2000) maintain that interactions with virtual family members, co-workers, and others cannot replace the quality of face-to-face interactions. In their own words, "you can't share a coffee or a beer with somebody

on e-mail or give them a hug" (pages unnumbered). What are the common obligations that bind citizens, given the absence of a universal draft in many industrialized nations? Paying taxes is considered the almost only near-universal obligation of citizenship (Dahrendorf, 1994; 1996; Mann, 1996). Multiculturalism, however, could make citizens reluctant to support collective causes through their taxes.

Given these centrifugal forces that draw citizens apart, can a collaborative sense of purpose in fraternity be achieved? Public schools in many nations have been the place where immigrants have learned the native language and absorbed the majority's culture and values (Kober, 2006). Can public schools create unity in today's multicultural societies? Multiculturalism could foster the fragmentation of the educational system, resulting in less heterogeneous student body in schools. Public schools may cease to be meeting grounds for students of diverse cultural background, a place where respect and tolerance for "others" can be learned and achieved.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism, which declared all the grand narratives of Western society obsolete, may be one of the forces that erode the foundations of citizenship. Considered a contemporary phenomenon, it is hard to believe that the following statement was made by Simmel as early as in 1921, describing a postmodern situation without using the term "postmodernism":

> at present, we are experiencing a new phase of the old struggle – no longer a struggle of a contemporary form, filled with life, against an old, lifeless one, but a struggle of life against the form *as such*. . .[it] insists on a fight against forms simply because they are forms. This is probably only possible in an epoch where cultural forms are conceived of as exhausted soil which has yielded all that it can grow. . . (Simmel, 1968, pp. 12, 13).

The pattern of postmodern change is in the direction of fragmentation of old cultures and the frenzied proliferation of new values, attitudes, and lifestyles in their place (Lyotard, 1984). However, postmodernism is not merely an extreme form of pluralism. Postmodernism is replacing rationality and solidarity with "semiosis, the structural law of value the free play of signifiers without reference" (Wexler, 1990, p. 165). Consequently, community life is impaired: "society that does not believe in anything is a society in a state of dissolution. The sharing of common aspirations and of unifying beliefs is essential to community life" (Brzezinski, 1970, p. 241).

The traditional foundations needed to form a social bond and to transform a random collection of consumers, or an aggregation of political, ethnic, and economic interests, into citizens striving for the common good are also eroding. Some scholars believe that by their very plurality, these new cultural forms may come to constitute a preventive force against all forms of total political ideology. However, much radical thought, particularly Marxism and feminism, reject postmodernism, arguing that indiscriminate pluralism may lead not to sharpened awareness of and increased respect for differences, but to uncritical sponge-headedness (Boyne and Rattansi, 1990; Gibbins, 1989; Lovibond, 1990). The fragmentary and nihilist tendencies of

postmodern society may threaten the commonness on which the concept of citizenship is founded. Are society, politics, and morality possible when partiality, relativity, uncertainty, and the absence of common foundations are the rule (Heater, 1990; Gilbert, 1992)? Sartori (1997) argues that "the ongoing vitality of pluralism rests on the tension between conviction and toleration, not on the still waters of indifference and relativism" (p. 65) that postmodernity may advance. Wood (1996) equates postmodernism with "post-intellectualism," namely, "loss of effectual personal knowledge, decline in analytic thinking. . ." (p. 20). Consequently, he argues, American citizens have lost their sense of purpose and system of cultural values and can no longer comprehend their own affairs nor direct their own destinies (pp. 69–70; 113).

Conclusion

Citizenship in democracy is based on shared values such as nonviolence, tolerance, mutual respect for reasonable differences of opinion, and the ability to deliberate (Woods, Bagley and Glatter, 1998). Etzioni (1992) emphasizes the need for shared virtues of communitarian values to bind a democratic society together. I concur with his view that pluralism must fit within some kind of overarching unity, and some ultimate values must be shared if the diversity in a democratic society is to be contained democratically. Democratic citizenship is nonetheless genuinely and profoundly pluralistic, not a fiction of pluralism that is advocated by some forms of multicultural and postmodern ideologies. Such false pluralism encourages rivalry and fragmentation and undermines fraternity and solidarity among citizens. Genuine pluralism denies the contention that individualism and shared community cannot coexist. The consumer market place in contrast defies pluralism and "tends to colonize every sphere and sector, even though it maintains the fiction of pluralism. . . Commercializing capitalism mandates the infiltration and penetration of noncommercial spheres in order to maximize profitability" (Walzer, 1983, p. 223). False pluralism may thus pave the road for the introduction of markets in education and other public spaces. In the nineteenth century, the pendulum swung away from self-contained and unrelated sub-systems of schooling, toward the principle of a single, national, educational system. It seems, as we shall see, that the pendulum is swinging back in the direction of fragmented system dominated by market supply. Public school systems are becoming a franchise of isolated private or quasi-private institutions, drifting away from the collective mission of public schools in democracy.

Globalization, multiculturalism, and postmodern ideologies represent, in my view, formative or framing contexts that help produce distinctive forms of social discourse, perceptions, and actions, exacerbating fragmentation, competition, and rivalry among citizens. Lack of solidarity and sense of common destiny erode the ideological foundations of the welfare state facilitating the penetration of the market ethos to all public spaces. Are citizens in democracy still committed to public education? Are they willing to support public education through their taxes? Are they willing to send their children to integrated schools?

Chapter 2
Education: Between Social Entitlement and the Discourse of Rights

The measure of the worth of society is how it treats its weakest and most vulnerable citizens (Sizer, 2004).

Controversies concerning the nature of public education and the legitimate forms of provision of public education are frequently rooted in diverse and often contradictory definitions of what education is or ought to be: public good, private good, positional good, social service, human right, children's right, or citizenship right. These terms are neither synonymous nor neutral, technical definitions. They are embedded in diverse intellectual traditions concerning the welfare state, democracy, and markets.

In this chapter these various approaches to public education will be examined. The fate of state-provided public education cannot be divorced from issues related to the welfare state itself. I will, therefore, begin by discussing the changing status and perception of social provisions, in general, and move on to examine the provision of public education.

Social Services in the Welfare State

After World War II the idea of benevolent government had few critics while today it is government that is out of fashion. The welfare state has been very much in vogue from World War II until the early 1980s. I argue that unity among citizens and government commitment to citizens are necessary preconditions for the emergence and continued existence of the welfare state. It overshadows economic considerations when costly social reforms are considered. In Britain, for example, remarkable unity was achieved among citizens during World War II. The war has done much to break down class barriers and to arouse the middle-class conscience to the plight of the poor. Never before had the government involved itself so much in the lives of the people since their well-being and productivity were essential for victory. The aftermath of the war also required massive government involvement. Vast spheres of life of the country– its cities, its industry, and its infrastructure – needed to be rebuilt, a task that would take years. The fact that the war had left Britain virtually bankrupt did not deter the Labour government from adopting in 1945 a social security sys-

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_2,

tem to assure a minimum standard of living. One of the government's new welfare schemes provided children with hot meal at school five times a week. In the 1944 Education Act the school leaving age was raised to 15, and free secondary education was made available (Waller, 2005). Paradoxically, as the economy grew stronger and living conditioned improved, the British wartime community spirit was replaced by a selfish Me. The case of Israel, which will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, also demonstrates how bankrupt and war-devastated Israel treated its citizens more generously than the present-time wealthy Israel. These cases clearly reveal the importance of unity and government commitment for the existence of the welfare state and the preeminence of ideological and social considerations over economic ones.

Welfare states were held responsible for securing minimum standards of economic well-being, thereby protecting citizens from the vagaries of market processes and somewhat correcting the gross inequalities of distribution that markets presuppose and amplify. In most Western societies an expending public sector became a norm. Consequently, in most member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), including the United States, the proportion of national income allocated to welfare services has increased steadily since the late 1940s, frequently absorbing as much as 50 percent of gross domestic product (Waldron, 1993). Since the mid-1970s, however, economic crisis undermined expectations for continuing growth needed to sustain extensive provision of welfare services. Consequently, most developed countries had to curtail welfare spending.

In the United States and Britain particularly, such policies received ideological support from the so-called New Right, a movement that gained visibility especially in the late 1970s and 1980s under the rule of President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher. New Right theorists supported, on both economic and ideological grounds, the removal of state intervention, allowing free market mechanisms to operate in all areas of public policy including provision of welfare services and education. Economically, welfare provisions were considered to suppress people's incentive to work and to seek employment diligently. Ideologically, a free market is considered the embodiment and guarantor of liberty; interference in the operation of the free market is thus an assault on democracy itself. Furthermore, new right arguments suggest that economic deregulation of social services endorses freedom of choice and consumer accountability (Nozick, 1975; Friedman, 1962; Hayek, 1944; 1960; Murray, 1982; Saunders, 1993).

Welfare economics, in contrast, as embodied in the works of Amartya Sen who received the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics in 1998, seeks to evaluate economic policies in terms of their effects on the well-being of the community. Sen (1999) claims that the discipline of economics moved away from focusing on the value of freedom, i.e., from enabling people to pursue the life they choose, to that of utilities, income, and wealth. This shift in the focus of attention of pro-market economists from freedom to utility, he maintains, has been achieved at the cost of neglecting the central value of freedom itself. In order for economic growth to be achieved, he argues, social reforms, such as improvements in education and public health, must precede economic reform. Likewise, the contribution of economic growth has to be judged not merely by the increase in private incomes or efficiency,

but also by the expansion of social services that economic growth may make possible. He argues that equity-oriented and efficiency-oriented considerations are often at odds with one another. While agreeing that responsible adults must be in charge of their own well-being, he argues that the capabilities that a person does usually have (not merely theoretically enjoys) depend on the nature of social arrangements. Therefore, the state and society cannot escape responsibility (Sen, 1999).

Citizens in welfare states grew accustomed to expecting publicly guaranteed provision of goods and services. However, social services, including education, were typically considered entitlements, not rights, something that might be changed or abolished with change of government. The erosion of public funding for education, and the desire to shrink the public sector and reduce public expenditure on social services, has often been used as an excuse to introduce market-related policies in education. Consequently, while it has been common to hope, perhaps, for too much from politics, the more dangerous temptation now is to hope for too little from public life (Purdy, 1999).

Social Services and the Discourse of Rights

The idea that citizens qua citizens are equal, without any achieved or ascribed qualifications, is echoed again and again in modern political thought (For example, Callan, 1997; Heater, 1990; Gutmann, 1987; Dahrendorf, 1994; Marshall, 1977). According to Heater (1990), the universality of citizenship transcends particularity and difference. Whatever the social or group differences among citizens, whatever their qualities of wealth, status, and power in the everyday activities of civil society, citizenship gives everyone the same status as peers in the political public. Can welfare benefits that are awarded on a discretionary basis be considered citizenship rights?

The perception of social provisions as human and citizenship rights, not as revocable entitlements or charitable goods, is fairly recent and is rooted in both democratic theory and a series of international conventions.

Walzer (1983) views welfare provisions as universally acknowledged element of citizenship in any political community:

> There has never been a political community that did not provide, or try to provide, or claim to provide, for the needs of its members as its members understood those needs. And there has never been a political community that did not engage its collective strength – its capacity to direct, regulate, pressure and coerce – in this project (p. 84).

Marshall (1977; 1981) differentiates among three dimensions of citizenship: civil, political, and social. The civil element of citizenship is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom, and the institution most directly associated with it is the rule of law and a system of courts. The political component consists of the right to participate in the exercise of political power. Political rights are associated with parliamentary institutions. Social rights represent the right to the prevailing standard of life and social heritage of society. Citizenship in the social sense is

based on the obligation of individual citizens to contribute taxation to a state system of provision and to a method of redistribution of resources to those fellow citizens who are unable to provide for their own needs. These foundations of citizenship, in Marshall's view, have been institutionalized in the welfare state. The existence of a welfare state is, therefore, a requisite of modern democracy and democratic citizenship.

Sen (1999) presents a humanistic-centered economic theory that challenges many of the ideas of markets. In analyzing social justice, he argues, there is a strong sense for judging individual advantages in terms of the capabilities that a person has, that is, the substantive freedoms, in being able to pursue the kind of life he or she has reason to value. The substantive freedoms include elementary capabilities like being able to avoid such deprivations as starvation and under-nourishment, escape morbidity, participate in society, and enjoy uncensored freedom of speech. It must be realized that while economic prosperity helps people to have wider options to lead more fulfilling lives, so do more education, better health care, and finer medical attention. In this constitutive perspective, development involves expansion of these other freedoms. Development in this view is the process of expanding human freedoms, and freedom is an end of development. Human beings must not be treated merely as a means of production, but also as the end purpose of development.

The New Right challenges the view that social entitlements are irrevocable citizenship rights. All social services are considered commodities that should be traded in the global free market.

Let us go on to examine how the social needs of people are treated in international agreements and what role is assigned to governments in caring for the social essentials of citizens.

UN Conventions

Several landmarks can be traced in the development of the discourse of rights at the international level. This discourse transforms social provisions from revocable entitlements into rights that are irrevocable, rights that governments must protect.

Human rights have autonomous and universal existence and apply to all human beings based solely on moral considerations. The obligation to enable individuals to fulfill a right is independent of charity or justice considerations.

The UN Charter of 1945

The charter mentions the obligation of all nations to respect human rights. However, the rights were not detailed, nor were state obligations with reference to the fulfillment of these rights stated clearly. The charter calls for international economic and social cooperation, and Article 55 specifies:

> With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:
>
> a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
> b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational co-operation; and
> c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

In this fundamental and pioneering document that has been regarded as the Magna Carta of our times, social rights are clearly acknowledged as human rights (Oduaran and Bhola, 2006):

> ". . .the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age and other lack of livelihood beyond his control" (Article 25). Also included are the "right to work" (Article 23(1)), "right to just and favorable remuneration, ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity" (Article 23(3)), "the right to education" (Article 26), "the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holiday with pay" (Article 27).

First generation, i.e., civil and political rights, and second generation, i.e., social rights, clearly enjoy equal status in the Declaration of Human Rights.[1] The underlying approach is that people who lack the basic necessities of life cannot adequately enjoy civic and political freedoms. Freedoms should go hand in hand with equality and social justice (Nickel, 1987). The General Assembly, therefore,

> Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction (In Brownlie, 1992).

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights – 1966

The 1948 Declaration of Human Rights did not, however, earn the international consensus necessary to become a binding treaty. Particularly, a rift existed between capitalist-democratic nations, such as the United States, that favored civil and political rights, and communist nations that favored economic and social rights. Consequently, in 1966 human rights were divided into two separate covenants: The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and The International Covenant

on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Both covenants went into effect in 1976. The 1966 division represents a certain retreat from the view that all human rights have equal status rather than being hierarchically ordered. It appears that social rights were downgraded relative to civic and political rights. First, a stronger position is taken concerning the protection and implementation of civil and political rights. States are held accountable, and governments are obliged to create institutions and make laws that secure these rights. Concerning social and economic rights, in contrast, governments are obliged to make progressive effort to sufficiently protect such rights:

> Each State Party to the present Convention undertakes to take steps, individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Convention by all appropriate means, including particularly adoption of legislative measures (Article 2(1)).

Consequently, social and economic rights, compared with civil and political rights, are less acknowledged as rights and less well protected by both international conventions and institutions and by states' laws and courts. Denial that social entitlements represent social rights is often based on classifying social provisions as *positive claim rights* – in other words, as representing spheres in which individuals are allowed to demand that others take action. Civil and political rights, in contrast, are classified as *negative rights*, requiring inaction, or as *liberty rights* that define spheres of freedom in which individuals are not obliged to act or to refrain from action.

Gavison (2003) does not accept this distinction between social and civil and political rights. Civil and political rights, she maintains, are often positive claim rights as well, whose implementation and protection require heavy taxation and high public expenditures. For example, the right to vote, the protection of individuals from discrimination, and the protection of property rights require public action and funds. Thus, the above distinction between social rights and civil and political rights offers no excuse for relegating social rights to a lower position.

The classification of social rights as positive claim rights raises fundamental issues: Who should be accountable for fulfilling such rights? What are the obligations of those held accountable? Can such rights be universally implemented disregarding the wealth and competences of those held accountable? Since 1985, the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural rights supervises the implementation of social rights by member states. It seems, however, that the international community is much more involved in the protection of civil and political rights than in the protection of social and economic rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was supplemented by a series of conventions to protect the human rights of specific populations. These conventions that were drafted between 1966 and 1989 include conventions against racial discrimination and against the discrimination of women and the convention on the rights of the child, which will be discussed later in more detail.

Patterns of Citizenship

Social Citizenship

"Social citizenship" is largely a twentieth-century concept that is closely associated with modern democratic theory. Social rights such as state responsibility for education, health, welfare, safety, and employment have undergone enormous expansion in the welfare state. Democratic theory views these provisions as irrevocable social rights of citizens. The idea that in order to be able to participate fully in public life, one needs to be in a certain socioeconomic position resonates throughout the tradition of Western political thought. Subordination causes pain to vulnerable individuals in all societies; in a liberal society it also threatens core political values (Nussbaum, 2004). Democratic regimes seek to associate their quest for legitimacy with underlying principles of respect for the humanity of their members. That rules out the coercive option in the face of the threat posed by need (Waldron, 1993; Nussbaum, 2004; Sen, 1999). Rawls' theory of justice (1971) provides another powerful argument connecting citizenship with at least basic welfare provisions. He claims that no one can voluntarily join an economic system without welfare provision. Citizens who have to live under such system (i.e., no welfare) will be unable to give it their support. Universal citizenship in the political sense requires that everyone be put in the socioeconomic position that one has reason to believe citizens ought to be in. Inequality subverts democracy in many ways. The poor, for example, can be manipulated by those who have economic power over them – those with whom they must come to terms if they are to secure a living. The removal of need from society is, thus, one of the urgent tasks of democracy, because as long as it remains, there is always the danger that the poor will not be able to fully and freely exercise their political and civil rights. Furthermore, economic security gives citizens the time and leisure to reflect on broader political issues, while inequality erodes feelings of fraternity and solidarity among citizens and interferes with processes of democratic deliberation.

Social citizenship became embedded in the expectations of ordinary people and cannot be altered without grave disruption to people's lives. Security of expectation is the basis of people's ability to plan their lives, and taking away welfare provisions upsets their expectations and ability to plan. Education plays a central role in producing a society decently attentive to human equality (Nussbaum, 2004).

Market Citizens

The decline of the welfare state marks a shift in citizenship conceptions from users of public goods or "social citizenship" to clients of privatized services or "market citizenship" (Schild, 2000). The infusion of citizenship with market metaphors could act as divisive force among citizens. Relationships among "market citizens" are governed by the norms of the marketplace. Processes of economic bargaining

and processes of civil deliberation are at odds with one another. Bargaining encourages participants to act strategically with respect to one another, even lie to one another about their preferences and beliefs when it serves their purpose, and to assume that others will do likewise. Democratic deliberation, in contrast, is founded upon trust, sharing of knowledge, and citizens' recognition of their joint involvement in a common fate (March and Olsen, 2000). Privatization of social services can thus be regarded as a kind of reverse social contract: It dissolves the bonds that tie citizens together into free communities and democratic republics. Furthermore, education, welfare, and housing are functions that citizens associate with the very essence of statehood with both sovereignty and the social contract which grounds it (Barber, 2007). It is not surprising that for many critics, the contemporary reliance on the market to solve political and social problems is an attack on the principles of democratic citizenship. Taking welfare rights away from the poor means taking political rights away from them as well (Marshall, 1977, 1981; Turner, 1993; Waldron, 1993; Ichilov, 2003). The retreat from public schooling is clearly a manifestation of the decline of the welfare state and of the invasion of all public spaces by the market.

Perceptions of Education

Education is a unique and multifaceted social right. Unlike health and welfare services that are expected to support people in times of need, education represents the most widespread form of institutionalized socialization of youngsters. Educational institutions produce human capital for the various social spheres in any given society and must be held accountable for providing each child with equal opportunities to acquire quality education, i.e., education that offers an open future, a future that is not decided nor limited by one's gender, race, religion, socioeconomic status, ethnic origin, or nationality. The widening access to education in most nations is anchored in the principles of social justice. Some countries, however, may embrace these ideas more warmly than others. Nevertheless, it is difficult to find any nation that has overtly repudiated the idea of widening access to education (Oduaran, 2006). However, some definitions of the essence of education do not support this view of education.

Education as Public and Private Good

Public goods are usually delivered by the government and financed from public funds like taxes. The distribution of such goods is non-competitive and universal. A public good, often entitled also common good or public interest, is much more than an aggregation of all private or personal goods. It includes goods that serve all members of the community and not necessarily anyone in particular, such as national defense, and goods that would serve members of generations not yet

born, such as protecting the environment (Etzioni, 2004). Education, for example, whether acquired in public or private schools becomes the private property of individuals in the sense that the cultural capital possessed by an individual can be further exchanged for a position in the labor market . Simultaneously, an individual's cultural capital is also part of the human capital of society at large and greatly determines the ability of all social spheres to function effectively for the benefit of all citizens. Public goods have been traditionally considered part of the political sovereignty of governments. Privatization transforms public goods into private goods thus raising the issue of redefining the boundaries between the public and the private spheres. Should all public goods be transformed into private goods? Which goods should remain public, if any? Who should participate in decision-making processes to determine this issue, and how should such matters be decided?

Education as a public good is provided within publicly funded schools that unselectively admit all students and cater to the needs of heterogeneous student populations. Public schools are also expected to do more than private schools to address social problems. They are expected to have programs to feed low-income children, provide before- and after-school-care, prevent substance abuse and violence, and address health issues. Education as private good signifies the rules governing its production and distribution. Typically, there is competition involved in obtaining a private good, and it is possible to exclude a class of consumers from consuming the good (e.g., those who have not paid) (Frank, 1997; Geuss, 2003). Education as private good is acquired in private schools that admit students selectively and are financed through tuition fees paid by families. The distinction between public and private schools, which has been blurred by the introduction of market components in public education, represents diverse and contradictory patterns of production and delivery of educational goods. Public goods are closely associated with the underlying propositions of both the welfare state and social citizenship. Private goods are linked to the market discourse. The social and educational consequence of transforming education into a private good will be discussed later.

Education as Positional Good

Education can also be viewed as a positional good. Such goods include products and services whose value is mostly, if not exclusively, a function of their ranking or desirability in comparison to substitutes (e.g., Rolls Royce) (Hirsh, 1976). Veblen (2006) characterized the consumption of such goods as conspicuous consumption. Competition for positional goods is, by definition, zero-sum game, because such goods are inherently scarce, at least in the short run. Quality education is only partially a positional good. It is always possible to create more good schools, build more schools, employ more teachers, and buy more educational technology. Scarcity of good education is not inherent but rather social. Safeguarding the scarcity of quality education serves the interests of those involved in conspicuous consumption, i.e., those attempting to impress others, not necessarily to obtain superior qualifications,

and those concerned with upholding their advantageous social position. This is so because education value-in-exchange depends on the amount held relative to others, not necessarily on its absolute value. Unlike income, the absolute level of education or even quality of education attained is probably less important than the relative amount and quality of education an individual or group attains. As a result, the pay-off associated with a given level of education declines rapidly as a large fraction of the population attains it. Consumers' desire for relative consumption causes the market mechanism to allocate valuable goods to the highest bidder (Jonathan, 1990). Hence, schools which are in great demand employ high admission standards and charge high tuition fees where possible. Credentialism exacerbates such tendencies. Credentialism is the constant increase in absolute levels of educational attainment, often unreasonably and unjustifiably inducing higher educational entry tariffs to be applied to the "good jobs" (Collins, 1979). In the United Kingdom, for example, nearly a third of British workers were over-educated for their employment (Sloane, Battu and Seaman, 1999). The scarcity of "good" schools, credentialism, and conspicuous consumption in education, and the introduction of competition in the provision of education, clearly supports perceptions of education as positional good. The perception of education as positional good greatly negates the idea of equality of educational opportunities and makes quality education rare and hard to access.

Education as a Human Right

The right to education is increasingly recognized as an overarching right – one not only fundamental in itself but also indispensable for the realization of all other human rights (Ouane and Glanz, 2006).

The major milestones in the acknowledgment of the right to education as a human right were Article 26 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 1966 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 28 of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child, and declarations made in a series of UNESCO world conferences on education for all (UNESCO, 2000a,b,c; Spring, 2000). Article 26 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims that "Everyone has the right to education," but does not articulate the purpose and content of this right. The nature of the right to education as a human right is articulated in Article 1 of the World Declaration on Education for All:

> Every person – child, youth, and adult – shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs. These needs comprise both essential learning tools (such as literacy, oral expression, numeracy, and problem solving) and the basic content (such as knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes) required by human beings to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work in dignity, to participate fully in development, to improve the quality of their lives, to make formal decisions, and to continue learning. The scope of basic learning needs and how they should be met varies with individual countries and cultures, and inevitably, changes with the passage of time (WCEFA, 1990).

The implementation of the universal right to quality education is essential for achieving other human rights that guarantee equality and citizens' ability to actively participate in all social and political spheres.

The 1960 Convention against discrimination in Education is of particular interest for the discussion of the retreat from public education. Discrimination concerning the implementation of the right to education may take the form of "any distinction, exclusion, limitation or preference" that is exercised based on peoples' race, color, sex, language, social class, religion, political opinion, and national origin (Brownlie, 1992: 319). The exercise of language rights, however, may result in the voluntary isolation of youngsters in specialized schools and in the rejection of students based on religious and language considerations. The convention does not support such extremist multicultural, divisive, and exclusionary vision of education. While supporting minorities' language rights, it simultaneously supports the right of minorities to the dominant language and culture (Brownlie, 1992, p. 321). The preferred road for integrating minorities into mainstream society is biculturalism and bilingualism. My preference is for integrated schools consisting of heterogeneous student body by gender, race, socioeconomic position, and culture, being exposed to a multicultural curriculum. Schools, I claim, should be meeting ground for diverse student population, providing opportunities to meet "others" and to learn to respect "otherness".

In 1989 the UN issued the Convention on the Rights of the Child, a convention that was endorsed by all member states, with the exception of Somalia and the United States. The convention represents a novel approach, viewing children as autonomous bearers of rights, and not merely as helplessly dependent on the goodwill and charity of their custodians. All human rights apply to children upon birth. Children are entitled to civic, political, social, economic, and cultural rights. All these rights share equal status, are interrelated, and are indivisible. It is the responsibility of the state to take all necessary actions to allow all children to fully realize their rights (United Nations, 1989):

> "States Parties shall undertake all appropriate legislative, administrative, and other measures for the implementation of the rights recognized in the present Convention" (Article 4). However, "With regard to economic, social and cultural rights, States Parties shall undertake such measures to the maximum extent of their available resources and, where needed, within the framework of international cooperation" (Article 4).

Articles 28 and 29 of the convention are specifically dedicated to children's right to education, and they state that the child is the bearer of the right (not his or her parents or any other party). Parents or other persons legally responsible for the child should ". . .provide in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in the exercise by the child of the rights recognized in the present Convention" (Article 5).

States Parties are obliged to progressively fulfill the right to education. Progressive application, a typical directive for the implementation of social and economic rights, does not undermine the responsibility of the state. States must take concrete actions, within a reasonable period of time, to fulfill the goals stated in the

convention. The universal minimal educational requirement is to "make primary education compulsory and available free to all" (Article 28(a)). Concerning secondary education, states should "encourage the development of different forms. . .including general and vocational education, make them available and accessible to every child, and take appropriate measures such as the introduction of free education and offering financial assistance in the case of need" (Article 28(b)). There is recognition that primary education is insufficient, and that secondary education should be made available to all students free of charge. Higher education should be made accessible to all on the basis of capacity (Article 28(c)).

Concerning the right to education, states are obliged not only to refrain from discrimination (as stated in Article 2) but to actively secure equal opportunity (as stated in Article 28). States must also "take measures to encourage regular attendance at schools and the reduction of drop-out rates" (Article 28 (e)).

Article 29 adds a qualitative dimension by focusing attention on the contents and purposes of education. Education must be child-centered and directed to "the development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential" (Article 29(a)). Education must instill respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and develop respect for the natural environment, for the child's parents and the child's cultural identity, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, and for civilizations different from his or her own (Article 29 (b,c,e)). Education should prepare the child "for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin" (Article 29(d)).

Concerning education, the Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted the principles that were stated in the 1966 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The supervisory committee overseeing the implementation of social rights established four criteria to measure the extent to which the right of education is being put into practice in any specific state. These criteria are indivisible and must be progressively implemented.

- Availability: Educational facilities for all children must be available.
- Accessibility: Educational facilities must be free of charge, indiscriminately admit all children, and be physically accessible to all children including disabled and handicapped children.
- Acceptability: The content of education should be congruent with the purposes stated in the convention and offered by qualified educational team, in a supportive and well-equipped educational environment.
- Adaptability: Student-centered education must be responsive to children's wishes, inclinations, talents, special needs, and students' cultural background.

(Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) (14/12/90), General comment.)

Given the great economic disparities among nations, the convention sets the minimal rod at elementary schooling, which is compulsory and free of charge.

However, the aim is clearly to make secondary education available and accessible to all children regardless of the purchasing power of their families. The convention also establishes high qualitative standards for education. Accountability for the implementation of children's right to quality education rests clearly with the state. State's responsibility for and control of education must persist in situations in which individuals and bodies have the liberty to establish and direct educational institutions (Article 29(2)).

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion of the various definitions and perceptions of education reveals a contested terrain. The "entitlement" view may lead to the revocation of public-financed social services, to their curtailment or expansion, based upon charity, justice, and economic considerations. In the discourse of rights, rights are ultimate, irrevocable, and independent of charity, justice, or economic considerations. Entitlements depend on the benevolence of governments and on the agreement of citizens to support social services through their taxes. Entitlements can be produced and delivered by the state or contracted and supplied by non-government providers. In contrast, it is the ultimate responsibility of government to secure the fulfillment of rights, independent of generosity and compassion. This responsibility is indivisible and cannot be delegated or contracted.

The status of social rights as human rights, however, is unclear and controversial. Are they less important or equally important as political and civil rights? What would amount to proper progressive implementation of such rights by governments?

The views of liberal-capitalist democracy and those of social democracy also diverge. What serves best the interests of democracy and citizenship rights, government-regulated public spaces and the provision of "public goods," or deregulation and the operation of free market to provide "private goods"? These issues will be further discussed in the following chapters.

Perceptions of the essence of education have changed over the years. Paradoxically, the welfare state that provided a great variety of publicly funded social services on a universal and non-competitive basis regarded such services as revocable entitlements, not as rights. The current recognition of social rights as human and citizenship rights is, unfortunately, accompanied by economic globalization and by the preeminence of divisive multicultural and postmodern ideologies. While UN conventions and modern democratic theory define education as a human and citizenship right, international trade law defines education as a service and commodity, legitimizing the sale and purchase of education and the exclusion of those who are unable to pay for it (Tomasevski, 2006). Globalization, thus, relieves governments of the necessity to allocate significant parts of their budget to education and tends to direct governments away from public education. Concerning citizens, supporting public education is in itself an exercise in citizenship. People contribute tax money, time, and effort toward an activity that benefits the entire society. The willingness

Table 2.1 Characteristics of public and private schools

Public education	Private education
State responsibility	Responsibility of private corporations and consumers
Free of charge, publicly funded	Tuition fees charged
Serves public missions and individual goals	Serves individual and sectarian goals
Universally available	Selective admission
Education is human right, citizenship right, entitlement	Education is commodity, service, entitlement
Education is public good	Education is private good, positional good
Students and parents: act as democratic citizens	Students and parents: act as market citizens, consumers

to do so is grounded in a sense of fraternity and solidarity among citizens. However, these elements of citizenship, as we have seen, are being weakened by multicultural and postmodern ideologies.

The conceptual distinctions concerning the essence of education enable us to more clearly characterize public education in contrast to private education. As "ideal types" (summarized in Table 2.1), public and private education are designed and destined to fulfill diverse missions. These two systems also differ widely with regard to the rules governing the actions of both service providers and consumers.

The introduction into public education of market-related policies, such as vouchers and other forms of choice, blurs the "ideal type" distinction between public and private schools. Such policies and their social and educational consequences will be discussed in the following chapters.

Note

1. The division of human rights into generations was initially proposed in 1979 by the Czech jurist Karel Vasak at the Institute of Human Rights in Strasburg. The division follows the three watchwords of the French revolution: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

Chapter 3
Visions of the Purposes of Education: Democracy, Human Development, and the Market-Managerial Approach

Societies' expectations of their public schools may vary and change overtime. However, some core expectations seem to remain stable in democratic societies throughout the years. Public schools have always been expected to be guided by the democratic purposes of education and by the humanist-professional child-centered ethos of education. In Chapter 2 the essence of what education is or should be was examined via the prism of diverse definitions regarding education as revocable entitlement, as public or private good, or as the embodiment of human and civic rights that governments have the obligation to fulfill and protect. In this chapter, the characteristics of three visions of education will be analyzed: the democratic vision of public education, the pedagogical-humanist vision of education, and education as a market. I will demonstrate that the idea of markets in education is several decades old, and the association between business and education dates even further back. What is unique of the present situation is the totality or hegemony of markets in all public spaces including education. In the 1980s markets were elevated to social and economic icons, becoming a new secular faith (Cookson, 1994; Ichilov, 2004). At present global education strategies foster domestic and international trade in education services treating education as a commodity to be sold and purchased, and many countries adopt various forms of market-related practices in education. I will demonstrate how the ethos of education markets is inconsistent with those of the democratic and pedagogical visions of education and defies the purposes of both human development and education for democracy.

The Democratic Purposes of Education

There is a wide consensus that education and democracy are inextricably linked and that schools are the nurseries that enable democracy to persist. There is also general agreement that the primary mission of education is democracy itself. In Marshall's words,

> Education of children has a direct bearing on citizenship, and when the State guarantees that all children shall be educated, it has the requirement and the nature of citizenship definitely in mind. It is trying to stimulate the growth of citizens in the making. The right to education

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_3,

> is a genuine social right of citizenship, because the aim of education is a necessary prerequisite of civil freedom (Marshall, 1977 pp. 81–2).

Democratic education can, thus, be perceived as conscious social reproduction (Gutmann, 1987; Barber, 1992; Marshall, 1977; Battistoni, 1985). Passing the democratic legacy from one generation to the next and encouraging each younger generation to voluntarily choose democracy, being convinced of its virtues as well as being aware of its faults, is the prime goal of democratic education.

Opinions diverge, however, on what kind of education would best serve the democratic purpose. Liberal economists and New Right theorists support the removal of state intervention, allowing free market mechanisms to operate in all areas of public policy, including the replacement of public education with free market practices. A free market is considered the embodiment and guarantor of liberty and means to endorse freedom of choice and consumer accountability (Nozick, 1975; Friedman, 1962; Hayek, 1944; 1960; Murray, 1982; Saunders, 1993). Others are convinced that to preserve a viable democracy, education must be both public and democratic (Gutmann, 1987; Barber, 1992; Macedo, 2003). Public schools are government institutions that are financed through public funding and are under democratic control. The government has the power to decide how much to spend on education and how much to spend on other, competing social goods. It is, however, the responsibility and moral obligation of democratic institutions to allocate sufficient resources to education to provide all children with ability adequate to participate in the democratic process. Public schools derive their legitimacy from the consent of the electorate and they should be held publicly accountable for providing all the public goods embodied in the enterprise of a common schooling (Macedo, 2003; McDonnell, 2000). These goods, as we shall see, cannot be delivered equally and effectively through educational markets. Public schools are expected to do more than private schools to address social problems. The collective missions aimed at promoting the common good include

- Preparing youngsters to become responsible citizens.
- Promote tolerance while building a shared culture.
- Reducing inequalities: Public schools were established to make education universally available to all children, free of charge, and have been recognized as gateways to opportunity. Only public funding can give schools the consistent support needed to educate children from poor families (Kober, 2006).

What are the hallmarks of public education according to modern democratic theory? What are the guiding principles of democratic education? What should be the role of the state in the production and distribution of education? Who should have authority to make decisions about education? Who are the legitimate stakeholders? Let's proceed to outline and analyze the characteristics that are considered to form the corner stones of democratic education, and to discuss how the introduction of markets subverts these principles.

Gutmann (1987) claims that educational authority should not rest exclusively in the hands of the central government. Educational authority should be shared and broadly distributed among citizens, parents, and professional educators. Content and purpose must be decided in a democratic manner, through rational deliberation of competing conceptions. Citizens should be empowered to influence the education that in turn shapes the political values, attitudes, and modes of behavior of future citizens. Gutmann (1987) neglects to include future citizens among the stakeholders. Yet we must not forget that participation in decision-making processes is a democratic and a human right of children. Parents and other custodians must ensure children's participation to the best of the child's evolving capacities (United Nations, 1989). Markets, as will be demonstrated later, restrict broader citizens' participation in decision-making processes concerning education, as business and the better-off parents become the main actors.

Development of self-control and critical thinking is an essential element of democratic education (Gutmann, 1989a). According to Dewey: "The only freedom that is of enduring importance is freedom of intelligence, that is to say, freedom of observation and of judgment exercised in behalf of purposes that are intrinsically worthwhile." Education that betrays this democratic mission mounts to "miseducation" (Dewey, 1965, p. 61).

While recognizing the importance of empowering citizens to take part in the making of educational policy, democratic theory of education recognizes also the need of constraining their choices among policies. Gutmann (1987; 2003) suggests that limits on choice should be put in accordance with the principles of non-repression and nondiscrimination. To be non-repressive, democratic schools must introduce children to a wide array of ideas and develop their critical capacities to evaluate ideas and make choices (Rosenblum, 2003). The principle of non-repression delegitimizes the use of education, by political authority or parents for example, to restrict rational deliberation of competing conceptions of the good life and good society.

Development of self-control and critical thinking is an essential element of democratic education (Dewey, 1965). By these criteria, the messages that advertising brings into schools deserve to be regarded as "miseducation," as betrayal of the democratic purpose of education.

Ackerman (1980) expresses this idea more emphatically suggesting that the mission of liberal education is "to provide the child with access to the wide range of cultural materials that he may find useful in developing his own moral ideas and patterns of life." (pp. 155–6). He is concerned that entrusting parents with a choice of school for their children may defeat the purpose of liberal education:

> [it would] legitimate a series of petty tyrannies in which like-minded parents club together to force-feed their children without restrain. Such an education is a mockery of the liberal ideal. Parents should have a say, but should not be given an exclusive voice (p. 160).

It is clearly the responsibility of government to enforce these principles of non-repression and nondiscrimination in public schools. These principles bring to

the fore issues related to parental choice and other manifestation of markets in education. Does home-schooling, for example, comply with these principles of democratic education? Could it not be repressive and limit youngsters' access to a great variety of educational experiences? Do specialized magnet schools that are narrowly focused on specific curricular contents comply with these principles? Does selective admission to schools violate these principles?

Another dimension of pluralism is having a heterogeneous student body in school. Public schools must be a meeting place for male and female students of diverse socioeconomic, racial, and cultural backgrounds, possessing diverse academic abilities and interests. Children are, among other things, each other's educational resources (Walzer, 1983; Gutmann, 1987; Levinson and Levinson, 2003). The meeting of "others" in schools can be an educational resource introducing students to ways of life different from their own and learning to be tolerant, be respectful, and appreciate the cultural and social mosaic of pluralistic societies. Heterogeneity among students also supports greater equality of educational opportunities. The quality of children's education depends significantly on how they are distributed among and within schools. Securing integrated schools is clearly a moral obligation of democratic governments and in many instances a legal duty as well. Integrating schools is justified to combat prejudice and inequality even when it goes against the majority will. In the United States un-integrated schools limit the education of black students in ways that violate the democratic standard of non-exclusion (Gutmann, 1987).

The moral obligation of democratic societies is not merely intervening when the rule of non-repression is broken, but to actively secure the apprenticeship of liberty, giving all children the opportunity to learn to be free.

According to Barber (1992):

> We are born ignorant, weak. . .born in chains. Our dependency is both physical – we need each other and cannot survive alone, and psychological, our identity is forged through a dialectical relationship with others. We are embedded in families, tribes, and communities. We must learn to be free. . .we must be taught to be thinking, competent, legal persons and citizens. . .we have to learn how to sculpt our individuality from common clay (p. 4).

Nondiscrimination is an important characteristic of democratic education. A democratic society is responsible for educating not just some but all children for citizenship. Public schools, unlike private schools, must unselectively admit all students and respond to their diverse interests and needs. Discrimination is repressive, excluding entire groups of children from schooling, and denying them an education conducive to deliberation of competing conceptions of the good life and good society. No child can be deprived of the ability to participate effectively in the democratic process. Barber (1992) extends the idea of nondiscrimination to oppose selective school admission of students, a practice that is frequently used in private schools. He rejects the idea of an existing dichotomy between equality and excellence claiming that education needs must not begin with the selection of equally adept students, because education is itself the equalizer:

> Equality is achieved not by handicapping the swiftest, but by assuring the less advantaged a comparable opportunity. ''Comparable'' here does not mean identical. . . The challenge in a democracy is to transform every child into an apt pupil, and give every pupil a chance to become an autonomous, thinking person and a deliberative, self-governing citizen: that is to say, to achieve excellence. (Barber, 1992, pp. 12, 13).

Gutmann (1987) considers the extent to which institutions other than schools (libraries and television in particular) should educate children. The decision to involve other institutions in democratic education must rely on a thorough examination of the democratic purposes of these institutions and consequently on if and how a democratic society should allocate authority over to them (Gutmann, 1987). By these criteria it is highly unlikely that corporations would qualify as partners in the education of future citizens.

Education is not solely a citizenship right. It is also a human right and a right of every child. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child holds governments accountable for making educational facilities available and accessible for all children. Schools must be free of charge, indiscriminately admit all children, and must be physically accessible to all children including disabled and handicap children. Education must be student-centered; responsive to children's wishes, inclinations, talents, special needs, and cultural background; and offered by a qualified educational team, in a supportive and well-equipped educational environment [Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) (14/12/90), General comment].

Business Involvement in Education

Business involvement in education is not a novel phenomenon created by the present era of globalization. However, the forms and intensity of such involvement have changed over the years (Ball, 2007). The ethos of business itself has changed over the years. Barber (2007) claims that capitalism evolved from "productivist capitalism" in its initial phase into today's "consumerist capitalism." Productivist capitalism prospered by meeting the real needs of real people, creating a synergy between making money and helping others. Consumerist capitalism, in contrast, profits only when it can address those whose essential needs have already been satisfied but who have the means to adopt new and invented needs. Fabricating needs become an essential part of profit making under consumerist capitalism, replacing the traditional market forces of supply and demand. Capitalism as a productive system of economic organization rooted in work, investment, saving, and deferred gratification was associated with the Protestant ethos (Weber, 1992). Consumerist capitalism, in contrast, extols consumption over hard work, investment, and long-term planning. Spending replaces the ethos of saving, and being engaged in consumption becomes more valued than the work of production. The Protestant ethic of ascetics is being replaced by an indulging ethos, whereby consumers act regressively, more like impulsive children than mature adults (Barber, 2007). Keat, Whiteley and Abercrombie (1994) observe a striking recent development: the tendency to refer to people as consumers in a wide range of contexts where they had been previously known

by other and more varied names (i.e., students, citizens, patients, theater goers). Furthermore, those who are involved as "producers" in cultural and educational institutions and in public service organizations (i.e., theaters, schools, hospitals) are urged to treat people as consumers. It seems that a new form of one-dimensional man is emerging – the consumer.

The association between education and business is not new. In the United States as late as 1890 the average length of schooling for each individual, including higher and special education, was but four and a half years, and many children received far less than that (Curti, 1959, p. 206). The American education system gradually expanded, mainly in response to demands of the industrializing economy and national unification. In the early 1880s demands were made for effective abolition of child labor and compulsory school attendance in common schools, and for more public funds for education.

American educators tended to consciously or unconsciously mold the school system to accord with the capitalist industrial economic system. They believed that many more students would enroll and stay in school if their parents would be convinced that the study of industrial and commercial subjects would enable their children to get ahead in the workplace. They were also convinced that schools should inculcate knowledge which would give America the upper hand in competing with other industrial nations for markets and hoped that capitalists would agree to support the expansion and operation of education through their taxes. Curti (1959) claims educators initially sided with capitalists and were supportive of their struggle against unionizing workers. Educators considered strikes manifestation of socialism, anarchism, and communism (using the terms interchangeably), insisting that schools should train children to resist the evils of strikes.

"Efficiency" the factory style has been tried out in education decades ago (Callahan, 1962). The scientific management movement in industry of the early 1900s influenced education as well. Scientific management conceived of workers as means of production that were to perform tasks planned and controlled by management (Taylor, 1947). To introduce such alien practices in education schools were defamed as "manufacturing establishment running on low grade of efficiency" (Curti, 1959, p. 228). Efforts at achieving greater efficiency in education included some familiar current practices such as the introduction of specialized classes, tests, measurements, and new administrative methods. In 1902 Dewey claimed that the profit drive of the publishing industry affects the introduction of new school subjects and the course of study (Curti, 1959, p. 229). Overall, however, for the most part business was indirectly involved in education. Many capitalists remained indifferent to the benefits of schooling making use of child labor in industry and agriculture. Nevertheless it was pointed out in 1880 that some capitalists "gladly paid taxes" for the education of poor children and that some declared in public that they were willing to be taxed for the improvement of schools in the South (Curti, 1959, p. 230). Despite these allegiances the majority of educators subscribed to the principles of greater equality of educational opportunities as vehicle for achieving greater social equality by closing socioeconomic gaps. Progressive educational ideas were increasingly promoted through the influence of thinkers such as John Dewey. Voices

began to be heard demanding the substitution of a democratic and cooperative economy for a competitive and mercilessly unjust society. The unionization of teachers and their affiliation with the American labor movement also advanced the idea that education should not be subordinate to the market. John Dewey, for example, was an ardent supporter of the union movement (Dewey, 1916). Margaret Haley, a teacher and pioneer in the movement for the unionization of teachers and for their affiliation with the general labor movement, fought the tendency toward what she called "factorizing education." Such a tendency, she claimed, made the teacher a robot, a mere factory hand, expected to carry out orders without question. She supported an educational vision which places humanity above commercialism and which demands the full expression of life for every human being (Haley, 1904).

The idea of replacing public education with free market practices can be traced back to Milton Friedman, Noble Prize winning economist. He believed that "every act of government intervention limits the areas of individual freedom directly and threatens the preservation of freedom indirectly" (Friedman, 1962, p. 33). The highest democratic value for Friedman was individual freedom, and he believed that free education markets would foster liberty. Earlier in 1955 he laid out a far-reaching plan calling for providing each child with a modest publicly funded voucher that would pay less than the full cost of private school tuition. Parents would be allowed to unlimitedly supplement the public voucher with their own funds and send their children to any school of their choice. Friedman anticipated that competition among schools would lead to the elimination of failing schools, and that the availability of public funds for private institutions would increase the supply of new schools (Friedman, 1955; 1962; Friedman and Friedman, 1982). He contemplated non-profit organizations (such as YMCA) running schools alongside for-profit companies. Friedman predicted that the poor would benefit most from his plan, more than the rich who would be hardly affected at all, and the middle class who would be only moderately affected.

While supporting free education markets, leading economists, including Friedman himself, are opposed to corporate involvement in social causes, including education (Friedman and Friedman, 1982; Sternberg, 1994; Henderson, 2001). Friedman argues that it is in the interest of freedom that companies will best discharge the responsibilities that specifically belong to them by taking profitability alone as a guide. In his words, "Few trends could so thoroughly undermine the very foundations of our free society as the acceptance by corporate officials of a social responsibility other than to make as much money for their shareholders as possible" (Friedman and Friedman, 1982, p. 133). Cadbury (2006) suggests that in addition to meeting its material obligations to shareholders, customers, suppliers, and creditors, to pay taxes and to fulfill its statutory obligations, corporations should take responsibility for the direct results of carrying out their primary tasks, for example, avoiding damage to the environment.

Corporate involvement in social causes, often presented as "corporate social responsibility" is becoming increasingly widespread and trendy (Emmot, 2002; Commission of the European Communities, 2001). In fulfilling their primary purpose, companies can choose to undertake such social activities as they believe

are in their corporate interest. Shareholders often support and even demand that corporations will adopt a favorable social profile, i.e., be looked upon as benevolent organizations that are not driven solely by making profit. Such companies are often required to report on their activities in the social, ethical, and environmental fields and disclose how, and how far, they take the interests of society into account in their decisions and actions (Cadbury, 2006).

Corporations are increasingly involved socially, not necessarily because of benevolent considerations. Reputation, which is considered a corporate asset, is built out over years, and so is consumer loyalty to products and companies. Education was considered a public space that should be free of any commercial activities and influences. Various forms of business donations to schools were kept fairly inconspicuous. Since the 1990s sponsored schools and commercialized classroom became a widespread phenomenon. Today, business is deeply and directly involved in schools. Corporate presence in school, or schoolhouse commercialism, is growing from advertising in hallways, classrooms, busses, and rooftops, to writing curriculum (VanderSchee, 2005). School–business partnerships, a term preferred by those who favor the penetration of markets into schools, can take various forms:

- Providing schools with sponsored instructional packages. These materials that are supplied by corporations and/or trade associations claim to have an instructional content. Often, however, such materials were found to be educationally trivial and highly commercial (Molnar, 1996).
- The allocation of school space such as scoreboards, rooftops, bulletin boards, walls, school buses and textbooks on which corporations may place logos and/or advertising messages.
- Contracting for goods and services. Typically include agreements between schools and corporations that give corporations the exclusive right to sell and promote their goods and services in school. In return the district or schools receives a percentage of the profit.
- Sponsorship of programs and activities in return for the right to associate the name of the corporation with the sponsored events.
- Corporate programs that provide money, goods, or services to a school or school district when its students, parents, or staff engage in a specific activity, such as collecting particular product labels or cash register receipts from particular stores (Molnar, 1996).
- Donations: money, equipments.
- Volunteering staff time to extend help during working hours: for example, to serve on governing boards and teach vocational or business studies in schools. The use of volunteers lowers costs and offers a chance for companies to enhance their reputation (Boyles, 2000; Molnar, 1996).

What is the educational vision of business? What prompts business to get involved in education? Opponents of business involvement in education often highlight the irresponsible, profit-driven behavior of corporations. In this chapter I chose to examine the perception of the role of business in education as presented

by a highly respected organization. The Committee for Economic Development (CED) is an American think tank, or a policy institute, that conducts research and engages in advocacy dedicated to voicing the "the best of business thinking." It should, nevertheless, be noted that critics of think tanks see them as public relations fronts that are engaged in activities that serve the advocacy goals of their industry sponsors.

The CED presents itself as a nonpartisan, business-led public policy research organization that had been in existence for over six decades. Its declared aim is to bring the business voice and perspective to critical national issues in the United States, and to affect future economic growth and prosperity. The CED portrays its actions throughout the years as providing a strong business voice for protecting the integrity of American democratic institutions. It had been involved in the Marshall Plan of the 1940s, educational reforms in the past two decades, including preschool for all children, and more recently a new reform titled "making Washington work." This is clearly a veteran, involved, and concerned organization, not an organization driven primarily by greed and self-interest, as some businesses often are (http://www.ced.org/). Examining its perceptions of business involvement in education should, therefore, present business at its best.

The CED considers education, social services, and economic development policies as parts of a whole rather than as independent choices, harnessed to achieve the following national objective: "This nation [the USA] has embarked on a difficult and important new task: *redefining its commitment to its citizens, especially its children* [my emphasis, O.I.]" (Timpane and Miller-McNeill, 1991, p. ix). The rise of private business interest in education reforms and improvements is described as one of the most dramatic and significant aspects of this process.

What, according to CED, motivates business involvement in education? "Education-minded business executives see their involvement in education as *a matter of corporate survival more than social responsibility or community public relations*" [My emphasis, O.I.] (Ibid., p. 34). "Today, human resource development is commonly named the most significant issue for future of most industries, probably with raw materials, markets, taxes, takeovers, and debt notwithstanding. In the late 1970s and early 1980s the supply of qualified entry-level workers became short. These changes in labor supply and demand, and the rapidity of technological change spurred renewed business interest in education, and in how the needs of business should be integrated into the nation's broader social and educational requirements" (Ibid., p. 32).

To meet those needs the preparation of students for a productive work life must be an important objective of education. To cater to the needs of business, schools must be transformed from multi-purpose educational institutions into factory-like business, into production sites; and the essence of education is narrowed down to measurable students' achievements:

> . . .[schools] were being asked to restructure themselves, as many businesses had, in order to give *operating sites* (i.e., individual schools) clear expectations, incentives, resources, authority, and ultimately, responsibility for *producing a greater educational outcome* (i.e., *measurably improved student performance*) [My emphasis, O.I.] (Ibid., p. 4).

This vision of education is being diligently implemented through the involvement of business in educational policy making at the federal and state levels, as well as through various forms of involvement in the schools themselves:

> New relationships have been formed at every level of government and in almost every area of educational policy. *Government and business leaders have begun to play a new and vital role in deciding the fate of public education* [my emphasis, O.I.] (Ibid., p. 8).

Business involvement in education is comprehensive and includes

- *Application of new management theories and* new perceptions of accountability to the world of education. *Business attempt to change schools by addressing management development needs, and administrative analysis*. [My emphasis, O.I.].
- School–business partnerships *and programs of assistance to individual schools and teachers*.
- *At the state level, business had begun to participate in the* development of educational reforms.
- Programmatic initiatives, *to change existing practice, rather than to enhance existing school programs* (Ibid., pp. 8, 9).

Why, according to CED, are state officials so eager for business involvement in education?

> The fiscal condition of the states was extremely tenuous during the 1980s; many states experienced their worst budget crises since the Great Depression. Intense international and interstate economic competitiveness for high-growth, and high technology industry made it increasingly clear that the nature of state policy making in economic development, employment, and education needed to change (Ibid., p. 32).

It seems that the dire economic situation, rather than ideological considerations, prompted state officials to engage corporate leaders in formulating new policies, policies that are shaped to fit primarily the interests of business.

Similarly, school principals, described as the most aggressive solicitors of school–business relationships, seem to be short of funds to deliver quality education.They seek the tangible, material outcomes they hope school–business partnerships can produce and would prefer to see more awards, scholarships, and special incentives for students; donations of more computers, equipment, or books; the provision of guest speakers; and the use of business facilities and equipment – rather than greater business involvement in the consideration of education programs and policies (Ibid., p. 11).

What specific impact has business had on state education reform initiatives?

> Sometimes business is credited with creating a positive climate for educational reform; in other cases business has garnered the political support necessary to pass specific proposals in state legislatures. In either case, it has frequently had enormous political influence. *Business helped change the politics of educational policy making in the states, and helped create a new era of educational decision making* [My emphasis, O.I.] (Ibid., p. 24).

Economic squeeze can be a justifiable incentive for change. However, the process of decision making concerning the nature and implementation of educational

reforms seems to subvert the democratic processes of public deliberation and broad citizen representation:

> "In most states, the initiative in setting education policy shifted during the decade from state boards of education, chief state school officers, and educators to governors, legislature, and business interests. New mechanisms for the development of policy have been discovered: special task forces and commissions that emphasize the involvement of business" (Ibid., p. xi). Further more, business leaders participated in special task forces and commissions to set educational agendas (Ibid., p. 21).

New reforms would not have passed without the pressures put by business:

> The legislature really listens to the business community. *Three business calls to a legislature seem like a groundswell. . . They have been critical in stimulating the reform movement in this state* [My emphasis, O.I.] (Ibid., p. 24).

This conduct of business is not unique to the United States alone. There is a growing tendency of business to play a much more active role in domestic politics. In Sweden, for example, business has been spending annually twice as much as all the parliamentary parties together on the formation of opinion in several elections. During the 1994 referendum on membership in the EU, Swedish business interests spent more than ten times as much in favor of EU membership than all groups opposing it (Pestoff, 1998, p. 5).

This has been self-presentation of business at its best, enabling us to learn about the purpose and vision of getting involved in education and modes of operation. The power of business clearly derives from the command of economic resources and the decline in the power of governments to effectively control many aspects of the economy and society (Ichilov, 2004). Some corporations have grown so big that their budget supersedes that of some governments (Klein, 1999). Should the power of money give corporations such prominent role in policy-making processes in democracy? Should their interests, however legitimate, eclipse those of other sectors and the multi-purpose nature of public education in democracy? Should business take advantage of the dire economic situation of states and schools? Should democratically elected or appointed decision-making bodies be taken over by un-elected and non-representative task force and other bodies? Should profound reforms, which according to business would rewrite the contract between citizens and government, proceed without broad public representation and deliberation?

My conclusion is that corporate involvement in education and the educational policies and practices that are formulated through decision-making processes dominated by business are not necessarily fashioned in the best interest of democratic society. They are simply reflections of the specific interests of powerful political actors. There are clear limits to corporate responsibility. Even the most civic-minded companies are primarily accountable to making profits for their shareholders. Business and democratic governments should be kept apart. A democratic society is "a society where no social good serves or can serve as a means of domination" (Walzer, 1983, pp. xiv–xv). The power of money must not allow business a legitimate advantageous access to shaping the ideology and behaviors of politicians at all levels of government, and of educators. These issues will be further discussed in Chapter 4.

The Pedagogical-Humanist Vision of Education

The market ethos and perceptions of education and schooling are diametrically opposed to the humanistic, professional child-centered pedagogical ethos. Educators' claims to expertise and knowledge are undermined by the market. Market-driven educational reforms tend to deny that differences exist between corporations that process raw materials and institutions whose "raw materials" are human. The operation of both types of organizations, it is claimed, must comply with identical rules, i.e., those of the economic market. The process of educating a child, however, is not the same as building a car or selling or advertising. One of the striking differences between these enterprises is that organizations that "process" human beings, i.e., hospitals, prisons, welfare agencies, and educational institutions, ideally cannot select their "raw materials", i.e., patients, students, clients, unlike manufacturers who can send back to the supplier raw materials that do not comply with high-quality standards. Public schools are expected to admit all children unselectively, including poor children, children from disintegrated families, abused children, handicap, children with learning disorders, the talented and the not so talented, the highly motivated and the unmotivated. Schools are expected to empower and educate every child, respond to children's special needs, and provide each child with an open future. Teaching, unlike industrial production, cannot be standardized. Educators must take into account the great variety among students in learning styles, motivation to learn, and the time it takes each student to learn various subjects. Professional teachers are child-centered and adopt their teaching methods and instructional time to the needs of each child (Levin, 1988; Cohen, Kulik and Kulik, 1982; Fitz-Gibbon, 2000; Gutmann, 1989b).

According to the pedagogical-humanist ethos, teachers form the cornerstone of any educational reform. To achieve its educational mission, schools must rely on a team of highly qualified professional teachers, who view teaching as a calling and who are committed to serve each child in a way congruent with the highest ethical and professional standards. Radical educators see their professional activities as welded to political acts. Teachers are viewed as bearers of critical knowledge that should empower students, especially those belonging to marginalized social groups, to make sense of their position in the world (Giroux, 1989; 1997; 2002; Freire, 1998; 2004; Kecht, 1992; McLaren, 1995; McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2005; Diamond, 2006). The primary commitment of teachers is to their students, and the students' well-being is their main concern (Bidwell, 1974). The school principal is above all a "head teacher," a pedagogical leader who is in charge of creating the atmosphere and conditions that would enable teachers to respond to the needs of each child. Running schools like firms have greatly transformed the role of school principals, from "head teachers" to directors and officers. The influence of the business sector in education is noticeable by the persons being appointed as leaders. People with business or managerial skills but limited educational knowledge are often appointed to lead districts and schools in crisis. In Boston and Chicago, the position of school superintendent was renamed in 1996 – "chief education officer," same as "chief executive officer" in a firm (Stromquist, 2002). Instead of providing tools facilitating

educational processes, school managers' chief responsibility is to exert control over teachers, by measurable outcomes (Apple, 2006). These new managers have been described by May (1994, p. 619) as "technicians of transformation" and by Foucault (1979, p. 294) as "technicians of behavior" whose task is to make workers docile and submissive.

Market reforms seek guidance for ways to run schools in economy, engineering, and organizational administration theories and practices. Schools must be "efficient," and to make them efficient they must be run in a business-like fashion. The infusion of market terminology in education and the parity between schools and firms are demonstrated in the following phrases:

> Schools fail to attract students "because *their product is deficient or out-of-date*. . .while *bankruptcies or school closing* clearly affect negatively the individual firms or schools that go out of business, the effects of such closing are positive at the systemic level – other units respond by improving their products. . .[and] *deliver a better service more efficiently* [My emphasis, O.I.]" (Schneider, Teske and Marschall, 2000, pp. 9–10).

Schools' survival depends on efficiently delivering fashionable products and services that would attract students. This would lead to a world of designer schools offering trendy curricula and utilizing questionable pedagogical strategies. Are popularity and quality education the same? School subjects that are related to the social sciences and humanities are becoming "out of date". Should they be abandoned? Who should take the responsibility for securing students with an adequate alternative school in the unfortunate event of a "school bankruptcy"?

Conclusion

In this chapter three visions of education were discussed. The analysis reveals that the business vision of education and the conduct of business in implementing this vision clearly subvert the fundamental democratic principles of public education. Educational authority that should be shared and broadly distributed among citizens is being considerably narrowed by the advantageous position of business. Competing conceptions are not being rationally and democratically deliberated as business becomes dominant in shaping educational policies and educational practices at the school level. Schools are being transformed into production sites of narrow and quantified knowledge, are allowed to selectively admit students, and education becomes market rather than child-centered. This clearly undermines the nonrepressive and nondiscriminatory principles of public education.

The pedagogical vision and the market vision also greatly diverge concerning the nature of schools as organizations, the essence and outcomes of education, and the roles that teachers and principals should play. Authority in modern society greatly depends on the control of meaning. The meaning of education is controlled by the market, not by the democratic purposes of education, not by a child-centered approach, or by the right to education.

Table 3.1 Pedagogical vs. market-managerial ethos in education

	Pedagogical ethos	Market-managerial ethos
Type of organization	Unique, "process" human beings	Firm like organization
Who leads change?	Teachers	School principals
School principal is:	Leader of pedagogical team	Business manager and entrepreneur
Type of discourse	Ideological, pedagogical	Business-like
Direction of educational processes	Bottom up: teacher–student	Top down: principal, organization
Principal–teachers relations	Cooperative and egalitarian	Hierarchical, control
Teachers' role	Autonomous professionals	Technocrats
Teachers are primarily accountable to:	Their students	The organization
Outcomes	Varied	Standardized test scores

The differences among the approaches that were analyzed and discussed in this chapter are summarized in Table 3.1.

In the next chapter the various forms of market practices in education are analyzed, and their social and educational outcomes are examined. The conceptual tools that were provided in Chapters 2 and 3, via the analysis of the various definitions of education and visions of public education will be employed to examine the social and educational consequences of implementing various market policies and practices in education.

Chapter 4
The Educational and Social Consequences of Markets in Education

In the present chapter principal forms of market practices in education are analyzed and their social and educational outcomes are examined. I demonstrate that market policies and practices are grounded in false assumptions about the essence of education and the expected behavior of all stakeholders. Such policies do not deliver the promised results.

Special attention is given to standardized tests as indicator of the quality of schools, teachers, and the knowledge acquired by students. The role of parents and their behavior in the education market place will also be examined. Do parents act as rational, informed consumers? Does the cumulative result of individual parents' choices improve schools? How is the role of teachers and school principals being defined in the market place? What are the consequences of business–school partnerships?

Markets in Education

By the early 1990s, privatizing public education became a credible policy in many countries and there have been an increasing number of attempts to restructure and deregulate state schooling. Privatization in education embraces a variety of practices. Generally speaking, privatization can be defined as "the transfer of activities, assets, and responsibilities from government/public institutions and organizations to private individuals and agencies" (Belfield and Levin, 2002; Levin and Belfield, 2006). Privatization often involves deregulation, i.e., liberalization from binding government rules. It may also include the creation of new markets as alternatives to operating governmental systems (Levin, 2001). Concerning education, the distinction economists make between public and private schools usually refers to the provision and funding of education. Public education is provided in government-run schools and funded by government. Private education takes place in schools operated by a variety of for-profit or not-for-profit organizations and funded by parents. Some policy initiatives introduce a "market" element into the provision of educational services (vouchers, for example) even though they continue to be paid for largely out of taxation. The term "quasi-market" is increasingly being used to

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_4, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

characterize such attempts to introduce market forces and private decision making into the provision of education (Le Grand and Bartlett, 1993). The extent of government intervention distinguishes quasi-markets from idealized view of "free" market. Quasi-markets frequently remain regulated in various degrees with the government controlling the entry of new providers, investment, quality of services, and price, which is often zero to the user (Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1998). In England and Wales, for example, all schools privately operated and state-run must meet state accountability standards and are monitored by a government agency (Office for Standards in Education). In Denmark and the Netherlands, the majority of schools are privately run, but are strictly regulated by government (Belfield and Levin, 2002).

The privatization of education may include the following practices that are not mutually exclusive. These practices will be briefly described here, and some of them will be later examined in more detail.

1. *School-based management*: Moves to dismantle centralized educational bureaucracies and to create in their place devolved systems of education allowing for significant degree of institutional autonomy. School-based management (SBM), for example, is a reform strategy based on transferring significant decision-making authority from state and district offices to individual schools. SBM provides principals, teachers, students, and parents greater control over the education process by giving them responsibility for decisions about the budget, personnel, and the curriculum. Through the involvement of teachers, parents, and other community members in these key decisions, SBM is expected to create more effective learning environments for children. Overall, SBM is often not more efficient or more effective than centralized decision-making processes. There are, of course, many variations on how it is put into practice. Participatory decision making sometimes creates frustration and is often slower than more autocratic methods. Participating members must be able to work together and concentrate on the task at hand. Not all teachers are interested in the budget process or want to devote time to it. Spending time on planning and budget matters leaves principals and teachers less time to devote to the main aspects of their work: teaching and educating youngsters. Furthermore, research has not found a link between SBM and gains in student academic achievement, lower dropout rates, increased attendance, and reduced disciplinary problems (Oswald, 1995).
2. *Charter schools*: Charter schools are another form of deregulation. Such schools originated in the United States in the 1960s by the Magnet School Movement in an attempt to create desegregated schools. The idea was to create in the cities high-quality schools with a distinct profile, to attract middle-class blacks and whites that might otherwise move to the suburbs or to private schools. In the United States such schools are typically sponsored by a local school board or state education agency and are freed of many restrictive rules and regulations including local labor contracts. They can, for example, select students and staff and design curriculum. In return, these schools are expected to achieve educational outcomes within a certain period, usually 3–5 years, or have their

charters revoked. Overall, charter schools tended to be somewhat more racially diverse; simultaneously, however, such schools tended to enroll slightly fewer students with special needs and limited-English-proficient students than the average schools in their state (Hochschild and Scovronick, 2000).

3. *Cutbacks in public funds*: Cutbacks in public funding for schools compel schools out of financial necessity, to reduce costs, while maintaining facilities and essential instructional programs and remaining accountable for student outcomes. To survive the dwindling public resources, schools often undergo downsizing resulting in staff layoffs and eliminating educational programs. The consequences of layoffs strike hard on the remaining instructional staff that must teach the same numbers of students (or even more students) with less funding. What is efficiency in economic terms is, thus, counterproductive for improving schools. Schools become increasingly reliant upon the support of business and must diligently find ways to mobilize money from the private sector. As we shall see, this reliance negatively affects schools' performance. Cutbacks in public funds that cripple schools defy the democratic purposes of education and represent a retreat of government from one of its core responsibility. According to democratic theory, it is the responsibility and moral obligation of democratic institutions to allocate sufficient resources to education to provide all children with adequate ability to participate in the democratic process.
4. *Private providers of education*: Provision of education is separated from its finance, so that different providers, including private and voluntary sector bodies, can compete to deliver the service. These may typically include the following arrangements:

    - Education Management Organizations (EMOs) are for-profit and non-profit management companies engaged in takeover and whole school operation of public schools (Green, 2005). For-profit EMOs are increasingly becoming a big business in the United States and the United Kingdom. It is estimated that in the United States, EMOs were projected to generate up to $123 billion in revenue in 2000. In the smaller UK system, it is estimated that about £5 billion of services in public education could be contracted out to private organization per annum (Fitz and Beers, 2002). In the United States the profit potential of various forms of investing in schools is estimated at $600 billion (Saltman, 2005). Unlike private schools that collect tuition from parents and offer private educational services, EMOs seek contracts with school districts or states to run public schools for profit. Thus, corporations take over public schools to run them for profit. This means that public funds are used to extract profits for investors instead of being invested in the improvement of educational facilities, higher teacher salaries, and richer educational programs and services for students. Therefore, the operation of public schools by for-profit firms has often been opposed. The main concern is that they will attempt to operate schools at the lowest possible cost in order to maximize profits and shareholder returns and therefore will not maximize the educational experience of students. EMOs often run schools in poor neighborhoods, while

wealthier communities can afford to spend much more on education, attract the teachers and administrators they want by paying higher salaries, and consequently have the highest performing schools. Can EMOs offer underfunded public schools that largely serve poor and non-white communities a better education while at the same time making profit? Prior attempts at what was labeled "performance contracting" often ended in disaster (Molnar, Garcua, Sullivan, McEvoy and Joanou, 2005; Ascher, Fruchter and Berne, 1996). From the point of view of democratic theory, it seems that EMOs should be disqualified as partners in the education of future citizens (Gutmann, 1987).

- Non-Government Organizations (NGOs): As early as the 1950s, Milton Friedman had contemplated non-profit organizations (such as YMCA) running schools alongside for-profit companies (Friedman, 1962). NGOs today can be local, nationwide, or transnational and global not-for-profit organizations dedicated to social causes. NGOs are networks of interest groups rather than formal representative structures and are, therefore, perceived as self-selected and unaccountable by those who question their legitimacy as participants in the delivery of public goods such as education (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Higgott and Bieler, 1999; Edwards, 2001).
- Private Finance Initiative (PFI): Private construction firms are contracted to design, build, and in some cases manage new projects. Contracts typically last 30 years during which time the building is leased by a public authority. It is a way of postponing the immediate recourse to the public purse.
- Public schools contracting with private providers for services like transportation, food services, textbooks, maintenance, instructional programs, and professional development. Although the schools remain public and receive public funding, there is movement toward privatization of school operations (Hill, Pierce and Guthrie, 1997). This, as we shall see, diverts schools' pedagogical, child-oriented focus to an economic, managerial focus, and children's education and health are being often compromised.

5. *Introduction of various forms of school choice*: For example, providing families with educational voucher and/or tuition tax credit that could expand participation in private schools by reducing the costs to families.
6. *Various forms of corporate involvement in schools*: The issue of corporate involvement in social causes, including education, was discussed in Chapter 3 and will be further discussed in this chapter.
7. *Home-schooling*: It is, perhaps, the most extreme form of retreat from institutionalized schooling. School-aged children are educated at home rather than at a school. As of the early 2000s, it is perhaps one of the fastest growing trends in education in the United States. Since 1993, the practice has been legal in all 50 states. In 1999 the estimated number of home-schooled children was 850,000, and about 1.1 million students were being home-schooled in the spring of 2003. Parents choose to home-school their children mainly because of concerns regarding the environment of schools or wish to provide moral or religious

instruction. Home-schooling can be an option for parents who wish to provide their children with a quality of education they believe is unattainable in schools (Wikipedia Website: Homeschooling, 2008; Murphy, Gilmer, Weise and Page, 1998; Bielick, Chandler and Broughman, 2001; Bauman, 2002). This practice raises major concerns about the implementation of children's right to education and the difficulty to supervise families to make sure that children receive quality education as defined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child – 1989, and that they are acquiring the civic competences necessary for taking part as citizens in democracy.

Privatization blurs the traditional distinctions discussed in Chapter 2 between private and public schools, by imposing similar guiding ethos, conduct, and practices in both types of schools.

The Underlying Assumptions of Markets in Education

The introduction of market-related practices in education is founded in a series of questionable assumptions concerning the identification of problems in the functioning of public schools and the behavior of all stakeholders in education. Market-driven educational reforms tend to deny that differences exist between corporations that process raw materials and institutions whose "raw materials" are human. The operation of both types of organizations, it is claimed, must comply with identical rules, i.e., those of the economic market. The differences between these two types of organization are discussed in Chapter 3.It is sufficient to remind us here that the process of educating a child is not the same as building a car or selling or advertising. Market reforms assume that educators have the resources, competences, and the proper conditions and support to pursue improvement but will act only when coerced and driven externally by punishment and rewards. Monitoring and assessing educational outcomes and teachers' and school principals' performance via the periodical use of standardized tests becomes a major component of the reward–punishment system. It is also alleged that the lack of motivation to improve stems from the fact that public schools, unlike private ones, have a monopoly over the education of students in assigned educational zones. Private schools are "better" than public schools because they must compete with both public schools and other private schools and make efforts to attract students. Educators in public schools, in contrast, are confident that students' enrollment will remain fairly stable, and make no effort to innovate, diversify, or improve. Parents, having the right to choose a school, may punish "failing" schools by transferring their children to "better" schools. The cumulative effect of parental choice is expected to raise the general quality of education in society.

Schools are fully equated with production sites of goods and services, and students and parent are regarded as merely customers shopping for better services at a lower cost. The following quotation provides an example of the infusion of market terminology in education concerning failing schools. Schools fail to attract students.

> because *their product is deficient or out-of-date . . . while bankruptcies or school closing* clearly affect negatively the individual firms or schools that go out of business, the effects of such closing are positive at the systemic level – other units respond by improving their products . . . [and] *deliver a better service more efficiently* [My emphasis, O.I.] (Schneider, Teske and Marschall, 2000, pp. 9–10).

This view overlooks the fact that private schools are often best, not because they offer the "best education" but because in large part they draw the best prepared and best equipped students, possessing the best social and educational backgrounds. They typically have a policy of selective admission, while public schools must admit students unselectively and respond to their highly varied interests, problems, and needs (Barber, 1992). Research findings reveal that once students' background traits are taken into account, the difference in achievement between public and private school students disappears (Laitsch, 2006).

Another false assumption is that markets are neutral means to achieve efficiency in all institutional spheres. I argue that the entry of market terminology, discourse, and practices into education creates a new epistemology that profoundly transforms all aspects of education. Epistemology helps social actors frame their reality and act upon it and has far-reaching effects on how and what is done (Kallinikos, 1995; Pestoff, 1998). Market-oriented reforms have an impact on the quality and substance of education through the climate that is created and the way school managers and others interpret the changing context and pressures in which they organize schooling and educate children (Woods, Bagley and Glatter, 1998). Berenstein (1971) maintains that "Formal education knowledge is considered to be realized through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of knowledge on the part of the taught" (p. 47). I will demonstrate how market practices and epistemology transform these components of the educational process.

The Reduction of Education into Measurable Outcomes

Market reforms claim to use a strategy of deregulation while in reality all-encompassing means of re-regulation are being introduced, including new bureaucratic institutions to monitor the performance of service providers. Widespread use of standardized testing became a cornerstone of many educational reforms, establishing a new and pervasive form of control. The guiding philosophy is "[what] could be effectively measured could then be effectively controlled" (Witzel, 2002, p. 64). To become marketable, services must be commodified, i.e., must be transformed into "products" that can be bought and sold. To commodify is thus to impose singular meaning on multidimensional goods (Barber, 2007; Leys, 2001). Test scores commodify educational outcomes and define the product that schools are expected to produce. This vision of educational outcomes is rooted in market epistemology that relies heavily on the numerical description and coding of various activities, converting human accomplishments into numerical values, and

directing attention to the primacy of utility and price (Kallinikos, 1995; Pestoff, 1998). This one-dimensional perception of education outcomes narrows what is considered knowledge worth learning, undermining the perception of education as a broader, humanist understanding of the world (Stromquist, 2002). Thus, the price for higher test scores may be significant restriction of a student's overall educational experience. This clearly violates the democratic vision of education as an opener of the widest horizons possible for all students and as preparation for the citizenship role. Narrowing the variety of educational experiences to which youngsters are exposed contradicts the humanist-pedagogical outlook of education as well.

Test scores also became a form of surveillance (Apple, 2006). In the belief that a reward and punishment system will stimulate progressive school improvement, policymakers have used student test performance as the basis for awarding or denying resources and recognition to schools, educators, and students, threatening state takeovers of poorly performing schools – a system known as high-stakes assessment (Laitsch, 2006; Kohn, 2004). Ball (2000) describes such monitoring systems as "performativity," i.e., "... a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic) (Ball, 2000, p. 216). Such measurements are regarded as evidence of educational outputs and quality, and as such are presumed to represent the value of individual educators and schools (Elliott, 2001).

The survival imperative makes it necessary for educators and schools to adopt new teaching strategies. Kozol (2005) emphasizes the negative educational consequences mainly for inner city students in the United States, claiming that liberal education is increasingly replaced by culturally barren and robotic methods of instruction. Teachers focus attention on the tested areas and neglect others, coaching to narrow skills sets and knowledge domains, and often feel that high-stakes tests are forcing them to teach in pedagogically unsound ways. Testing helps to cement the idea that education (and teaching) consists of pouring prescribed knowledge into empty receptacles, viewing students as objects (Freire, 1998; Kohn, 2004). Although somewhat effective for raising test scores, such teaching techniques do not necessarily help students develop higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills. Educators may become frustrated professionally and may despair feeling that the target goal is unattainable. Thus, more highly qualified teachers may be leaving the profession (Kohn, 2004).

Test scores have become an essential component in the promotional campaign of schools that are competing with each other to attract students, especially the better students. To assure high scores, low-scoring students are often inappropriately removed from the pool of test takers. Practices such as transferring special education students to other schools or pushing students out by counseling them to leave the school have been used. Minority and high-poverty students are particularly vulnerable (Laitsch, 2006). Such practices clearly violate the ideas of equity and equality of educational opportunities (Viteritti, 2003; Wolfe, 2003a, b). In Barber's (1992, pp. 12, 13) own words, "The challenge in a democracy is to transform every child into an apt pupil, and give every pupil a chance to become an autonomous,

thinking person and a deliberative, self-governing citizen: that is to say, to achieve excellence." Dismissing lower achievers in order to artificially inflate schools' test scores is undemocratic and professionally unethical.

Standardized tests do not expose previously unknown "failing" schools. There is ample information which schools are experiencing problems, and high-stakes testing can only exacerbate existing problems. Testing represents control instead of providing tools facilitating educational processes. It humiliates and hurts the schools that most need help, signaling to families to abandon those schools and transfer to schools that often do not want their children, being stigmatized as "fugitives" of failing schools. Consequently, more low-income minority students are dropping out or are abandoned in "failing" schools (Kohn, 2004).

Who should be responsible for providing students who leave failing schools with better educational opportunities? Who should provide compensatory education for such students to allow them to succeed in the "better" schools? Furthermore, school closures can only occur at a time of falling school rolls (Walform, 1994). This seems to be a drastic and rare event. Many "failing" schools remain open, raising the question who assumes responsibility for the quality of education available to their students?

Unpopular schools may seek to "improve" by changing the schools' image to attract middle-class students. Means such as changing the name of a school, its uniform, and providing curriculum based on fashions and fades can be used (Gewirtz, 1998). Choice could, thus, lead to a world of designer schools offering trendy curricula and utilizing questionable pedagogical strategies, instead of improving education for all (Cookson, 1994).

My conclusion is that test scores can be one component of evaluation in education. However, they do not account for multiple educational purposes and have consistently simplified the definition of teaching and student learning and ignored variations in learning conditions and social contexts (Macpherson, 1998). Higher scores on standardized tests do not necessarily reflect meaningful improvement in teaching or learning – and may even indicate the opposite.

The Role of Parents in Education Markets

School choice is, perhaps, the leading idea of educational reform in many countries today (Brighouse, 2000). It represents ideological commitment to individual rights over government intervention, asserting that family's right to choose its own education is paramount. It is also viewed as a means for compelling schools to be run more efficiently and become more effective. Parents' behavior is thus a key factor in the operation of education markets. Parents are perceived as customers who make informed choices for their children's education. A major premise of school choice is that parents rather than government or civil servants should be responsible for holding the schools accountable (Van Dunk and Dickman, 2003). Under this scenario, the empowerment of parents is the key to improving education. Through their vouchers parents will decide the fate of schools. A school's success will depend on

its ability to attract enough students to remain open. This vision of parental choice assumes that parents' actions are a reliable accountability mechanism, one that will result in the demise of schools that cannot attract parents and the success of those that can (Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1998; Chubb and Moe, 1990).

How valid are the above assumptions? A fundamental issue concerns the underlying motivation behind parental behavior in schooling markets and whether strengthening individual parental choice produces an effective demand for improvement of overall educational attainment. There is evidence that freedom of choice is an important way to raise parents' satisfaction levels (Peterson and Hassel, 1998; Teske and Schneider, 2001). However, does parental choice have the effect of raising the general quality of education in society (Arnett and Davies, 2000)?

The shift in education from public good to private good tends to turn parents into "market citizens" who are weakly attached to the community and whose interest is mainly pursuing their own objectives even at the expense of others (Schild, 2000). Choice creates a formative or framing context that helps to produce distinctive patterns of social action. As a result "Individuals . . . become competitive and adversarial . . . possessiveness and aggressiveness are primary and highly prized social traits . . . the Other is seen first as an antagonist and last (if at all) as neighbor" (Barber, 1989, p. 57). Parents are engaged in the pursuit of self-interest and often view education as a positional good. That is to say that they are concerned with the educational attainment of their children *relative* to other children in the cohort not with absolute attainment. In other words, parents want their children to acquire more and better educational capital, viewing hierarchies of employment opportunities as fixed and social status linked to educational attainment and sustained across generations by the distribution of cultural capital (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). Parents' choice can also be guided by considerations of "conspicuous consumption," i.e., attempting to impress others, not necessarily to obtain superior education (Veblen, 2006). Parents representing the upper social echelons may be interested in retaining quality education as rare commodity rather than in making it available and accessible to all. Making quality education universally available could undermine the value of the cultural capital accumulated by their own children. Credentialism, or the increase in absolute levels of educational attainment to induce higher educational entry tariffs to be applied to the "good jobs," seems to give their children an advantageous head start over other children (Collins, 1979). Consequently, measures to increase individual opportunity and choice in schooling markets decrease social justice as a whole (Jonathan, 1990). Measured by socioeconomic background of students and school's prestige, parental choice created a sharper hierarchy of schools, instead of raising the educational level in all schools (Woods, Bagley and Glatter, 1998). "Choice" does not try to correct or mitigate inequalities. Instead, the wider choice of specialized schools narrows the range of people and interests with whom and with which a student associates and interacts (Dagger, 1997). International evidence suggests that privatization reforms create more ethnically and academically homogeneous schools. In the United States re-segregation of schools is deepening. Segregated schools tend to be highly correlated with school performance and the ability to attract teachers (Public Education Network, February 1, 2008).

The tradition of attending a local school is beginning to wither, and it is associated with the volume of social, economic, and cultural capital possessed by families (Conway, 1997). Parents prefer to opt for enrolment in schools that are of the same racial group as their own (Belfield and Levin, 2002; Levin and Belfield, 2006). Popular schools have no incentive to become more open to a greater variety of students, by offering a fuller range of curriculum, for example. Thus, competition does not by itself increase diversity or encourage innovative approaches in education. This clearly is at odds with the prescription of democratic education, striving to create heterogeneous and pluralistic educational environments for youngsters.

A 5-year study of Milwaukee, the oldest and only large-scale voucher program in the United States, concludes that the reality of parental choice accountability is falling far short of its promise. Market forces do not or cannot provide the rewards or extract the penalties expected. In the absence of effective accountability in a choice system, the inadequate public education that vouchers are supposed to improve may be replicated. The result ironically is that the very people choice schools are supposed to help – poor families – are betrayed (Van Dunk and Dickman, 2003). Smrekar and Goldring (1999) conclude that greater parental choice and competition between schools do not automatically lead to closer home–school relations and more parental involvement either. Competition between private and public school within a given neighborhood is expected to make both sets of schools more effective. Studies in the United States reveal at best generally positive but substantively modest effects, while about two-thirds of the studies show no significant change as a result of competition. Overall, educational economists cannot indicate unambiguously that private schools are more efficient than public schools (Belfield and Levin, 2002). Education Management Organizations (EMOs), for-profit and nonprofit management companies engaged in takeover and operation of public education, had well-publicized failures to deliver the promised better education at a lower cost, also failing to raise student performance level in schools and school districts (Fitz and Beers, 2002).

Other two concerns arise as a result of greater freedom of choice for parents. What happens if some choices are socially, culturally, or politically unacceptable? Parents may choose education or provide home-schooling for their children based on racist, gender inequality, or other unacceptable ideas. This perception of the role of parents overlooks the idea that education is primarily a human right of the child himself, not the right of parents. Parents should assist their children to fulfill this right and include children, according to their evolving capacities, in decisions concerning their education. What happens, however, when parents' choice violates the right of the child for quality education as interpreted by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN, 1989)? Whose responsibility is it to monitor the choice parents make and to proscribe unacceptable choices?The costs of monitoring families' acts being high, who should finance the supervision?

The inevitable conclusion is that the uncoordinated decisions of individual parents cannot produce an optimal output of education as a public good. Parents should have a say, but should not be given an almost exclusive voice.

The Changing Roles of Teachers and School Principals

In Chapter 3, three visions of education were discussed in great detail, including a discussion of the role of teachers. To avoid repetition, I will focus here on some additional aspects only concerning the changing role of teachers and principals. The introduction of markets in education affects not only the "product" that teachers are expected to deliver. Teachers' conditions of employment and teaching practices are shaped by the organization of schools and the way that they are financed (Hodges-Persell, 2001; Bernstein, 1996).

Privatization in education, as in other spheres, is often accompanied or preceded by the weakening of labor union (Bridges and MacLaughin, 1994). Teachers' unions are seen as obstacles on the road to the privatization of education. Deregulation frees Education Managing Organizations and schools of many restrictive rules and regulations, including local labor contracts. The aim is to employ teachers and school principals via personal contracts, instead of negotiating their work conditions via collective bargaining. Unions provide vital support for teachers' interests that include retaining jobs, improving working conditions, tenure, and professional autonomy. The bargaining position of un-unionized educators is generally weak, and teachers in private schools are often paid lower salaries (Caldwell and Spinks, 1993; Hodges-Persell, 2001). One should take into account that teachers' unions are an important element in the professionalization of teaching. The professional teacher is expected to possess knowledge of both pedagogy and specific subject matter, be competent in teaching and educating students, and be committed to students (Goodlad, 1990; Bidwell, 1974). Unions articulate an ethical code for educators, setting professional and moral standards of conduct, and are often involved in developing teachers' training programs and in offering professional support for teachers. Antiunion sentiments and policies in privatized schools are aimed not only at lowering teachers' salaries, but also at eradicating the professional ethos of teaching and replacing it by "corporate culture pedagogy," reducing literacy to tapes, booklets, charts, and graphs, commodifying education into measurable outcomes and narrowing the professional autonomy of teachers (Boyles, 2000. p. xv). Such policies make a profession that is struggling to compete with others to attract qualified individuals even less competitive and may result in the withdrawal of qualified and dedicated teachers. To advance the teaching profession, teachers' unions should gain functions similar to those of the traditional professions (such as medicine and law, for example) instead of being undermined and dismissed.

Educational markets erode the fraternity among teachers and between teachers and school principals. Principals are no longer "head teachers," members, and leaders of a professional team. Their primary function is managerial-commercial, not pedagogical. They are not expected to provide pedagogical leadership, but instead to market the school successfully, raise money from non-public sources, and run the school efficiently. The influence of the business sector in education is noticeable by the persons being appointed as leaders: people with business or managerial skills but limited educational knowledge are appointed to lead districts and schools

in crisis. Symbolically, in Boston and Chicago, the title of school superintendent was renamed "chief education officer," same as "chief executive officer" in a firm (Stromquist, 2002). Privatization affects the legitimacy of teachers' authority and the authority of the entire school. The motives of administrators and educators could be questioned by parents and students: Are those in charge of education motivated by profit or the need to save money or by responsibility for providing better education for all students (Hodges-Persell, 2001)? My conclusion is that the changing roles of teachers and school principals are counterproductive for improving education and for increasing the availability of quality education for all children. Qualified and highly motivated teachers are the cornerstone of any education reform. Efforts should be made to attract the best qualified people to the profession, by offering both internal and external rewards. Teaching should be challenging and rewarding professionally, teachers' working conditions should be improved, including promotion opportunities and salaries. Teachers often need professional support, and not whipping, to become more effective.

Business–School Partnerships

In Chapter 3 the benevolent face of business involvement in education was exposed, as presented by a highly respected organization dedicated to voicing the "the best of business thinking." In this section, the ugly face of business–school partnerships will be revealed. Youngsters are desirable targets for markets. In 2000, there were 31 million American kids between 12 and 19 already controlling 155 billion consumer dollars. Four years later, there were 33.5 million kids controlling $169 billion, or roughly $91 per week per child (Barber, 2007, p. 8). It comes hardly as a surprise that business spends over $11 billion a year on advertising targeting children, teens, and young adults (Barber, 2007, p. 236).

Babies as young as 6 months can form mental images of corporate logos, which means that brand loyalties can be established as early as age two. By three or three and a half, experts say, children start to believe that brands communicate their personal qualities, for example, that they are "cool" or strong or smart. By the time children head off to school most can recognize hundreds of brand logos (Barber, 2007; Schor, 2004). It is not surprising that business considers schools an attractive opportunity for selling goods and for further developing consumerism and brand loyalties. Schools provide an ideal setting of captive and impressionable consumers who have influence over adult spending as well (Kenway and Bullen, 2001; Molnar, 2005).

Business–school partnerships can take various forms such as providing schools with instructional packages; advertising on the sides of school buses; and contracting for goods and services (Boyles, 2000; 2005). Contracting is the most common method of privatizing public services. Under this strategy public agencies purchase services from the private sector, from either for-profit or not-for-profit organizations. Those who are opposed to business entry into the hard core of education, i.e.,

providing educational packages, may still favor the outsourcing of services such as transportation and food that are not inherently part of the educational process. However, a lesson can be learned from the story of the lunch program in the United States. Business carries with it an educational agenda of its own, such as promoting consumerism and building brand loyalties, that often contradict the democratic and pedagogical essence of education. The social and educational consequences of transforming lunch services from a public good that is financed and supervised by the federal government into a private good provided by for-profit organizations and supervised by local and school authorities are grave.

I will proceed to discuss two examples of so-called business–school partnerships that demonstrate the destructive educational and social consequences of such partnerships. The first one represents contracting for-profit companies to supply schools with lunch services, and the second represents donation of expensive communication equipment with conditions attached.

School Lunch Services

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, private and philanthropic gifts to local schools supported school meals. In the 1930s, in the United States, limited amount of federal support became available, and federal endorsement grew through the legislative action of The National School Lunch Act of 1946. The legislation was expanded in the 1960s, making free and reduced lunches available to all children who were members of low-income households. Since the 1970s, reduction in funding for lunch programs was an important factor allowing corporations to enter the market of school food services. The US Department of Agriculture passed regulations allowing local food authorities to contract services to private corporations. Typically, responsibility for ensuring the compliance of private business with federal nutritional requirements was shouldered upon local food authorities. Nutrition professionals and child health advocates argue that to begin with, current federal regulation concerning fast-food and soft-drinks in schools are too lenient. Needless to remind readers that increased consumption of soft-drinks and fast-food can have serious health implications for children, The National School Lunch Program was established to ensure that each school child had access to a healthy meal. Privatization may deprive poor children in particular of a healthy lunch (VanderSchee, 2005).

Today, more than 20 percent of schools offer brand-name fast-foods in their cafeterias, and almost 50 percent of all school districts in the United States have contracts with a soft drink company (VanderSchee, 2005, pp. 2, 3). Given the lack of federal funds, local food authorities contract for-profit suppliers of food services as their only option of maintaining a fiscally viable lunch program, i.e., nationwide corporations could generate higher sales volume with lower operational costs.

School administrators become increasingly dependent on contracting with business for funds to run the school, not just their lunch programs, and some districts hire

consultants to locate and negotiate the most profitable arrangement. In exchange for exclusive sales rights, soft drink companies offer schools lucrative signing bonuses and promotional packages that often include additional funding for sports equipment, extracurricular activities, scholarships, or technology. Nationwide, schools earn $750 million per year from fast-food and soda vendors (VanderSchee, 2005, p. 3). Pressure can be put on school principals and teachers to boost sales, for example, by allowing students to bring drinks to class. This represents disregard for children's health and interference with classroom discipline and learning routines. School–business partnerships are insecure and last as long as profit expectations are met. Profits are the bottom line and when profits fall school funding by business is cut down or is totally withdrawn. Thus, only public funding can give schools the consistent support needed to educate children (Kober, 2006).

The conduct of public school principals and administrators should be guided by the sense of vocation, professional commitment, and expertise (Woods, Bagley and Glatter, 1998). However, they seem to betray the public service ethos and give priority to business considerations over health and pedagogical matters. School and local authorities, which are supposed to supervise and be held accountable for the conduct of business in schools, become reliant on business instead. The victims are children who acquire bad eating habits and whose health is put at risk. Business–school partnerships indoctrinate and manipulate children into the commercialized consumer society whose ethos can be summarized as "I shop therefore I am." Schools, thus, betray their public mission. The case of food demonstrates that privatization of what seems like an auxiliary service, far removed from the education calling of schools, can still have profound educational and social results. It also demonstrates that supervision must not be trusted to administrators and educators who are increasingly dependent on funds raised through school–business partnerships.

Exposure of Students to TV Commercials

Many schools in the United States receive expensive video equipment from TV channels in return for presenting their news programs and advertising to a national captive audience of millions of students (Apple, 1998; Hepburn, 1998; Molnar, 2005). Channel One, for example, is a commercially produced TV news program that is broadcast to thousands of schools and to millions of students throughout the United States. The news programs consist of ten minutes of international and national news and two minutes of commercials. Schools must guarantee that 90 percent of the students will be watching 90 percent of the time. The ten minutes of news and two minutes of commercials must be watched every school day for 3–5 years as part of the contractual agreement. The entire program must be shown; no editing is allowed. The satellite antennae is fixed to the Channel One station and, except in few instances where courts have ruled otherwise, cannot be used to receive other programs (Apple, 1998). Channel One, given the situation of mandatory exposure

to its news and advertisements, can afford to charge advertisers twice as much as regular TV stations, claiming "no audience erosion" (Klein, 1999, p. 90).

The exposure of children to commercial in schools violates the educational mission of schools. Commercials are not simply informative messages about goods and services; they are social and cultural texts that manipulate customers into specific choices of consumer goods. Similar techniques are used in election campaigns of public officials (Ichilov, 2003). Schwoch, White and Reilly (1992) argue that although many commercials are ignored during a typical round of viewing, many others are retained at various levels of awareness. Television advertising is a site for the reception and formation of everyday knowledge. The images and discursive formations of television advertising enter viewers' verbal and visual vocabularies with ease, and shape their perceptions of reality. A study of television advertising for children reported that more than 15 percent of the time devoted to most children's programming consists of commercial advertising (Kunkel and Gantz, 1992). The degree to which children are able to recognize commercials and to be on guard against commercial persuasion is age related. A more advanced comprehension of advertising practices does not develop until the later elementary school years. In order to process commercial contents, a child must be able to distinguish between regular programs and commercial messages. The child must also be aware of the persuasive intent of commercial messages. Studies have shown that children who lack the ability to comprehend the persuasive intent of advertising are most susceptible to commercial influences. They tend to accept product claims and appeals at face value, especially those delivered by a popular character that they like and trust. In contrast, children who can recognize persuasive intent are more skeptical and distrusting of advertising (McNeal, 1987; Young, B. 1990). Television that is perceived as real has a greater effect than when it is judged to be unreal (Fitch, Huston and Wright, 1993). Studies among adolescents have shown that materialism, defined as "the importance a consumer attaches to worldly possessions" (Belk, 1985, p. 265), was positively related to the amount of television viewing and positive attitudes toward advertising (Yoon, 1995). Exposing children to advertising in schools may advance the notion that such commercials represent credible information, and mixture of commercials and news may interfere with children's ability to distinguish between the two. It is the mission of the schools to expose children to a great variety of sources of information, providing them with the ability to critically evaluate such sources and be able to decipher their intentions. Allowing projects such as Channel One to enter schools undermines the ability of schools to cultivate critical citizenship and consumer skills among students.

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion revealed that the market gospel does not deliver the promised results. Moreover, markets are founded on erroneous assumptions concerning the behavior of stakeholders such as parents and educators. They are there-

fore incapable of providing solutions for the numerous problems facing education in this rapidly changing world.

Schools' deregulation grants schools a false autonomy. In reality they are far less autonomous to act upon professional, social, and ethical considerations. They operate under the threat of the tyranny of standardized tests that commodify education, redefine the essence of teaching and learning, and what is valuable knowledge. They are forced into the so-called business–school partnerships in order to raise money, being faced with severe cutbacks of public funds. The commercialization of education that goes hand in hand with the privatization of education defies both the democratic and humanist agendas of education, by promoting " ... excessive adherence to financial return as a measure of worth" (Brown, 1993, p. 451).

The fact that educational systems operate as 'quasi-markets' and not as fully free markets blurs public awareness to the privatization of education. Even those who are opposed to the retreat from public education may be oblivious to the fact that the implementation of new managerial practices in schools, the evaluation of educational outcomes and educators' performance via the use of standardized tests, and the private provision of previously publicly provided "non-education" services are closely interrelated. Such practices are guided and inspired by the market epistemology and discourse. Public awareness of the grave social and educational consequences of markets in education could initiate the beginning of the awakening from the illusion of markets.

Chapter 5
The Building of Public Education in Israel

Introduction

Chapters 5 and 6 are dedicated to the examination of the building of public education in Israel and of the recent retreat from the ideals and practices of public education. In each chapter a brief background overview about Israeli society is provided, to enable readers to more fully comprehend the social context in which educational policy is being shaped and its social and educational consequences.

The state of Israel was established in 1948 but its institutional foundations were laid by Zionist pioneers decades before. Although the pre-state institutions lacked sovereignty, they provided many public services, such as education, and performed various governmental functions. The tasks of centralization and depoliticization of various organizations and institutions and the creation of an effective central government dominated the first years of statehood. Ben-Gurion, the first prime minister of Israel, was determined to create effective state institutions and a strong public sector, and in the process, abolished or nationalized systems that operated during the pre-state era. Ben-Gurion advocated the implementation of "statehood" (mamlachtiut), i.e., bringing under state authority domains that during the pre-state era were the responsibility of voluntary organizations. He believed that only the state can transcend partisan interests and assume responsibility for indiscriminately caring for all its citizens. Such actions often encountered opposition and were accompanied by power struggles.

Ben-Gurion was determined to create a public education system, financed and supervised by the state, and urged the nascent Israeli Knesset (parliament) to enact laws that would chart the education public space. To comprehend the enormity of this task I will begin by briefly discussing the structure of the sectarian Hebrew education system which operated during the pre-state period (Yishuv). Ben-Gurion wished to depoliticize and dissolve these autonomous systems ("streams"), and create unified state education. The exigencies of the first years of statehood greatly determined the structure and missions of the emerging state system, and will be discussed next. The massive state financial investment in education during that period is admirable given the urgent and formidable tasks with which the newly born state had to cope and the meager resources that were at its disposal.

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_5, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

My main purpose, however, is to trace the emerging Israeli public education and explore the ethos of state responsibility for education through three acts of legislation: Compulsory Education Law-1949; State Education Law-1953, and the Knesset Decision on an Educational Reform in 1968. These documents and especially the process of deliberation that preceded their publication reflect, in my view, the essence of the ethos that dominated the education public space during the first years of statehood. My analysis will be based mainly on the protocols of the Knesset (Divrei Ha'Knesst), protocols of the Knesset Education and Culture Committee, on reports of specially appointed committees, and on the writings and speeches of political leaders who took part in the shaping of the Israeli public education system. I chose to extensively use citations of Knesset members and of central public figures because, in my view, these citations best reflect the climate of ideas and ideals that dominated the process of charting the education public space.

Let us begin by outlining the structure of the Hebrew education system during the pre-state era and discuss the challenges and exigencies that the newly born state was facing.

The Structure of the Education System During the Pre-state Era (the Yishuv) and First Year of Statehood

The Hebrew educational system during the pre-state (Yishuv) era was divided into autonomous "streams" that were affiliated with various factions within the Zionist movement. Each "stream" built its own schools, selected and trained teachers, and produced curricular materials. In 1948, the General Stream (affiliated with the general Zionist and liberal parties) was the largest, encompassing about half of the teachers and half of the students. Its supervisory board advocated the depoliticization of schools supporting the view that ". . .the school must be above political parties and social classes. . .must be general and uniform for all parts of the nation" (Zameret and Yablonka, 1997, p. 125).

The Labor Movement Stream was the second largest and was under the authority of the "Education Center" (merkaz le'chinuch) of the Histadrut (The Labor Union). It was affiliated with the labor parties (especially Mapai and Mapam). About 27 percent of all Jewish students attended Labor Stream schools, and about one-third of the teachers taught there. The educational vision of the Labor Movement stream was "[to] create a Jewish, pioneering, autonomous personality, committed to the Zionist-Socialist vision, and willing to fulfill in body and soul the missions of the Hebrew Labor Movement" (Zameret and Yablonka, 1997, p. 125).

The Mizrachi Stream catered to religiously orthodox Zionist Jews and was affiliated with two religious political parties: Ha'Mizrachi, and Ha'Mizrachi Laborer (Ha'Poel Ha'Mizrach). It served about 22 percent of all Jewish students and employed a little more than a quarter of all Hebrew teachers. Its purpose was to establish modern national-religious schools and to simultaneously advance Jewish religious studies and general knowledge: "The national and religious elements are the foundation rocks upon which the Mizrachi education rests. [Our] pur-

pose is to prepare the younger generation for the renewal of national life ... to educate youngsters for Torah life as persons, citizens and builders of the homeland" (cited in Zameret and Yablonka, 1997, p. 126).

During the first days of statehood the government decided to support an additional educational system, that of the ultra-orthodox anti-Zionist Agudat Israel. The ultra-orthodox agreed to be loosely incorporated into the Zionist education system mainly because their schools were financially in dire straights. Zionist money was vital for the survival of their schools. Also, ultra-orthodox leaders realized that the Jewish world center is moving to Israel and wanted to exert influence rather than remain isolated (Zameret and Yablonka, 1997, p. 127). As we shall see, the Israeli government made special provisions for the persistence of this ultra-orthodox "stream" in the State Education Law-1953. The "Independent Education" (Chinuch Atzmai), as this stream was labeled, was granted special status which was extended in later years to yet another orthodox stream – the Spring of Torah (Maayan Ha'Torah) of the Sephardic ultra-orthodox party – Shas. This crack in the unified education system served in recent years as an escape route from state education. As we shall see, parents' associations and various organizations followed the ultra-orthodox lead and established a host of quasi-private schools that are heavily supported through public funds.

The streams continued to operate as rival education systems during the first 6 years of statehood, until the legislation of the State Education Law in 1953. Attempts to coordinate the activities of the "streams" proved to be ineffective. Tough competition existed among the various streams, in an attempt to win over new immigrant children, and to increase their stronghold among the more veteran population. In many instances pressures, such as threats of being fired, were put upon parents to convince them to send their children to a particular school. Such practices were derogatively labeled "soul hunt" (tzaid nefashot). The competition among "streams" was clearly part of the struggle among political parties to increase their stronghold among veteran Israelis and to win the support of the ingathering new comers. The competition shifted the power balance among streams, and in the summer of 1953 the Labor Stream became the largest, holding about two-fifths of the students, the second largest was the General Stream with about one-third of the students, and the Mizrachi Stream came third enrolling about one-fifth of all students (Zameret and Yablonka, 1997, p. 127). This is hardly surprising given that the labor parties were in power and controlled key positions and resources. The task of creating a unified state education system demanded the abolition of the autonomous "streams" and faced great resistance, as will be discussed further.

Challenges and Exigencies During the First Years of Statehood

The first years of statehood were marked by mass immigration of Jews into Israel. The Israeli Jewish population almost tripled. About half of the immigrants came from Europe having survived the Holocaust and war, and half were refugees from Muslim countries in the Middle East and North Africa. The veteran Jewish

population that numbered about 650,000 with the establishment of the state was confronted with the massive task of absorbing an immigrant population larger than itself. The urgent need of providing penniless immigrants with housing, jobs, health services, and education became the responsibility of the newly born state, and demanded vast financial resources. The War of Independence that lasted from the end of 1947 until the beginning of 1949 took a heavy toll on human life. The war had left Israel virtually bankrupt, exhausted the meager economic resources of the newly born state, and devastated the economy. The government took emergency steps including the rationing of food and clothing to secure the equal distribution of scarce provisions among all citizens and to curb private consumption in favor of security and development needs (Gross, 1997).

The educational system had to constantly expand rapidly to accommodate newly arrived immigrant children. This was clearly a formidable task, as can be learned from the data concerning the growth in the numbers of students. During the first decade the Jewish student population in kindergarten and schools grew from about one hundred thousand to half a million, and the number of teachers grew from 5,000 to 20,000 (Zameret, 1997). In 1949 there were 86,000 elementary school students, and in 1950 the number grew to 120,000. This means that in the course of 1 year the number of elementary school students increased by nearly 150 percent (Shazar, 1982, p. 96).

Israel also assumed responsibility for the education of Arab children who became Israeli citizens. Shazar, Israel's first minister of education, presented his vision for Arab schools:

> We do not wish to create a Hebrew school for the Arabs. We'll create for the Arabs an Arab school, where Hebrew will also be studied. Hebrew would become a common language that would enable the creation of ties. I know well how many chasms must be bridged. I do not idealize the situation. However the state will be built on cooperation with the [Arab] minority, bridging the gap between the majority and minority, with mutual understanding and mutual recognition, we'll together build this state of ours (Shazar, 1982, p. 54).

Assessing in retrospective the achievements of the education system during these difficult years, the first minister of education, Shazar remarks

> Taking into account that the establishment of the State was preceded by a period of violent conflicts and war, that took place still under the rule of the British Mandate, we can appreciate how scant were the administrative tools, how scarce were buildings and how negligible were the forces with which we were facing the enormous mission of absorbing the young education citizens that outnumbered the absorbing citizens' population (Shazar, 1982, p. 96).

Charting the Education Public Space

Compulsory Education Law-1949

Ben-Gurion insisted that a law providing compulsory free education must be one of the first laws to be legislated by the Knesset. Indeed, Compulsory Education

Law-1949 was the first education law that the Knesset passed. Deliberations started while the War of Independence was still raging. The law made 1 year of kindergarten and 8 years of elementary education universally available, free and compulsory. The grave economic situation did not deter the state from taking upon itself the heavy financial burden of implementing the law. The law that was amended several times since its enactment, originally applied to all children between the ages of 5 and 13, and to youngsters between the ages 14 and 17 who did not complete primary education. The latter were to attend schools for working youth. The law did not dissolve the "streams," and stipulated that parents should send their children to a school of their choice.

Although the attendance rates of Jewish students in elementary school were high even before the enactment of the law, it was felt that the law was vitally needed to secure full participation of both Jewish and Arab youngsters. Joseph Shprintzak (of MAPAI Labor Party), then spokesman of the Knesset, clearly expressed these concerns, emphasizing the importance of making education universally accessible to all children:

> Even incomplete statistics tell us that part of all Jewish children and a larger part of non-Jewish children in this country are out of school. For years now this shameful stain persists and does not leave us . . . many students do not complete school . . . there are places in which only one fifth of those entering first grade complete the eighth grade.[1]

To somewhat ease the financial burden, it was decided to fully implement the law within the course of 3 years, beginning in 1950 and completing the process in 1952. The task remained nevertheless formidable. It was estimated that in 1950 the number of students in grades one through six was increased by 7,800 students, in 1951 4,200 students were added to the seventh grade, and in 1952, an increase of 4,250 students was expected in the eighth grade (Shazar, 1982, p. 44). These numbers include both Jewish and Arab students who were out of school. The Arabs who became citizens of Israel following the establishment of the state were treated with suspicion as an enemy-affiliated minority and were under martial law until 1966. The state, however, took upon itself to indiscriminately implement the law among Arabs and Jews alike. Shazar reported that the academic year 1948/9 opened with 4,000 Arab students and ended with 7,500 students and that in 1950 15,000 students attended school. He also reports of the building of an Arab high school and a teachers' training institute for Arab schools. He complains that many Arab local authorities were reluctant to contribute their share for education, making the situation more difficult (Shazar, 1982, p. 103).

The discourse that permeated the legislation process was highly ideological, as will be demonstrated. The commitment to compulsory free education was deeply embedded in the Zionist vision of the mission of Israel – a state that is responsible for the gathering of Jewish exiles and their absorption, and for the fate of the entire Jewish people:

> . . . in this law the state of Israel took upon itself an obliging contract toward its citizens, it took upon itself the burden of responsibility for the education of the children of Israel – education that fathers and mothers were willing to sacrifice their lives in order to make it accessible to their children.[2]

The Minister of Education Shazar referred to students as "citizens of education" (ezrachei chinuch) and to immigrant students as "returning exiles" (shavei ha'galuiot), asserting that the education system "must accept the young citizens who are knocking on the gates of our country, in a fashion that they and the country deserve" (Shazar, 1982, p. 98).

Education was considered a state instrument for creating a Jewish, democratic state, a state that also takes care of the education of former enemies, Arabs that became Israeli citizens, respecting their cultural uniqueness and willing to make them partners in the building of the state:

> In our political situation compulsory education must take on special roles that were created by our unique living conditions – the integration of ethnic groups and waves of immigration, combining the ancient culture with the renewed culture, teaching the [Hebrew] language – things that previous generations and our transitory generation were missing. In addition our school has a special role: implanting the sense of independence and the aspiration for freedom. Our education must convey the feeling of equality and citizenship to all those who reside in the country, Jews and Arabs.[3]

Shazar commitment to public education was also rooted in the discourse of human rights. He cited in the Knesset clause number 26 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights that was published in 1948: "Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory . . ., " emphasizing that "all nations must strive" to implement the human right to education. He pointed out that the Compulsory Education Law expresses Israel's commitment to education as a human right. He also stressed that the obligation to education and learning is rooted in the Torah and in Jewish traditions.[4]

Israeli legislators expressed their desire to include in the provision of compulsory free education, both preschoolers from the age of three and high school students, and to make higher education accessible to all. It was hoped that improved economic conditions will allow for such an extension in the future:

> We can only regret that the implementation of compulsory education will be slower than we would have hoped, because of budgetary difficulties. Compulsory education is vitally needed for the state, especially for a democratic state, and is one of the most important and essential tools in the hands of citizens who, in the final account, determine the fate of the country. I look forward to see the day when the state of Israel will provide not only compulsory and free elementary education, but will be the first nation to provide compulsory and free secondary education . . . [5]

To facilitate the burden of tuition fees in kindergartens and high schools Shazar promised to adopt interim solutions until the anticipated extension of the law could be materialized in the future:

> Endowments and scholarships in kindergartens, secondary schools, vocational and agricultural schools, schools of arts and all educational institutions above the elementary level . . . the hand will be as widely open as possible. A widely opened hand is a relative matter for this poor nation, but it is obliged to be open . . . (Shazar, 1982, p. 41).

Shazar, the first minister of education, expressed in the Knesset his view concerning the national and cultural significance of the law:

> Compulsory free education for all the state's children, regardless of gender and religious distinctions, is the first law concerning education, the first attempt to solve by state tools issues related to our cultural concentration; to construct by state tools our spiritual lives in our homeland (Shazar, 1982, p. 36).

The commitment of the state to education went way beyond the teaching in school of specific subjects. It included responsibility for the health and nutrition of students, as well as hygiene and recreation: "...already now [1950] 50,000 school children are receiving daily milk and cocoa, and about 25,000 receive hot meals. Our goal is to double these numbers in the course of this year." (Shazar, 1982, p. 105).

Over the years the ministry took upon itself the responsibility and financial burden for a great variety of activities and content areas:[6]

> Toward the third decade [of the state] the Ministry of Education presents the State with a learning-educational "dowry" that reaches beyond the curriculum. I refer to a complex web of frameworks and activities designed to broaden the horizons of students, through art education, also deepening their civic, national and universal conscience. Such activities include ... publication of students' newspapers, school trips, celebration of holidays and days of remembrance, club activities dedicated to arts and literature, heritage, geography of the country, familiarity with the diasporas; broadcasts to schools, informal education provided via a variety of school and community clubs, pre-military training, youth movements, field schools and youth hostels (Aran, 1971, pp. 57–58).

During the Knesset deliberations, it has been suggested to prepare a proposal for a comprehensive education law instead of focusing solely upon the provision of free and compulsory education. A comprehensive law was meant to chart a state education system, dealing with the structure and contents of education. The decision was to postpone the enactment of a comprehensive law and to focus on the urgent task of providing free and compulsory education, a task upon which there had been consensus among all political parties.

The minister of education was keenly aware of the great significance of the legislation of the Compulsory Education Law:

> I think that I will not be mistaken to claim that in the country, nation, and the entire world [the legislation of this law] will be acknowledged with satisfaction and astonishment, for in the face of roaring weapons in a bloody war, we took the courage to expand the boundaries of education, which guarantee the existence and perseverance of the people of Israel ... We were blessed with massive immigration, on a scale that we did not expect in our most favorable dreams ...I doubt that there is another area, in addition to education, in which the immigration confronted us with such expanded and unpredicted tasks (Shazar, 1982, pp. 100, 95).

State Education Law-1953

Compulsory Education Law established state responsibility for providing free, compulsory elementary education, a responsibility that was perceived not merely as an obligation, but as a Zionist and humanist mission, and as a fundamental element in the contract between the government and the citizens of Israel. However, the

education system remained politicized and fragmented, and parents were obliged by law to make a choice among schools belonging to the various "streams". Ben-Gurion was determined to dissolve the "streams" and institute a unified state education system, but his position was widely disputed even within his own party (Davidson, 2002). It is interesting to note that while at present the political left is often opposed to the erosion of the welfare state and of the retreat from public education, Israeli left-wing parties were supportive of the continued existence of the streams. Liberal parties and the right, who currently support deregulation and privatization of the delivery of all public goods, strongly supported the foundation of a unified state education system.

State Education Law-1953 depoliticized and centralized the education system, bringing all schools under state control. The law charts the education public space, dealing with structural, administrative, and contents issues; defining state responsibility for education, and the space that allows parents to make decisions and choices concerning their children's education. Cynically, however, as will be explained later certain clauses of the law that were intended to foster public schooling created over the years routes for escaping state schools.

Why were many Knesset members so eager to centralize the education system and to replace parental choice with school placement by the authorities? It is vital to examine the grievances that the law sought to abolish, because it seems that recent trends of privatization and decentralization bring these grievances back to the fore.

The issue of the fate of the "streams" had emerged during the legislation process of Compulsory Education Law. One of the arguments that were brought up by Knesset members, that supported the establishment of a unified state education system, was that public education systems are prevalent in all the enlightened nations. The affiliation of the "streams" with political parties was of prime concern. The politicization of the education system was regarded as undemocratic and divisive. By obliging parents to choose a school that belongs to one of the streams, parents were also disclosing their political party preference. This was clearly in violation of their freedom of conscience and of their right to keep their political inclination discrete. Knesset members felt that parents must not be compelled to "declare in writing in front of municipal officials [who are in charge of school registration] – to which party they belong, and to which party they are most loyal . . . The state trusted education to sects, view points, parties and streams – but where is the state itself?"[7]

It was advocated that politics and education must be kept apart:

> The state is the state of Israel and schools should exist for all Israeli children, without partitions and controversies.[8]

The fragmented education system was also regarded as divisive as can be learned from two statements made by Knesset member Izhar Harari (Progressive Party) in 1948, and again in 1953:

> We strive for the ingathering of exiles, we bring here Jews from all corners of the world, but we split them spiritually into streams. This is the dispersion and not the ingathering of exiles.[9]

> State schools must be an educational and learning places for children of all parts of the public . . . a lively, vibrant education system with a variety of pedagogical trends and shades, an education system that would be a melting pot for welding the nation's unity, and for nurturing the state and the most exalted ideals of humanity and of the people of Israel.[10]

Those opposed to relinquishing the "streams" considered such action as violation of parents' right to choose a school for their children which corresponds with their beliefs and conscience. This right of parents has been ridiculed by Knesset Member Harari (Progressive Party):

> Since when does the state trust the parents so strongly? Since when does Zionism trust parents? Zionism represents children's rebellion against their parents . . . and now the parents are those who are acceptable to the state? Not the state will determine the kind of education that will be made available to children, but this will be determined by parents? What will be done in the event that parents will group together demanding a kind of education which the state opposes? Why should the state grant some parents the kind of education that they desire and deny such choice of other parents? By what moral right can such action be justified?[11]

The Minister of Education Shazar like many members of his party (Labor Party) supported the continued existence of the "streams" and did not see them as divisive:

> The language is one [Hebrew] and there is one education system, and one elementary school, and this education web is under one financial and administrative authority. Each [stream] only adds flavor without diminishing what is common and unifying . . . [12]
>
> Let's preserve the viability of the streams to grow and develop in accordance with the freedom of conscience . . . now that the state exists we can realize this by the power of law . . . the tolerance which underlies our lives, permits the preservation of the streams and their integration, without imposing the choice of any of the stream (Shazar, 1982, p. 42).

Others supported the view that state supervision must be restricted to allow schools the freedom to choose ideologies and ideas as central pillars of the kind of education they wish to provide.

These representative statements that were made already during the deliberations over the Compulsory Education Law, demonstrate the intensity of the disputes. As we shall later see, current controversies over parental choice seem to resonate many of the arguments that were already brought up more than half a century ago.

The elimination of the streams was a central issue during the Knesset deliberation of the State Education Law. Ben-Gurion and Minister of Education Dinur[13] considered the abolition of the streams as precondition for establishing a state education system, not as an end in itself. In Ben-Gurion's own words:

> The abolition of the streams is not a nominal matter, but the abolition of frameworks and political affiliations that divided the nation and creating chaos in education. The erection of state education – is not a nominal change either but a change of content. A unifying and amalgamating content . . . we desire a state school that would serve as a lever for national unity and building of the country. With the abolition of the streams we wish to achieve two main goals: (a) Transfer the responsibility for education from political parties to the state. (b) Implement basic cultural, pioneering and social values in all schools.[14]

Ben-Gurion considered the law as extremely vital for the rebuilding of the nation and state:

> There are two laws that in my view are of prime importance, for they define the central and chief goals of the state of Israel. These are The Law of Return [which grants all Jews the right to return to their ancestral homeland] and State Education Law.[15]
>
> There are not many commemorative days in Jewish history that can compete with the enormity and significance of May 14, 1948 – the day of the declaration of the state of Israel. However, the day of the declaration of state education by the government of Israel is also worthy of being engraved in our history. The expropriation of education from the authority of political parties, placing it under the authority of the State – is a crucial step in the founding of the State and the unity of the nation.[16]

Again the streams were described as divisive, as interfering with the mission of the ingathering of exiles and of transforming the ingathering exiles into a unified nation. They were considered a negative remnant of life in the Diaspora that must be eliminated:

> Our long Diaspora years left their impression, and thus the education system in the pre-state era did not consist of what is unifying and common to all of us, but on spiritual differentiation in which division and separation overrode unity. The primary meaning of this law is shrinking away from this heritage of the Diaspora, liberating education from its dependency upon political and status parties and transferring education to the authority to its natural owner – the state, to build it on principles that are shared by the entire nation, getting children out of the whirlpool of political struggle and bringing them into an educational atmosphere that meets their developing needs . . .[17]

The division of the education systems into streams was blamed for separating children from an early age into schools that cater to socially homogeneous student populations. This interferes with youngsters' natural development and with their right to become familiar with "others." This also promotes inequality of educational opportunities, neglecting immigrant children. A socially stratified society is the result of discrepancies between schools serving veteran and immigrant children:

> [The consequences of "streams"] On the one hand there is an outrageous waste of money on unneeded administrative tools, and half-empty classrooms, and on the other school-age children in immigrant settlements are out of school, the teachers are inexperienced and the teaching level is low. This situation must not go on for the sake of the children and the entire country. It is inconceivable that this glorious cultural tradition of our nation and these great values of the Zionist movement will be accessible to only few, while others are deprived of them . . . It is inconceivable that few will be allowed to develop creative and autonomous personality, while others rot in an atmosphere that stifles talents and fosters hatred for the entire environment. It is inconceivable that few will be educated to serve the nation's security and social needs, while others grow up detached from awareness about the needs of the homeland, as if they still reside in the Diaspora.[18]
>
> I have always considered state education, unified education, to be a road leading to democracy in the state. It's beyond my understanding how can people put up with the separation of one person from another from an early age, creating facts and partitions among people, determining who is privileged and who is unworthy. By doing so we create a new aristocracy.[19]

Members of left-wing parties considered the abolition of the workers' education stream and the institution of unified education a bourgeois takeover, a "reactionary reform." They alleged that the proposed state education is a deceitful act aimed at

infusing society with bourgeois ideology, and teaching the younger generation to regard socialism an enemy.

> "State education" in capitalist regimes means the exploitation of state tools and budgets to impose bourgeois education upon the younger generation in order to educate youngsters to serve the interests of foreign and domestic bourgeois . . . Explicitly or implicitly, any type of education, any ideology, reflects certain class interests. The bourgeois is trying to deceive the public, to present its class ideology as unified national ideology. But this is an illusion. . . . in capitalist societies [state education] will always be that of the dominant capitalist class. . .[20]

Competition among schools is at present a central element of educational reforms, even when schools are "marketed" by techniques taken from the world of consumption and advertising. Competition among the streams, especially when inappropriate means have been used to "convince" parents to prefer a specific school for their children was deplored and labeled "soul hunt."[21]

In the final analysis it seems that there has been an agreement among all Knesset members concerning the aim of providing equal educational opportunities to all students, unconditioned by students' social class. The controversies concerned what would promote equality: the abolition of the streams or their persistence.

Variations Within State Education

State Education Law attempted at creating an education system that will be unified but not monolithic, allowing for content variations and choices. Some legislators expressed concerns that choice opportunities could be unduly exploited by parents. They did not anticipate, however, that the freedom of choice will be subverted to allow for massive abandonment of state schools and the re-fragmentation of the education system into a web of quasi-private schools that are heavily financed through public funds.

The law allowed parents to choose between regular state schools and religious state schools. A religious school is defined as state school in which Jewish religious practices are part of the school's daily routines (praying in school, for example), and curriculum, and the educational staff is observant of Jewish traditions.

The law authorizes the minister of education to grant schools that are outside the state system ("unofficial schools") the status of "recognized schools" and determine the requirements that such schools must comply with as prerequisite for obtaining state funding. These preconditions include the implementation of national core curriculum. This arrangement was adopted to allow the ultra-orthodox stream of Agudat Israel to persist and receive state money. The ultra-orthodox stream wished to distinct itself from state religious education and remained affiliated with the Agudat Israel political party. Core curriculum was not implemented in the so-called "autonomous schools," and all attempts at supervising schools were resisted.

Nevertheless, 60 percent of their budget comes from state funds. Over the years, additional sectors and groups demanded that these arrangements would apply to

their schools as well. The arrangement that was originally intended to apply solely to Arudat Israel was extended to the Sepharadic ultra-orthodox schools, Maayan Ha'Tora of the Shas party, and to a great variety of specialized schools (such as democratic or art schools) that were founded by parents' associations and various NGOs.

The recent proliferation of "recognized schools" clearly subverts the intention of the legislators. The law proposal included a clause that was vehemently opposed and was not included in the law itself. The clause granted the minister of education the authority to change the status of a state school from "official" to "recognized" should 60 percent of the parents request such change. Sixty percent of the budget of "recognized" schools will come from state funds. This clause clearly intended to extend the arrangement that was made with Agudat Israel schools to any school, based upon parental choice.

Opposition to this proposal was massive, as can be learned from statements made by Knesset members:

> Is this proposed arrangement intended to prevent politicized education or to reinforce it? Is it not clear to us that tomorrow "Agudat Israel" will depart, followed by "Ha'Shomer Hazair," and then another political party will abandon [state schools] and start its own schools – and in this way are we supposed to build state education? No my colleagues, this will further divide the nation, *and this clause contradicts the idea of state education on which this law proposal is founded*.[22] [My emphasis, O.I.].
>
> *I'm greatly concerned that this clause opens the road for the erosion of our enterprise, shattering the foundations of education*. Divisions within the Hebrew nation will resume, contrary to what is really needed"[23] [My emphasis, O.I.].

The controversial clause was drastically changed, allowing the state flexibility concerning the approval of "recognized schools," the amount of state support that they would receive, if any, and the preconditions that should qualify such schools to receive state aid:

> The [Knesset Education] Committee's point of departure was that *this law is intended to regulate the conditions for the establishment of state education system, and not the conditions for establishing recognized institutions. Having said that, it is impossible to avoid dealing with conditions pertaining to already existing recognized schools* . . . The Committee altered the [controversial] clause and added that such schools will be obliged to implement state core curriculum. The amount of government support is not predetermined by law. The Committee's point of departure was that the state is not obliged to unconditionally support such institutions. The amount of financial support, should it be granted, will be determined for each individual school separately, pending on compliance with regulations made by the Minister of Education.[24] [My emphasis, O.I.].

The possibility of massive withdrawal from state schools via this loophole that was meant to provide only for the persistence of already existing "recognized schools" has not been anticipated by the legislators. What worried them was the possibility of the reintroduction of political sectarianism into state education. Legislators worried that the kibbutz movement and other sectors may wish to secede from the state education system and demand for their schools arrangements that would be on equal footing with those of ultra-orthodox schools. This did not happen. Kibbutz education, nevertheless, preserved its unique features for many years. The use of

this clause as an escape route from state schools by parents associations and private organizations, and the consequent proliferation of quasi-private "recognized" specialized schools that are supported by public funds, clearly subverts the spirit of the law and the intentions of its legislators.

The law allows for experimentation within specific schools. This could involve trying out curricular or any other innovations. Students who do not wish to take part in the experiment must be offered an alternative school. This arrangement that was meant to make the state system dynamic and open to innovations also became an escape route from state schools. Experimental schools can eventually be transformed into "recognized" schools.

Another arrangement provided in the law to allow for curricular variations and parental involvement and choice was the option to implement supplementary curricular programs beyond the required core curriculum. These enrichment programs could cover a quarter of a school's total teaching hours. The minister of education is authorized by the law to assign supplementary programs to schools. The minister is also authorized to approve alternative supplementary programs, based on the demand of parents. Such supplementary programs must be financed be the parents themselves or by the municipal authorities. The introduction of enrichment programs that are financed by parents were derogatively labeled "grey education", legitimizing private-funded programs to operate within state schools. This arrangement enhanced inequality between schools catering to children from well-off families and schools whose students come from poor families.

In spite of their concerns, Knesset members were supportive of the provision of supplementary programs at parents' request and expense. However, these arrangements were closely controlled by the state:

> The desire for variations in education is based on the democratic and anti-totalitarian nature of Jewish statehood in Israel ... statehood of a living people that is blessed by great heterogeneity...[25]

The Minister of education Dinur was also supportive of allowing curricular variations beyond the core curriculum, but outlined the restrictions:

> We must emphasize that in principle state education does not intend to stifle public initiatives, pedagogical experimentations, and cultural innovations. State education leaves space for actions by initiating educators and the public seeking the realization of certain ideals. It is my view that, pending on the approval of the Minister of Education, all societal innovations and quests, should be allowed to enter the state education system, if this is desired by the entire public, segment of the public, or demanded by parents ... However, *the right to bring variation into education does not include the establishment of another school, nor employing other teachers – curricular variation is allowed within existing program and school ... it must be clear that the variation is pedagogical ...* [My emphasis, O.I.].[26]

The position of the legislators concerning supplementary programs is stated very clearly. Parents' right to demand variations is derived and rooted in the authority of the state and in citizens' recognition of the supremacy of the state. The state determines the scope and the implementation of this right. Supplementary programs are aimed at providing greater curricular variation by parents within schools only.

Programs that are operated by parents outside the state education framework are not entitled for state funds or sponsorship. Interpreting this arrangement as an approval to withdraw from state schools, clearly subverts the legislators' intents and the spirit of the law.

Reforming the Education System

Zalman Aran, who served as minister of education for almost a decade (during 1955–1960, and between 1963–1969), was the initiator of a structural reform and determinedly endeavored to see it approved and implemented. As minister of education, Aran was prompted by a sense of national mission and responsibility, as can be gathered from the following poetic statement:

> The state of Israel, in which the contemporary biblical story is being unfolded, must feel the breath of Israeli history that accompanies it day by day and hour by hour. Thus my belief is that our destiny and faith are rooted in the identity and character of the Hebrew Israeli person, and that education plays a decisive role in shaping the personality and character of hundreds of thousands children and youth [these youngsters] will determine the faith of the state . . . (Aran, 1971, p. 18).

Education ministers that preceded Aran were preoccupied with the formidable task of erecting a unified state education system and the provision of compulsory free education in accordance with the already constituted education laws. The constant arrival of newcomers made it necessary for the education system to continuously expand, building more schools and training more teachers. Growing awareness of the wide gap in educational achievements, especially between students of North African and Middle Eastern origin and those of European origin, prompted the adoption of a great variety of compensatory programs in the 1950s and on. Aran was deeply concerned about educational inequalities and the fact that many students did not continue their schooling beyond elementary education or dropped out of high school. He aimed at making high school education universal, allowing for a larger and more ethnically and socially heterogeneous student population to receive high school education.

Aran attributed students' failure in school to their living conditions. In his words: "One cannot blame a flower for having low IQ if it wilted before it had a chance to bloom, if from the outset it was placed in the shade, and was deprived of sunlight" (Aran, 1971, p. 18). Consequently he supported the implementation of enrichment and compensatory programs from an early age, targeting deprived populations. He was nevertheless displeased with the results:

> For years now we have been observing the situation in the education system, not as passive but as active observers. Many important experiments were carried out on a large scale, and yielded positive results. However, these are insufficient results, and the achievements do not meet our needs . . . (Aran, 1971, p. 76).

His dissatisfaction and sense of urgency to arrive at comprehensive and efficient solutions drove him to contemplating a comprehensive reform in the structure of the

education system. He was aware of educational reforms in other Western countries and was weighing their suitability for solving the problems of the Israeli education system:

> The deficiencies of the Israeli education system have 'elderly brothers' in developed veteran countries. At present, all modern countries, in the east and west, are reexamining the structure of education . . . most countries support the institution of middle-schools for youngsters ages 12–15, which represent the age of transition from childhood to the world of youth (Aran, 1971, p. 45).

He was convinced that the introduction of middle schools is a suitable solution for Israel and presented his vision for the desirable structural change:

> In at least four countries (France, England, Sweden, and the United States) reforms started not in elementary schools . . . students of the ages 12–14 are capable of absorbing knowledge that is now taught in high schools only . . . we shall make them [middle schools] a preliminary stage of high school education, we shall plant them in a soil and climate that are suitable for the developmental needs of this age group . . . we shall achieve our goals by creating an education framework that will be reinforced by academically trained teachers; supplied with laboratories, workshops; furnished with appropriate curricular programs and teaching methods, and supported by educational counselors that would advise students about high school education . . . All this is possible only in large regional schools . . . (Aran, 1971, pp. 79, 80).

Aran was convinced of the importance of advancing equality of educational opportunities and of having schools with ethnically and socially heterogeneous student body. He may have been impressed by the groundbreaking decision of the American Supreme Court ruling in 1954 that segregating black and white students in separate schools violates equality (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954; *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 1955).

During his first term in office, Aran had appointed a public committee to explore the situation of secondary education, including issues related to the structure of education, curriculum, and vocational and agricultural educational programs. However, from a statement he made at the opening session of the committee (July 5, 1957) it appears that his mind was already made up and that he knew what kind of reform is needed: "Before the committee decides what it wants, let me tell you what [recommendations] I want the committee to consider" (Aran, 1971, p. 61). He suggested the addition of 1 year of compulsory, free education (age 14–15), and the reorganization of the education system to include 6 years of elementary education, 3 years of junior high school, and 3 years of high school. Junior high schools would provide guidance to students and direct them to a high school that would suite them best.

In the beginning of his second term in office Aran appointed the "Praver Committee" (on October 28, 1963) "to examine the possibilities and needs of extending compulsory free education by including the age group 14–16, or grades nine and ten."[27] The committee's recommendations did not meet Aran's expectations. It was recommended to extend compulsory free education by 1 year only to the ninth grade. The committee was not convinced that existing conditions, such as the shortage of buildings and teachers, permit the extension of compulsory free education

by 2 years, as recommended by Aran. The recommendations also did not include a structural reform. Instead, the committee supported the strengthening of elementary education to ensure the proper preparation of all students for high school.

The committee acknowledged with satisfaction the massive financial support already offered by the Ministry of Education to enable students from low-income families to pursue high school education. About one-third of all high school students are fully or partially exempt from paying tuition. This arrangement applies to all the years of high school education, i.e., grades nine to twelve. The annual cost of 21 million Israeli pounds is covered by the Ministry of Education.[28]

Aran remained convinced that only a reform that would extend compulsory free education by two additional years, and simultaneously create middle schools with unique characteristic and a unique social and pedagogical mission, could achieve the following goals:

1. Allowing all students to make the most of 12 years of schooling by realizing their capacities to the full. It is our duty and responsibility to ensure such equality of educational for all children.
2. To uncover students' talents and qualifications, and in that way provide them with guidance.
3. To improve the educational achievements of students who arrived from Islamic countries.
4. Expand the number of students who enjoy high school education.
5. Accelerate inter-ethnic contacts among the younger generation.
   (Aran, 1971, pp. 75, 78, 79).

Aran believed that decisions concerning the possible adoption of such profound and expensive reform must be made by the Israeli Knesset. His suggestion to appoint a parliamentary committee[29] to deliberate both the expansion of compulsory education and the proposed structural change was accepted. The committee headed by Knesset Member Dr. Elimelech Rimalt held its opening session on June 22, 1966, and a concluding session on May 22, 1968.

Addressing the committee, Aran proposed to divide the 12 years of schooling into three rather than two levels, and explained:

> In the present structure of 8–4, grades seven and eight are part of the world of the younger grades (grades one to six) instead of belonging to the world of adolescents. The curriculum of grades seven and eight is totally detached from that of the ninth grade. Grades seven, eight, and nine must form a distinct education level, bridging the first level (elementary) with the upper level (secondary). Without such change, it will be impossible to further improve educational achievements. Also, in the current structure the developmental opportunity, the growing capacity to absorb of youngsters ages 12–15, is being wasted.[30]

Junior high schools were intended to form the first stage of secondary education, while being autonomous and distinct from both elementary and secondary schools, in terms of administration and management, curriculum, and the educational staff. This education level consists of comprehensive schools, offering a wide range of learning and educational experiences, and admitting all students without selection.

Such schools would enable students to become aware of their talents and inclinations, and enable them to choose high school education which suites them best. The education staff will closely observe students' performance, and be able to provide guidance and support. This will ensure students of the ability to benefit the most from secondary education, without dropping out of school. Comprehensive schools would offer vocational programs for academically low achievers. (Aran, 1971, pp. 70, 72, 75).

The committee that became known as the Rimalt Committee recommended the extension of compulsory free education by 2 years, and the reorganization of the education system to consist of 6 years of elementary school, 3 years of junior high school, and 3 years of secondary school. The committee recommended that school integration be implemented at the elementary school level, rather than being postponed to the intermediate level. The committee allowed 6 years period for implementing the extension of compulsory free education. It should cover the entire 14–15 age cohort until 1972, and the entire 15–16 age cohort until 1975. The committee did not set a deadline for the complete implementation of the structural change, nor was the structural change legislated.

The Knesset decision won great publicity. Those who reacted positively saw the structural change as an opportunity to improve educational achievements through the employment of academically trained teachers, a chance for interaction among students of diverse ethnic backgrounds, and an opportunity for students to make better informed decisions concerning secondary education. The negative reactions expressed concerns for the fate of elementary education. Taking away the older age groups may deprive younger students of idols to observe and follow. It was also feared that elementary schools will be depleted of senior teachers who will be transferred to teach in junior high schools. Another concern was that students' academic, social, and ethnic heterogeneity may promote tensions, rivalry, and isolation instead of promoting mutual respect and togetherness.

Aran was not naïve and warned that the proposed reform is not a magic wand that would instantly solve all problems. He anticipated many obstacles on the road to implementing the reform, as well as the rise of unforeseen problems for which solutions will have to be found. He was also aware of the possibility that some parents will try to evade the integrated junior high schools and send their children to selective schools. He was nevertheless confident that these issues will be properly addressed.

The recommendations of the Rimalt Committee were approved by the Knesset on July 29, 1968, and adopted by the government. The Knesset decision was not legislated into law. However, its legal standing is not merely declarative. A Knesset decision obliges the government to take action, and it remains in effect unless changed or made void by another Knesset decision. The Israeli Supreme Court treated the reform decision as legally binding but its unconditional support has eroded over the years as will be further explained (Gal, 1995; Gibton, 2004).

The reasons why the Knesset chose to refrain from legislating the reform remains unclear. After all, Knesset deliberations over both Compulsory Education Law-1949 and State Education Law-1953 reflected a sense of national mission and expressed

a desire to see these laws as first links in an emerging "education constitution." The great significance of the Knesset decision is, nonetheless, indisputable. According to Aran's own assessment, the implementation of the reform " . . . will make an historical contribution to the glorification of education in the state of Israel (Aran, 1971, p. 88)." Why, then not legislate the reform?

One can only speculate and suggest that Aran did not wish to delay the reform by going through a lengthy legislative procedure and considered the Knesset decision sufficient. He must have been aware that in the United States a profound reform, creating integrated schools for black and white students was initiated by Supreme Court ruling, not by law (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954; *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 1955). His major concern was the successful implementation of the reform and he was confident that the support for the reform of both Knesset and government will always remain forthcoming:

> . . . I'm confident that neither the Government not the Knesset will ever support proposals that are aimed intentionally or unintentionally at the eradication of the Reform (Aran, 1971, p. 76).

Aran could not have imagined in his most pessimistic visions that over the years the Israeli Supreme Court will not consistently support school integration, giving precedence to parents' right to choose a school, and that the support for integration will greatly depend on the prevailing social climate and the identity of the judges. Neither could he imagine that parents will break away from state schools to establish, with the blessing and financial support of government, quasi-private schools for their children and that the increasingly fragmented state education system would become more segregated and much less egalitarian.

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion reveals the strong commitment of the state of Israel to establishing a public (state) education system that would be under state authority and financed by public funds. State schools were regarded as a ruling instrument for achieving collective goals such as the ingathering of exiles, for solving social problems, such as inequality, and for educating future citizens. The Israeli case clearly demonstrates that solidarity among citizens and a strongly committed government are most significant in the building and sustaining of a viable public education system. Financial considerations were taken into account, but did not deter government from making massive investments of public funds in education. Ideological considerations clearly prevailed.

The desire was to continually expand public investment in education. Compulsory Education Law was regarded as a preliminary step only in the inclusion of all youngsters in the education system. The aspiration was clearly to expand the law and offer compulsory and free education in high schools and to preschoolers, and to make higher education accessibly to all. There had been consensus across

political and ideological lines concerning the ethos that guided the erection of a state education system and with the idea of total state responsibility for education.

The leading theme that runs through the first two education laws and the Knesset approval of the education reform is that of state responsibility for education. This responsibility was regarded as indivisible and total, responsibility that must not be transferred or delegated to organizations that are not directly accountable to the Knesset. In Minister Dinur's own words:

> State education means that education is under the *authority* of the state . . . the *responsibility* for education rests upon the state – the total, unshaken and indivisible authority . . . the state bears responsibility for deciding how the development of the younger generation be directed and guided . . . *national sovereignty means that the state is accountable for guarding the spiritual heritage . . . and therefore the state is not allowed to transfer the responsibility for its future to anyone, because the education of citizens guarantees the existence of the state.* What will the state look like should it transfer the defense of its borders to others? Such action would mean the renunciation of its independence, of its political existence, and would be a suicidal act . . . similarly, *transferring to others the responsibility for the future generation, its abilities and social happiness, the moral intellectual and technical level of each citizen represents a breach of trust, a violation of the duties of the state.*[31] [My emphasis, O.I.].

The total commitment of the state to education did not remain an empty promise, as can be learned from statements made by Aran upon retiring from his office as minister of education in July 1969:

> I served as Minister of Education and Culture for almost half the years of the existence of the state . . . I have never been deprived by the Knesset or by the government. Under the circumstances, I received the maximal assistance for implementing the Ministry's programs . . . education matters won a central place, and the budget of the Ministry has dramatically increased . . . during the years 1957–1961 the budget more than doubled . . . the treasury showed generosity toward the needs of education (Aran, 1971, p. 243).

The ethos of state education that was crystallized during the first two decades of statehood has eroded over the years and was replaced by the economic-managerial free market ethos. These developments will be discussed in the next chapter.

Notes

1. Knesset Member J. Shprintzak (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 13/07/1949, p. 999.
2. Knesset Member A. Sheptel (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 26/07/1949, p. 1157.
3. Knesset Member P. Ilanit (United Labor Party) Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 26/07/1949, p. 1144.
4. Knesset Member Z. Shazar (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 26/07/1949, p. 1162.
5. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset, (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 20/07/1949, p. 1100.
6. Aran was Minister of Education and Culture in 1955–1960, and during 1963–1969.

7. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 20/07/1949, p. 1101.
8. Knesset Member E. Raziel-Naor (Herut Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 20/07/1949, p. 1101.
9. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 20/07/1949, p. 1102.
10. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 23/07/1953, p. 1686.
11. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 20/07/1949, p. 1101.
12. Knesset Member Z. Shazar (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 2. 26/07/1949, p. 1160.
13. Professor Ben-Zion Dinur was Minister of Education and Culture during 1951–1955.
14. Ben-Gurion. D. (1953). "State Schools" (Beit hasefer hamamlachti). Speech made at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Israeli Labor Party (Labor Party), 6/2/1953. in his Hazon va-derekh, Vol. 3, p. 164.
15. Ben-Gurion. D. (1957). "The Purpose of State Education" (Megamat hachinuch hamamlachti). Speech made at the Pedagogical meeting of the Teacher's Union (17/10/1954). in his Hazon va-derekh, Vol. 5, p. 250.
16. Ben-Gurion. D. (1953)."The eternity of Israel" (Netzah Yisrael). (01/01/1953). in his Hazon va-derekh, Vol. 4, p. 282.
17. Knesset Member S. Persitz (General Zionist Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 11/08/1953, p. 2198.
18. Knesset Member R. Zabari (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1676.
19. Knesset Member I. Harari (Progressive Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1680.
20. Knesset Member M. Vilner (Communist Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1686.
21. Knesset Member D. Ben-Gurion (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 23/07/1953, p. 1696.
22. Knesset Member S. Persitz, (General Zionists), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1670.
23. Knesset Member Z. Shazar (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 23/07/1953, p. 1692.
24. Knesset Member S. Persitz, (General Zionists), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 11/08/1953, p. 2199.
25. Knesset Member B. Azania (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1681.
26. Dinur, B. (1953). "How should we implement state education?" (Keitzad natkin et hahinuh ha'mamlahti) Discussion of State Education, Meeting of the Central Committee of the Labor Party, 6/2/1953, p. 9.
27. Praver Committee file no.1514/2, protocol of meeting on 20/1/1966, p. 1.
28. Ibid., p. 1.
29. Ad-hoc Knesset committees are similar to permanent committees in terms of their structure, authority, and operation. They are appointed, however, for a designated period of time, and are dissolved once their mandated mission is achieved.
30. The Rimalt Committee. Protocol no. 3. 17/7/1966, p. 7.
31. Knesset Member B. Dinur (Labor Party), Divrei Ha'Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset), Vol. 14. 22/07/1953, p. 1659.

Chapter 6
The Retreat from State Education

In the present chapter the major steps of retreat from public education in Israel will be traced, and the most salient manifestations of the retreat will be discussed. I argue that the market gospel represents a total reversal of the Zionist vision of public education as well as drastic departure from the democratic purposes of education. The introduction of market in education in Israel, as we shall see, is manifested in educational policies and practices similar to those that have been discussed in previous chapters and seems to characterize educational reforms in many countries around the globe. The educational and social consequences of such practices must, nevertheless, be considered within the unique circumstances of Israeli society. I will begin by providing background information about social and cultural changes within Israeli society over the years and discuss the major rifts within Israeli society. Those changes and wide rifts facilitated the retreat from public education and paved the road for market reforms.

Israeli Society Transformed[1]

A public school system is founded in a sense of fraternity and solidarity among citizens who are willing to support schools through their taxes and send their children to integrated schools where core curriculum is being taught. It is also founded in strong commitment of the state to make quality education accessible to all children and to generously allocate the required financial resources. These two preconditions are becoming scarce in Israel making the future of public education doubtful and vague.

The creation of a welfare state in Israel was greatly inspired by the Zionist ethos. There has been consensus among all Zionist political parties, socialists and liberals alike, that the formidable historical tasks of nation-building, the ingathering and absorption of exiles, the building of a safe haven for the entire Jewish people, cultural revival and the revival of Hebrew should be the primary, indivisible, and non-transferable responsibility of the state of Israel. I argue that the introduction of free market ideology and practices that gained momentum since the mid-1980s was made possible by the decline of the Zionist ethos, as well as by demographic, cultural, political, and economic changes that greatly transformed

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_6, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Israeli society. Collective identities and goals are undermined by egocentrism, careerism, consumerism, and frenzied "new age" hedonistic lifestyles. The withdrawal from state education was also made possible by the exacerbated fragmentation within Israeli society and the growing rivalry and alienation among citizens.

Cultural and National Divides

A major attribute of Israeli society is the wide and deep rifts between religious and non-religious groups, between Israeli Arabs and Jews, between the political left and right, and between the rich and the poor, between newly arrived immigrants and veteran Israelis. These divides that often intersect and overlap represent contesting visions of Israel as a Jewish-democratic state and profoundly shape Israel's political culture. Israeli multiculturalism is reshaping collective identities and represents a continuous debate over the meaning of "Israeliness," "Jewishness," the rules of the game, and the criteria for distribution and redistribution of common goods (Kimmerling, 2001). Israeli society had been fragmented and sectarian already during the Yishuv period, but this has been viewed as a relic of the Diaspora that should be replaced by greater unity and cohesion following the regaining of independent statehood. Current Israeli multiculturalism often endorses social visions that do not necessarily value unity and cohesion (Ichilov, 2008).

The dynamic and ever-changing nature of Israeli society can be attributes mainly to the constant flow and at times to the massive waves of immigrants arriving from all over the globe. The waves of Jewish immigrants created a colorful and dynamic mosaic of cultures and traditions as well as dissatisfactions and conflicts. The Zionist ideology of wedding diverse Jewish communities into one nation has been replaced by a more pluralistic vision of Israeli society and culture (Ichilov, 2004). In the past new immigrants were placed upon arrival in absorption centers where they learned Hebrew and became acquainted with Israeli society. At present the state is more marginally and indirectly involved in the absorption of immigrants, and the vision is no longer the integration of immigrants into the main stream Israeli culture. Isolated enclaves of immigrants are acceptable. Immigrants get initial financial support ("absorption basket") and it is up to them to decide how and how far they wish to be integrated into main stream Israeli society (Ya'ar and Shavit, 2003). This method of absorption seems highly inadequate for Ethiopian immigrants and Olim (Jewish immigrants) from the Asian republics of the former USSR. These underprivileged communities need a much more massive state aid and support.

Current multiculturalism does not necessarily endorse solidarity and unity among Arabs and Jews as well. Israeli Palestinian-Arabs contest the legitimacy of Israel to exist as a Jewish-democratic state, and wish to radically transform it. It was claimed that Israel must cease defining itself as a Jewish state, and should divest itself of the anthem, the national symbols, and the Law of Return that allows all Jews to return to their ancestral homeland (The National Committee of Mayors of Arab Municipalities in Israel, 2006; Adalah, 2007). Thus, cohesion among Jews and between Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs is eroding.

Socioeconomic Rifts

Israel's current economic policy is clearly guided by liberal-capitalist ideology. Israel takes part in the global economy and joined the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), deregulating all services, including education, and allowing the operation of various modes of supply based on international competition. These changes transformed the contract between the government and Israeli citizens (Peleg, 2005; Rabin and Shany, 2004). The leading ethos is no longer that of an historical mission and indivisible responsibility of Israel for the fate of the Jewish people. Economic efficiency takes precedence over ideological and social considerations, commodifying services of infra-structural importance, which have been viewed as domains of government ownership and control (such as water, electricity, and transportation), and social services, such as health and education that were seen as governmental responsibilities, and as inseparable element of the exercise of governmental authority. Socioeconomic rifts are becoming deeper and wider. On the one hand business and professional elites are rising and on the other the number of families in need is soaring, and about one-third of the children in Israel currently live in households that are below the poverty line. It should be noted that there is one employed breadwinner in 38 percent of the poor families. Israel occupies a dishonorable place at the top of the inequality ladder among the industrialized nations (Ram, 2004; Swirsky, 2004). Simultaneously, government spending on welfare services, instead of increasing, considerably declined over the years. Israel's ranking on average welfare expenditure (as percentage of the GNP) is at the sixth place from the bottom among OECD countries (Achdut, Cohen and Endelbald, 2004).

There are also great discrepancies in the social needs and the availability of resources to meet such needs among local municipalities. Data reveal that in well-off municipalities, children form about 23 percent of the local population, while representing about 60 percent of the population in low socioeconomic localities (The Israeli Council for the Welfare of the Child, 2004, p. 14).

Municipalities that are in a budgetary crisis are typically those that serve poor populations with multiple social needs. The living conditions of children in needy families and poor communities greatly affect children's life chances and opportunities to acquire quality education. Underprivileged municipalities find it hard to invest in education and compensate for government budgetary cuts. Consequently, neither poor families nor poor municipal authorities can counterweigh the devastating effects of the dwindling public funds. Inequality of educational opportunities is intensified. The mean monthly expenditure on education of families in the upper income level was 1,360 Israeli Shekels, while that of families in the lower income brackets was about 360 Israeli Shekels (Kop, 2004; Central Bureau of Statistics, 2003).

The retreat of government from its social commitments is clearly a retreat from the Zionist vision of the nation's public responsibility and commitment to all citizens.

Manifestations of the Retreat from State Education

The withdrawal from public education took the form of seemingly isolated and unrelated steps that were adopted without democratic deliberation or legislation. Often, loopholes in existing legislation that was meant to buttress public education were cynically exploited to tear it down. Such steps included budget cuts; encouraging schools to raise funds from non-public sources; the growing numbers of "recognized" schools; the gradual introduction of school choice; growing involvement of business in education; and widespread use of standardized testing. The Dovrat report of 2005, as we shall see, was the first attempt to integrate all these practices into a comprehensive reform that would be legislated and implemented as a whole, following the US example of No Child Left Behind.

The Marginalization of Ideological Considerations

The first commitment that the newly born State of Israel took upon itself was financing compulsory free education. Legislators were acutely aware of the limitations imposed by the grave economic conditions and regretted that the state can provide only elementary compulsory and free education. However, this scope of coverage was remarkable and similar to the coverage provided by wealthier European countries. It manifested the unrelented commitment of the state to public education, a commitment that gave precedence to ideology over economic considerations. Members of the first Knesset proudly highlighted the financial commitment that Israel took upon itself, while facing the enormous task of the absorption of vast numbers of Olim (Jewish new immigrants) during a period of dire economic situation, and expressed the desire to provide a broader coverage once the economic situation improves.

Legislators were aware of the UN Declaration of Human Rights that was published a year prior to the legislation of State Education Law, 1949, recognizing education as a human right. The obligation of the state for the education of the younger generation, however, was rooted mainly in Zionist ideology, not in the discourse of human rights. The Minister of Education, Shazar regarded immigrant students as "returning exiles" that must be adequately welcomed and treated (Shazar, 1982, p. 98).

The discourse of children's rights in education was buttressed in 1991 when Israel ratified two international conventions: the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Subsequently, the Student Rights Law of 2000 was legislated, mentioning the right to education in a declarative fashion. The right to education is a positive right, charging the state with the financial burden for education. Paradoxically, however, while at present the discourse of human and citizenship rights is much more salient than during the first years of statehood, the commitment of the state for education has considerably eroded, and economic considerations have become supreme. It is reasonable to speculate that members of the first Knesset, who wished to expand the scope of

state responsibility for education once the economic situation improves, would have been greatly disappointed and displeased with Israel's present-day treatment of education. Needless to say that Israel's economy at present is far removed from the dire economic conditions that characterized the first years of statehood.

Compulsory free education has been expanded over the years and at present, education is compulsory until the end of the 10th grade, and free education until the end of high school (12th grade). All in all Israel provides 13 years of tuition-free education between the ages 5 and 18 (age 5 = compulsory preschool kindergarten).

Let us consider, however, how "free" free education is. As we have seen in Chapter 5, generous public funds were available for a great variety of educational activities, as well as for health and food services within schools. At present, education is free only as far as tuition and registration fees go. Parents have to pay an "education toll" (*Agrat Chinuch*) in the amount that is decided annually by the minister of education. "Free" does not cover parents' expenses on books and accessories, supplementary school programs, transportation, hot meals, and payments for school trips, school parties, and other activities. The ongoing transition from six days of schooling to five longer days of schooling means that parents and local municipalities will have to finance educational activities and programs on Fridays. The financial burden on families is substantial, a situation that affects most severely poor families and large families, as well as residents of poor municipalities.

Contrary to the wish of legislators during the first years of statehood to continuously expand compulsory and free education, legislation aiming at offering compulsory free education from the age of three and to students with special needs has been inadequately implemented. In 1984, Compulsory Education Law was amended, offering state-financed preschool education from the age of three. However, the implementation has been postponed year after year for financial reasons. The treasury estimated the cost of implementation at 900 million Shekels per year. The amendment began to be partially implemented only in 2000 in selected settlements. According to an optimistic assessment only about one quarter of the three to four age group is entitled to free education at present. In comparison, the highly costly Compulsory Education Law of 1949 was fully implemented within 3 years to include all children, Arabs and Jews, between the ages 5 and 13, when Israel's economic situation was grave. Wealthy Israel's treatment of education legislation can be interpreted as disrespect for the Knesset and as withdrawal from the state's responsibility for education. Economic considerations seem to override ideological ones, and the fervor to further expand free education subsided.

The government's closed hand and ungenerous heart toward education is visible also in the implementation of Special Education Law –1988. The law provided free special education for youngsters with special needs from age 3 until the age of 21. The state is obliged by the law to provide compulsory free education including the financing of treatments such as physiotherapy. It was also required that priority be given to the integration of children with special needs in regular schools instead of isolating them in specialized schools. In 2000, a committee ("the Margalit Committee"), appointed to examine the implementation of the Special Education Law, alerted the Ministry of Education to the urgent need of providing the necessary

resources to enable schools to properly care for integrated special education children (Ministry of Education, 2000).

In 2002, Compulsory Education Law was amended, and a clause was added allowing for the integration of special education students in regular schools and providing for their special needs within regular schools. Each special education student was to be assigned a package of services individually tailored for his/her needs that will accompany students and be delivered in any school of their choice. The long trail of appeals to the Supreme Court concerning the improper implementation of the amendment clearly reflects the current situation. The major obstacle is money again (Bar-Natan, 2004; Worgan, 2006).

What is the fate of the 1968 educational reform that raised very high expectations for achieving greater equality of educational opportunities and was so widely endorsed by the Knesset? The vision that the 1968 structural reform was striving to achieve was mainly to make high school education universally accessible and expand the number of students who enjoy it. Another major purpose was to accelerate inter-ethnic contacts among students by securing a heterogeneous students population in each school. However, the implementation of the 1968 structural reform was partial and incomplete, and as of 2008 the reform has not been fully implemented. The Knesset did not set a deadline for the full implementation of the reform, but clearly intended to see it implemented urgently. In 1978, 10 years after the Knesset decision, Zvulun Hammer, the then minister of education, appointed a committee to examine issues related to the pace and scope of the implementation of the educational reform. The committee reported that the primary obstacles were lack of funds, the wide socioeconomic rifts among students, and parents' objection to send their children to integrated schools (Nesher, 1996; Chen, 1997).

Despite obstacles and setbacks, the 1968 reform had remarkable achievements. First of all, a considerably larger part of the relevant age cohort acquired secondary education; intensive building of schools, laboratories, and sport facilities took place; and thousands of teachers pursued academic studies to upgrade their educational and professional qualifications. In the Ministry of Education, a special department was set to develop curricular materials, and psychological and counseling services were developed to guide and assist students (Zameret, 1971).

Over the years the number of junior high schools steadily grew from 32 in 1969/1970 to 500 schools in the academic year 2002/2003. In 1969/1970 only 11 percent of the relevant age group attended junior high school, and in 2002/2003 73 percent of the students were in junior high schools. However, the reform was not implemented in ultra-orthodox schools and was only partially implemented in Arab schools. This slow pace of implementation over a period of 30 years is disappointing, especially given the improved economic situation in Israel and the highly worthy social and educational purposes that the reform sought to achieve.

At present, about one-third of the students are still not enrolled in junior high schools. The Ministry of Education continues to pay lip service to the structural reform and school integration, but is not keen on completing the implementation of the structural reform. Instead, disregarding the Knesset decision of 1968, the

ministry encourages, supports, and finances the emergence of quasi-private schools and implements free market policies and practices in the educational system.

A central goal of the education reform of 1968 was the creation of a heterogeneous student body in each school. The steadfast support of the Supreme Court for school integration over parents' right to choose a school for their children has also enfeebled over the years. School integration proceeded through the mapping of educational districts and the assignment of children to schools by the authorities, at times against the expressed wishes of parents. Many appeals to the Supreme Court were registered over the years concerning school integration, mostly by dissatisfied parents who contested the assignment of school for their children. Since the Knesset decision of 1968, which was treated by the Supreme Court as a legislated law, until the beginning of the 1990s, the Supreme Court rulings reflected unconditional support for school integration, giving precedence to decisions made by the authorities over parents' right to send their children to a school of their choice. This position is clearly echoed in statements made by Supreme Court judges:

> The various legal directives concerning compulsory education clearly suggest that the parents cannot say to the education authorities 'I do not wish to accept free education granted by the state. I will choose the most suitable school for my children, and pay for it.' The parents are obliged by law to let the authorities decide . . . (Supreme Court Judge Kister, cited in Gibton 2004, p. 496).

> The Supreme Court cannot disregard the essence of the modern state, let alone a welfare state like ours. . .citizens take upon themselves obligations that inherently restrict their freedoms. . .citizens' welfare and wellbeing are subjected to the good of the public. . .such is the situation in education, one of the most important and sensitive action areas of the state, attempting to care for its future and prosperity, an area that the state is not allowed to trust solely in the hands of individuals. . .it will be inappropriate for this court to disregard the government policy, and grant parents their wish, thereby cracking the wall of the education reform whose success must be in the interest of every citizen (Supreme Court Judge Etzioni, cited in Gibton 2004, p. 496).

Analyses of the Supreme Court ruling since the 1990s reveal that the court's firm support eroded over the years and that the school integration ethos is no longer unconditionally supported (Gal, 1995; Gibton, 2004).

Declining Public Funds for Education

Diminishing government funding for education is one of the manifestations of the retreat from the Zionist vision of the state's commitment to public education. Summarizing his term as a minister of education during the formative period of the 1960s, Aran, who introduced a costly educational reform, praised the open hand and generous heart of the Ministry of Finance and the high priority that education enjoyed on the national agenda. This spirit of generosity continued to characterize the 1970s, where the annual growth of the budget of the Ministry of Education was 10 percent during 1970–1975, and 7 percent during 1975–1979 (Swirsky, 2004, p. 79). In the 1980s this trend was reversed and budget cuts became the dominant

pattern. Between 1980 and 1986 the mean annual decrease of the education budget was 0.3 percent, and in 1985 a budget cut of 16 percent was introduced (Kop, 1987). In the early 1990 the budget went up again to accommodate the massive wave of immigrants from the former USSR, but the increase barely brought the per-student budget to the level of 1980 (Shouldiner, 1996). Between 2000 and 2005 the education budget underwent a series of drastic cuts, adding up to more than 10 percent of the budget. Furthermore, since 1995, public expenditure on education did not grow proportionally with population growth and, between 2001 and 2005, decreased by 12 percent although the number of students increased by 7 percent. The result is that students are studying less hours in more crowded classrooms (Adva Center, 2005).

The national expenditure on education includes both public (i.e., government and local authorities' funds) and private (parents' payments and donations) funds. It, therefore, represents the overall expenditure on educational services in both public and private educational institutions, from preschool education to higher education, including the spending of local authorities on school buildings and equipments. Also included in the national spending on education are families' costs on tuition, books, accessories, etc. In Israel, the national expenditure on education, as a percentage of GNP, has been on the decline. It decreased, for example, from 9.7 percent in 2002 to 9.2 percent in 2003 and 9.1 percent in 2004. The per capita national expenditure on education went down by 2 percent in 2003 and by 1 percent in 2004 (Schwartz, 2006, p.1). Public spending on education is a major manifestation of a government's commitment to education. It is generally agreed that reduction in public spending on education and increase in families' costs intensify inequality of educational opportunities. Government expenditure in Israel went down from 80 percent of the total national cost in 1995 to 76.3 percent in 2001. Concomitantly, the share of families went up from 20 percent in 1995 to 23.7 percent in 2001 (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2006, Table 8.1). This level of government expenditure is above the mean in OECD countries which was 78 percent in 2003. However, it is much lower in comparison with many western European countries, notably Finland that took the lead in students' achievements on international tests (such as TIMMS and PISA). The public expenditure in Finland in 2003 was 98 percent of the total national spending on education, and the share of parents was only 2 percent (Schwartz, 2006, Table 3, p. 4). In such instances family earnings play a minor role in determining children's educational opportunities, while in Israel parents' income plays a significant role in determining youngsters' access to quality education.

Public expenditure on education is only one component of the Israeli government's social policy that represents drastic reduction of government's responsibility for social needs of children and their families. The overall decline of the welfare state in Israel strongly affects the living conditions of children, their access to quality education, and their educational achievements. School payments by well-established parents allow some schools to provide their students with richer school programs and facilities. This phenomenon, which has been labeled "grey education," proceeds with the unofficial approval of the Ministry of Education and signifies inequality of educational opportunities for students of poor families (Iram and Schmida, 1993). The decrease in public funding for education and the growth of

private investment by those who can afford to do so, clearly affects the accessibility to quality education for all children and broadens inequality in educational achievements and in long-term life chances. According to an economic assessment, it is unlikely that state funds will replace private funds in a foreseeable future (Klinov, 1989). This form of state education may, thus, reproduce and intensify socioeconomic rifts instead of creating an open future for all students.

Deregulation and Contracting

The Ministry of Education is engaged in deregulation and outsourcing of many services that were previously produced and supplied by it. Such services include counseling, curriculum development, continuing education programs for educators, and the building and maintenance of schools. The institution of a specialized department for curricular development, for example, was inspired mainly by the 1968 structural reform that created a need for developing suitable curricular materials for junior high schools in particular. There was also awareness of the need to continually examine and update curricular materials given the rapid accumulation of knowledge and innovations in the sciences and humanities. Instead of relying on ad hoc committees that were previously engaged in curriculum development, Aharon Yadlin, the then minister of education proudly announced in 1971 the founding of a department that would be engaged in curriculum development. The department that consisted of educators, scientists, and educational psychologists took charge of planning and preparing curricular materials, testing them out, and implementing them, including the instruction of teachers (Yadlin, 1971; Adan, 1971). At present, the role of the department has been reduced to outsourcing the production of curricular materials leaving a wide space to the initiative of commercial publishers.

The Cessation from State Schools: Diversity vs. Fragmentation

State Education Law-1953 attempted at creating an education system that will be unified but not monolithic allowing for content variations and choices. The legislators dreaded the politicization of education that was embedded in the pre-state educational "streams," but were confident that flexibility and choice will not be exploited for the re-fragmentation of state schools. The education system was viewed as a state instrument that should amalgamate fragmented exiles into a nation and provide democratic citizenship education. Division and separation were viewed as inevitable consequence of Diaspora life, and unity was cherished as a symbol of renewed national life. Education was regarded as "public good" that must be under the state's responsibility and control and generously supported through public funding.

Public educational systems must be flexible to allow for diversity and renewal. A distinction must be made, however, between diversity that enriches and fosters

public schools and fragmentation that destroys public education, by breaking the education system into a web of quasi-private schools that are massively financed through public funds.

The measures for creating diversity that were stipulated in the State Education Law of 1953 proved to be problematic and have been subverted to promote inequality and fragmentation rather than diversity within unity. The law allows for the inclusion of supplementary programs within state schools at parents' request. Supplementary programs can cover as much as 25 percent of the total study periods. Such programs, however, are not financed by the state and must be funded by parents and/or the local authorities. It is unlikely that poor parents and impoverished communities would be able to take advantage of the opportunity to adopt supplementary educational programs. Only well-established parents and wealthy municipalities can, thus, provide students with richer school programs and facilities. This phenomenon, which has been labeled "grey education," clearly fosters inequality of educational opportunities.

The most problematic clause, which greatly displeased both legislators and the general public, was adopted to allow the ultra-orthodox schools of Agudat Israel to persist and receive state money. It was probably assumed that the small ultra-orthodox communities are remnants of Diaspora life and will remain marginal or be totally integrated into main stream Israeli society. The law authorizes the minister of education to grant schools that are outside the state system ("unofficial schools") the status of "recognized schools" and to determine the requirements that such schools must comply with as prerequisite for obtaining state funding. These preconditions that include the implementation of national core curriculum have never been enforced in ultra-orthodox schools. Contrary to expectations, the ultra-orthodox schools are currently thriving. An additional school system, operated by the Sephardic ultra-orthodox party Shas, "The Spring of Religious Education," operates alongside the veteran Agudat Israel school system. These "recognized" schools that are outside the state education system do not follow state curriculum and are under the partial control only of the Ministry of Education, receive state funds that amount to 75 percent of the funds received by state schools. In addition, there are some ultra-orthodox educational institutions (mainly Talmud Torah) that are totally exempt from state control and receive 55 percent of the state schools' funding. The fact that as a rule, the ultra-orthodox public does not serve in the army and only marginally participates in the labor force, and on top of it operates private schools that are publicly funded, alienates many Israelis. Parents who break away from state schools often use the ultra-orthodox example as an excuse.

Since the mid-1980s magnet schools that are allowed to recruit students without being restricted to a particular educational district became an increasingly fashionable way of escaping state schools. Instead of adopting supplementary programs within existing state schools, parents establish new magnet schools seeking the approval of the ministry to become "recognized" schools. In 1991, a committee was set to examine the issue and offer its recommendations to the Ministry of Education. The committee (headed by Professor Kashti and better known as "the Kashti Committee") recommended the institution of a special unit in the ministry

that would be in charge of approving a limited number of such schools under specific circumstances only and supervising their conduct. Magnet schools were not permitted to selectively admit students, and their student body had to be heterogeneous by both socioeconomic criteria and scholastic achievements. These recommendations attempted to restrict the number of magnet schools, thereby preventing the escape of the better and more affluent students from state schools. The situation was reexamined by Professor Kashti and his colleagues in 2001. Their conclusion was that the recommendations, which were made and officially adopted a decade earlier, have never been implemented (Ministry of Education, 1991; 2001).

Cynically, a unit for the approval and supervision of magnet schools was founded within the Ministry of Education, but, contrary to the official policy, is engaged in mass approval of magnet schools (Ministry of Education, 2002). To justify this practice, state schools are portrayed indiscriminately as "regular schools that must be improved" and magnet schools are depicted as the innovative engines capable of setting an example to be emulated by failing state schools (Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 4). Most magnet schools, unlike public schools, selectively admit students and their students come mainly from the better educated and affluent families (Barak-Medina, 2007; Ministry of Education, 2001). At present, about one-third of all elementary schools excluding ultra-orthodox schools (530 out of 1,800 nationwide) are already "recognized" schools and the numbers are growing. Hundreds of middle schools and high schools have also become "recognized" schools (Barak-Medina, 2007). As a result, the education system is becoming increasingly fragmented into a series of magnet schools with distinct ideological "credo" (such as democratic schools), pedagogical philosophies ("open" schools), cultural distinction (Eastern traditions, Russian culture), or curricular focus (arts, sciences, etc.). Consequently, depleting public schools are progressively facing fierce competition with growing numbers of publicly financed quasi-private schools. State schools increasingly serve students of low socioeconomic background whose parents lack the resources to create "recognized" schools for them. This is both a manifestation and a consequence of the eroding solidarity among citizens, who act strategically to fulfill their interests without being concerned for those left behind. This is clearly a total reversal of the Zionist vision of the role and essence of state schools. Such massive changes proceeded without proper legislation and penetrated state education via legal voids establishing practices that clearly subvert the original intentions of legislators. The use of legal loopholes as escape route from state schools by parents' associations and private organizations, and the consequent proliferation of quasi-private "recognized" magnet schools that are supported by public funds, clearly subverts the explicit intentions of the legislators of the State Education Law of 1953. Subversion and avoidance of democratic deliberation processes concerning practices that totally transform state education is undeniably anti-democratic.

Home-Schooling

Home-schooling that represents the most drastic retreat from institutionalized schooling is being gradually introduced in Israel. In 1994, as the first requests from

parents for home-schooling were submitted to the Ministry of Education, a committee was appointed to examine the novel situation. It recommended the approval of home-schooling in exceptional instances only. Permission is granted for 1 year only but can be extended. Parents must submit a detailed curriculum and proof of its implementation to the ministry for approval. Occasional visits by ministry workers to make sure that children are indeed studying are an additional method of supervision. Home-schooling is a marginal phenomenon but seems to be growing. In 2003, the ministry reported 60 home-schooled children, and in 2007, 116 families were granted permission to home-school their children (Ministry of Education, 2006; Teachers Union, 2006; Raz (last update: September 22, 2008)).

Changing State Schools

Privatization of education is not necessarily reflected in the ownership of schools, but more so in how schools conduct themselves. Private education has consistently been in existence in Israel. In terms of ownership, nursery schools and kindergartens as well as schools and whole school networks were privately owned by NGOs (such as ORT, WIZO, Haddassa, Naamat, and Amal) or municipalities. However, they were integrated into the state education system, implemented state curriculum in schools, complied with the structural reform of 1968, and abided by the directives of the Ministry of Education. At present, market-related educational policies have been implemented in state schools. The introduction of free market ethos and practices profoundly transforms state schools, as well as the essence of education, and the roles of both teachers and school principals.

The market gospel was first articulated in the 1980s by Shimshon Shoshani, who served first as the Director of the Education Administration of Tel-Aviv-Jaffa and later on as General Director of the Ministry of Education during the term of Ministers of Education Itzchak Navon (Maarach) and Amnon Rubinstein (Meretz). He initiated the founding of two magnet schools in Tel-Aviv to attract well-to-do families to Tel-Aviv and prevent their migration to the suburbs. He first outlined his vision for the renewal of the education system in Tel-Aviv-Jaffa, and later on, as the Director General of the ministry, expanded the program to the entire education system.[2]

His proposals include the typical practices of privatization: Deregulation; parental choice of school; a system of achievements-based rewards and punishments; transforming schools into corporations; and introducing new managerial methods and ethos (such as TQM – total quality management). To justify the need for such a reform, which was intended to replace the structural reform of 1968, he pronounces that the old reform was unsuccessful in achieving its assigned goals. However, he attributes the presumed failure to drastic budget cuts, to partial or improper implementations of directives, and to the elimination of "Part II" of the school day that was designed to foster integration via after-school club activities and educational enrichment programs. He totally disregards the fact that despite

such obstacles and setbacks, the reform had remarkable achievements: A considerably larger part of the relevant age cohort acquires secondary education; intensive building of schools, laboratories, and sport facilities took place; and thousands of teachers pursued academic studies to upgrade their educational and professional qualifications (Zameret, 1971). Given this success, it was logical to suggest that the government should renew its commitment to the Reform of 1968 and provide the necessary resources for its successful implementation. Instead, a market-oriented reform was suggested, relieving government of much of its responsibilities concerning public education and creating entirely new rules of conduct. The education reform of 1968 that has been partially and often improperly implemented represents therefore the end of an era when the Zionist ethos of public education ruled supreme.

The implementation of market policies and practices in education gained momentum during the 1990s, especially when Shulamit Aloni and Amnon Rubinstein (both members of the Meretz party) served as education ministers. In 1992, Minister Aloni appointed two committees: A steering committee on school autonomy and a committee whose mandate was to explore issues related to allowing schools to raise money from non-public sources. Both committees are better known by the name of the persons who chaired them: the "Volunski Committee" and the "Gafni Committee," respectively (Ministry of Education, 1993a; b). When the reports were submitted, in 1993, Amnon Runinstein was the minister of education. The appointment of Gafni, an economist and former Governor of the Bank of Israel, to chair a committee on education was a novelty that signaled the supremacy of economic considerations over pedagogical and social ones.

According to the recommendations of the Volunsky Committee, autonomous schools should be patterned in a business-like fashion, and the principal would act as managing director of a corporation more than as pedagogical leader of a team of educators. School budget would be controlled by the principal, who is authorized to contract management and educational agencies, and purchase services. The principal would have the authority to hire and fire teachers and make decisions concerning tenure and other working conditions of teachers. Schools would be autonomous to set their unique educational goals, adopt a "credo," develop school curriculum, and conduct school-based achievements evaluation. It was recommended that each school will be run by a school board in which the school principal, teachers, representatives of the municipality, community, and parents will take part. At present, state schools are being gradually transformed into "autonomous" schools. School boards, however, have not been formed, and principals can only indirectly hire and fire teachers who are employed through manpower agencies for the implementation of supplementary school programs. Many schools have already become "autonomous" which means that not only "recognized" schools but also state schools are beginning to resemble a franchise of isolated autonomous schools.

The Gafni Committee recommended that schools should be encouraged to raise funds from non-public sources. This can be done by leasing school facilities, seeking donations and sponsorships, and through payments made by parents. Given schools' differential ability to raise money, it was recommended that a "national association

for education" be founded to allocate money for those schools that are incapable of raising funds. On January 18, 1994, the Education Committee of the Knesset rejected outright the recommendations made by the Gafni Committee. However, raising money by schools through non-profit organizations has been an established practice since 1994 and has been intensified ever since (Fishman, 2000).

The situation concerning fund raising by schools has become much more complicated in recent years. Anonymous donations are no longer the rule. Businesses are beginning to increasingly penetrate the schools in an attempt to display corporate social responsibility (CSR). Companies that are traded in the stock market are rated on a CSR scale based on four criteria: business ethics, work environment, human rights, and contribution to the community (Ha aretz, The Marker, June 16, 2006, p. 6). Business is seeking the implementation of curricular materials and programs in schools as well as being involved in fund raising and sponsorship of various programs and school events. It has been reported, for example, that the stock exchange authorities initiated the introduction of a compulsory new subject in high schools: learning about the stock exchange and why it is worthwhile to invest in the stock market (Ha aretz, The Marker, April 26, 2006, p. 4; Ha aretz, April 7, 2007, p. 6). A supermarkets chain implements in several middle schools in Israel a program of consumer education. Participating schools receive colorful brochure which contains curricular materials and suggested activities that would presumably inculcate "responsible consumerism." Some activities take place in the local supermarket. The program was first implemented in three schools without the authorization of the ministry and, in 2003/4, when an official approval was obtained was expanded to include three more middle schools. Analysis of the program revealed that it mainly promotes consumerism and brand-name loyalty (Stein, 2007). There are many additional examples of business involvement in curricular activities that form the core of education. These include a pharmaceutical corporation that provides chemistry lessons and a cellular company that offers technological instruction.

The policy of the Ministry of Education concerning the various forms of business involvement in schools is stated in a directive issued by the Director General on April 2006 (Ministry of Education, 2006). The ministry does not reject categorically the involvement of business in education. Instead, a Committee for the Authorization of Incorporating Commercial Advertisings in Schools was appointed by the Director General of the Ministry of Education to examine and approve or deny business initiatives for various school interventions. Overt advertising in schools is categorically denied, and schools are instructed to prevent business from collecting in school information about students, such as phone numbers. The consent of the school principal is another precondition for the involvement of business in schools. The permit to form such partnerships is limited to 1 year and can be extended or revoked sooner if the rules of the game are broken. However, the ministry does not supervise the operations of business in schools, and there are no explicit sanctions to be imposed upon businesses that deviate and misbehave. Supervision is trusted to the self-control of business and to school principals and parents. A recent study revealed that school principals are often co-opted by business and regard the partnership as recognition of their managerial competences. They also become dependent

on the resources provided by business. This may clearly interfere with their ability to critically supervise the conduct of business in their schools (Stein, 2007).

Business involvement in curricular matters should be of special concern to educators. It can defy and subvert the pedagogical and democratic purposes of education. Earlier in 1918 Thorsten Veblan, a prominent American sociologist, expressed his concerns about the involvement of business in higher education saying:

> The intrusion of business principles in the universities goes to weaken and retard the pursuit of learning, and therefore to defeat the ends for which a university is maintained (Veblen, 1918).

Schools are more vulnerable than universities because younger children are more impressionable and at greater risk than university students and professors. Business must be categorically prevented from penetrating the education public space.

School Choice

Since the enactment of State Education Law in 1953, Jewish parents had a choice between regular and religious state institutions, and Arab parents had a choice between Hebrew and Arab state schools. "Unrecognized" schools were almost exclusively Jewish ultra-orthodox institutions or private church schools (Ichilov and Mazawi, 1997). Local authorities had total control over the assignment of students to educational institutions from kindergartens through high school. Students were assigned to schools within defined education zones based on families' place of residence. In 1992, Amnon Rubinstein, the then minister of education, appointed a committee to examine the issue of school choice. Headed by Professor Dan Inbar, the committee that submitted its recommendations in 1994 became known as "the Inbar Committee." The committee rejected the view that choice should serve as means for upgrading schools by creating competition among schools (Ministry of Education, 1994). The recommendations advocate instead, contrary to the conventional market wisdom, that all schools must be improved prior to the introduction of choice. It is claimed that "real choice" is the choice among "equivalent" schools and not among better and failing schools. Diversity of content should preferably exist within schools rather than among schools, but schools should be allowed to distinguish themselves as long as "vertical" distinction (i.e., differential quality of education) is eliminated. The recommendations do not relieve the state of its responsibility for making quality education accessible to all students, and school upgrading could be a long and costly process. The state, not market forces, must upgrade all schools prior to the implementation of choice. As might well be expected, these recommendations have never been implemented.

From the 1990s many municipalities adopted a practice known as "controlled choice". It means that parents can choose among several designated state educational institutions and are requested to rank them from the most to the least desirable. The local authorities are those who make the final decision concerning the assignment of students to schools. The authorities, presumably, take parental

preferences into account, but are primarily responsible for ensuring that heterogeneous student population by ethnic, socioeconomic, and scholastic criteria is present in each school. In reality, local authorities are reluctant to confront displeased parents and priority is given to accommodating parents' wishes (Ichilov and Mazawi, 1997).

"Controlled choice" applies to state schools only. But, as we have seen, parents can avoid state schools altogether and make a choice among a great variety of "recognized" magnet schools that selectively admit students. They may, likewise, choose to establish a new magnet school for their children or home-school them. Controlled choice seems to offer some choice to users of state schools. It could also encourage and accelerate the flight of students of better educated and wealthier parents from state schools.

Teachers' Status and Terms of Employment

The introduction of market-related policies and practices clearly undermine the professional autonomy of teachers, depreciate their status, and deteriorate their working conditions and terms of employment. As a rule, public school teachers are public employees. High school teachers are typically employed by municipalities or by educational chains that own the schools (such as WIZO and ORT). The salary and working conditions of all teachers are determined by law and by agreements reached periodically through collective bargaining between teachers' unions and their employers. However, State Education Law-1953 allows for the implementation of supplementary educational programs at the expense of parents and/or the municipality. To implement supplementary programs, auxiliary teachers are hired on a part-time basis. A directive issued by the ministry of education stipulates that the hiring and firing of auxiliary teachers and their working conditions must be identical to those of the permanent teaching staff (Ministry of Education, 2002). These instructions are not observed creating two classes of teachers: permanent teachers that are state or municipality employees and auxiliary teaching power that is employed mainly through various employment agencies. The employment of the latter is gaining momentum in both state schools and in the various magnet schools. The costs of employment of such teachers are lower, and they are often hired to teach subjects that are part of the core curriculum, not merely for the implementation of supplementary programs.

Budgetary cuts resulted in a reduction of study periods in schools and dismissal of teachers. Consequently, many schools cannot afford to domestically "produce" various educational programs and services, including the teaching of core curriculum subjects, and contract various educational agencies. At present, thousands of teachers are employed by employment agencies and NGOs, some of which were founded by parents to establish and operate "recognized" magnet schools. To cut down on expenses, such agencies do not employ the permanent school staff but employ their own teachers instead. These teachers are employed at lower salaries

and are often paid per hour. To cut down on expenses, NGOs and employment agencies fire and rehire teachers each year. This prevents teachers from accumulating social entitlements that are mandated by the labor laws for workers who work consecutively. Such practices clearly violate the explicit instructions of the ministry. However, to allow school principals to cope with budgetary cuts, such practices often receive the silent approval of the ministry (Worgan, 2006; Union of High School Teachers, 2006; Ha aretz, July 2, 2006; Ha aretz, July 9, 2006). These exploitative and unjust methods of employment interfere with the professional autonomy of teachers, create an insecure working environment, undermine the ability of teachers' unions to provide protection, and further deteriorate the prestige of the teaching profession.

Requiem to State Education: The Dovrat Committee

The "National Task Force for the Advancement of Education in Israel," better known as the Dovrat Committee, was appointed by Limor Livnat, minister of education in 2001–2006. Following the lead of the United States "No Child Left Behind" reform that was legislated into law in 2002, it was recommended to implement the proposed comprehensive reform as a whole and to enact it into law (Ministry of Education, 2005). The recommendations represent a total reversal of the ethos of public education that predominated the first two decades of statehood, transforming education from a public good into a commodity that is produced and distributed through market mechanisms. Symbolically, Shlomo Dovrat, a businessman from the private sector, was appointed to chair the committee. In the past, Supreme Court Judges, Knesset members, educators, and intellectuals chaired committees on education.

Educational reforms in the global age can be classified into three main categories based on the main goals they seek to achieve and on the size of public investment in their implementation. Competitiveness-driven reforms and equity-driven reforms, are characterized by massive public investment in education. The purpose is to promote greater equality of educational opportunities and to produce highly qualified "human capital" to allow for greater competitiveness in the global markets (Apple, 2004; Carnoy, 1999). In contrast, finance-driven reforms are motivated mainly by the desire to minimize budgetary deficits, transferring resources from the public to the private sector (Carnoy, 1999). Such policies are often adopted under pressure of international financial institutions such as the World Bank and international trade agreements such as GATS (Woodhall, 1991). Finance-driven reforms are prevalent in the global age and can be observed in the United States, United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, member countries of the OECD, Brazil, and Chile.

The education reform proposed by the Dovrat Committee is clearly a finance-driven reform. To obtain the initial support of the Treasury, Minister Livnat guaranteed that no additional public funds will be required and that the reform can be carried out within the ever-shrinking budget of the ministry.

The recommendations include policies and practices that characterize finance-driven reforms. Schools are expected to improve without additional funding or professional assistance as a result of external pressures. These include competition among schools in the form of "controlled" choice and a system of rewards and punishments based upon standardized achievement tests. It is a comprehensive reform that embraces the entire education system from the structure of the ministry to the functioning of schools. It includes changes of administrative nature, changes concerning the role of teachers and school principals, their training, career opportunities, and work conditions. Junior high schools that formed the core of the 1968 reform are abolished, as well as the assertion made in State Education Law of 1953 that each school is by default a state school, unless assigned a different status (such as "recognized school"). The reform adopts and legitimizes the privatization steps that have been introduced over the years such as parental choice, school autonomy, and the proliferation of public-funded quasi-private magnet schools.

It is proposed that the ministry of education will be trimmed off, decentralized, and will remain in charge of formulating educational policy. Its operational responsibilities will be delegated to the municipal and school levels. Municipalities could contract various NGOs to operate schools. Given the great socioeconomic discrepancies among municipalities, decentralization that is not accompanied by the allocation of special public funds to poor communities is likely to exacerbate inequality of educational opportunities.

The underlying premise of the Dovrat reform is that education should be run in a business-like fashion and become efficient. This economic-managerial view of education defies the distinction between organizations that process raw materials and organizations that "process" human beings. As was mentioned in previous chapters, one of the striking differences is that manufacturers can turn down raw materials that do not comply with their high-specified standards. Public schools, in contrast, are obliged to unselectively admit all children including children from broken homes, children of poor families, abused children, children with various disabilities, and the more-talented and the less-talented ones. Raw materials can be uniformly processed while schools must differentially cater to children's needs and take into account variations in learning styles, motivation to study, and the time it takes to learn a specific subject. Public schools must assure each child of an open future, a future that is not restricted by gender, ethnicity, nationality, race, or socioeconomic conditions. Business enterprises are accountable to their shareholders only while public schools are accountable to the entire society. Thus, the pedagogical-humanist view of education considers the empowerment of highly qualified teachers, who regard education as a mission to be key factor in the improvement of education. School principals should be primarily pedagogical leaders, who work with teachers as a team to provide appropriate solutions for the needs of each child. According to the managerial approach, principals are primarily managers of an education corporation, and teachers' primary responsibility is to "produce" high scores on standardized achievement tests. Education becomes a quantified commodity, instead of being perceived as a long-term process of personal development, maturation, and growing sophistication and understanding (Levin, 1988; Cohen, Kulik and Kulik, 1982; Fitz-Gibbon, 2000).

A central recommendation of the Dovrat reform is the abolition of junior high schools. Creating middle schools with unique characteristic and social and pedagogical mission was the core of the 1968 structural reform. This structural reform was inspired by the desire to achieve the following educational and social goals:

1. Allowing all students to make the most of 12 years of schooling by realizing their capacities to the full. It is our duty and responsibility to ensure such equality of education for all children.
2. To uncover students' talents and qualifications and in that way provide them with guidance.
3. To improve the educational achievements of students who arrived from Islamic countries.
4. Expand the number of students who enjoy high school education.
5. Accelerate inter-ethnic contacts among the younger generation.
   (Aran, 1971, pp. 75, 78).

Junior high schools formed the first stage of secondary education, but were autonomous and distinct from both elementary and secondary schools, in terms of administration and management, curriculum, and their educational staff, and admitted all students without selection. Through the exposure to a wide array of learning and educational experiences that were offered in these comprehensive schools, students became aware of their talents and inclinations, and could pursue their high school education in a school that would suite them best. As was mentioned earlier, in spite of budget cuts and inappropriate implementation, the 1968 had very significant achievements, notably, making high school education universally accessible and increasing the number of high school students and graduates (Zameret, 1971).

The 1968 reform represented the end of the era of the Zionist ethos of public education and the unconditional commitment of the state for providing all children indiscriminately with quality education. The abolition of junior high schools thus has symbolic, as well as social and educational implications. The ideal of integrated schools is abandoned, together with the ideal of equality of educational opportunities. An education system consisting of 6 years of elementary school and 6 years of high school compels students to make decisions and choices prematurely at the end of elementary school. Dropout rate may consequently increase. Competition among high schools in an attempt to attract the better prepared students and those who come from well-off families would exacerbate inequality of educational opportunities.

One of the recommendations of the Dovrat Committee is, in particular, a final blow to and an ultimate retreat from state education as it was enacted in the State Education Law of 1953. Instead, public-funded private education is instituted and legitimized. The controversial term "private education" is not mentioned in the Dovrat report. Instead, it is suggested that "two types of education institutions will be in existence – public and not public" (Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 212). "Not public" is clearly private. The starting status of each school is by default "not public." Schools can decide if and to what extent they wish to become "public." A "not public" school that wishes to become "public school" must take the initiative

to qualify for such status. The extent of a school's "publicness" is determined by the number of criteria that the school is willing to adopt. These criteria include the partial or full implementation of core curriculum and the unselective admission of students. The scope of a school's "publicness" will determine the amount of public funding received, ranging between 35 percent of the budget for "not public" schools to 65 percent for schools representing the top of the "publicness" ladder. All schools regardless of their scope of "publicness" will also receive public funds to cover 85 percent of the cost of supplementary services. Thus, for example, a school that admits students selectively, and expels underachieving students, but is characterized by "systematic teaching" and partially or fully implements the core curriculum, will be entitled to public funding in the amount of 35 percent of the budget and 85 percent of the cost of supplementary services (Ministry of Education, 2005, p. 214).

The implementation of these recommendations would put an end to public schools that are fully supported by public funds. Even the most "public" school will have to raise a substantial portion of its budget from non-public sources, including parents.

The current distinction between state schools and "recognized" schools will be erased. The only distinction among schools will be based on the extent of their "publicness." However, the criteria for determining the degree of schools' "publicness" remain vague and unsupervised. How would the various criteria be operationally defined? For example, what are the indications of "systematic teaching?" What would amount to "partial" or "full" implementation of the core curriculum? Who would be in charge of determining the degree of schools' "publicness?" Who would periodically examine schools' compliance with the required criteria? The ministry has had very poor record of supervising existing magnet schools to ensure non-selective admission of students and the existence of socioeconomic and scholastic heterogeneity within each school (Ministry of Education, 2001). Supervising each school within the system is a highly costly enterprise. The inevitable conclusion is that the recommendations leave the school system totally unsupervised, deregulated, and fragmented.

The Dovrat reform was not legislated, however, the market ethos reigns supreme, and market-oriented policies and practices continue to be implemented without legislation or appropriate democratic deliberation.

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion reveals that the state of affairs of public education in Israel is bleak. In the previous chapter I traced the process of erecting the education public space and the ethos that guided it. Ben-Gurion, Israel's first Prime Minister who articulated and implemented the idea of "statehood" in all social spheres, assigned vital importance to the institutionalization of state education and considered the State Education Law as one of the two most significant laws that define the destiny

of the Jewish-renewed statehood. The significance of this law, he declared, is comparable with that of the Law of Return that grants all Jews the right to return to their ancestral homeland.[3]

He suggested that the day of the declaration of state education should become one of the commemorated days in Jewish history, alongside May 14, 1948, which marks Israel's declaration of independence.[4]

State schools were regarded as national instrument for fusing diverse Jewish exiles into a unified nation, reviving ancient traditions and developing a renewed Hebrew culture, developing a sense of citizenship and independence, and creating affinity among Jews and between Jews and Arabs. State schools were expected to promote equality and give each child a chance to have an open future.

State education was child-centered. The Ministry of Education was preoccupied with how to offer children the best education that would allow them to grow strong, healthy, and well educated. The activities of the ministry branched to embrace the provision of milk, hot meals, producing curricular materials, developing compensatory programs, and providing a great variety of curricular and extracurricular programs. The treasury generously supported the expanding educational needs. Ideological considerations dominated, and the economy was expected to serve the pursuit of national goals rather than determine these goals.

Legislators did not wish to create a monolithic state system and allowed for flexibility and variations. They made it explicitly clear, however, that such provisions must not be exploited for the secession from the state system, and variations must be contained within state schools.

State education is no longer viewed as state tool for achieving collective goals, nor is it regarded as public good that is financed, produced, and distributed by the state. Education seems to be stripped off any sense of common purpose and clear objectives. The retreat from public education is, therefore, a retreat from the Zionist vision of public education.

Education is no longer child-centered either. Economic considerations take precedence and delay or prevent the implementation of laws legislated by the Israeli house of representatives – the Knesset. The needs of young children, children with special needs, and children in poverty, for example, are not met with the love and generosity that characterized the public education ethos. The major concern of government is how to be efficient and cut down expenses instead of being preoccupied with how to best serve children. The supremacy of the treasury over the Knesset that embodies the sovereignty of the people is clearly anti-democratic. So is the subversion of existing legal provisions to allow for the decentralization and deregulation of education. Step by step without proper democratic deliberation and legislation, state education is being transformed and eliminated.

Schools are increasingly becoming centered on quantified achievements and are much less concerned with youngsters' overall development and maturation through education. The pedagogical-professional vision of education that is child-centered has been marginalized and the managerial-economic ethos reigns supreme. The roles of teachers and school principals are also changing in accordance with the managerial-economic ethos that guides the schools. The education system is being

increasingly fragmented into a series of autonomous isolated schools that articulate their own "credo." Such schools can only reproduce and intensify existing rifts and exacerbate inequality of educational opportunities.

The meticulously documented case of the creation of public education in Israel and of the retreat from state schooling demonstrates that markets in education are not merely technical means for achieving greater efficiency. Both the rise and decline of public education are closely linked to the ideology and political philosophy that underlie modern societies. There has been a shift over the years from intellectual rejection of the market mechanism highlighting its inadequacies, to elevating markets to an iconic status, advocating the implementation of markets in all social spheres (Sen, 1999). Government's commitment to public education is of crucial significance for the existence of viable public schooling and so is the dedication of institutions such as the courts, to the ethos and ideology that underlie public schooling. Governments must be aware that equity-oriented and efficiency-oriented considerations are often at odds with one another and that the far-reaching powers of the market in education must to be curbed and supplemented by the creation of equal educational opportunities for quality education to promote social equity and justice.

The Israeli case reveals that citizens' commitment to public education is fostered by the existence of bonding conditions and a strong sense of solidarity and common destiny. Existing social rifts and the loosening of social bonds among citizens encourage withdrawal from public schools. Unity must not imply lack of pluralism. However, in order to achieve solidarity, pluralism must fit within a certain kind of overarching unity and certain ultimate values must be shared (Janowitz, 1983; Etzioni, 1992; Ichilov, 2003; 2008; Ichilov, Salomon and Inbar, 2005).

Notes

1. A comprehensive analysis of change is clearly beyond the scope of this chapter. Only major changes that are related to the retreat from state education will be briefly discussed.
2. His program for the renewal of the entire education system included a proposal for a structural reform that has not been implemented and will not be discussed here.
3. Ben-Gurion. D. (1957). "The Purpose of State Education." (Megamat hachinuch hamamlachti). Speech made at the Pedagogical meeting of the Teacher's Union (17/10/1954). In his *Hazon va-derekh*, Vol. 5, p. 250.
4. Ben-Gurion. D. (1953). "The eternity of Israel" (Netzah Yisrael), (01/01/1953). In his *Hazon va-derekh*, Vol. 4, p. 282.

Chapter 7
The Future of Public Education

The foregoing discussion in this book revealed that the market gospel does not deliver the promised results and defies the democratic purposes of education. Faith in public institutions, democracy, and fellow citizens is being replaced by a secular faith that draws its inspiration not from the democratic social metaphor of community and cooperation, but from the market metaphor of individual interest and competition. The consumer market place defies pluralism and "tends to colonize every sphere and sector, even though it maintains the fiction of pluralism. . . Commercializing capitalism mandates the infiltration and penetration of noncommercial spheres in order to maximize profitability" (Walzer, 1983, p. 223).

The introduction of markets reflects ideologies that seek to redefine the boundaries between the public and private realms, to diminish the role of the state in both domains, and to advance market practices in the delivery of social services including education. The loss of governmental power and control and the transfer of power from elected political authorities to unrepresentative and un-elected bodies, such as corporations and NGOs, undermine the autonomy of individuals and nations alike and, thus, endanger the fulfillment of all citizenship rights (Rifkin, 1995; Barber, 1995; Kiernan, 1997). Educational ends are complex and must be decided publicly. However, market policies tend to play down the role of political structures and decision making in education in favor of letting the market and its consumers decide.

Public school systems are becoming a franchise of isolated semi-privatized institutions, drifting away from the collective missions of public schools in democracy. Deregulation grants schools a false autonomy. In reality, educators are far less autonomous to act upon professional, social, and ethical considerations. They operate under the threat of the tyranny of standardized tests that commodify education, redefine the essence of teaching and learning, and what is valuable knowledge. Educators are forced into the so-called business–school partnerships in order to raise money being faced with severe cutbacks of public funds. The commercialization of education that goes hand in hand with the privatization of education defies both the democratic and humanist agendas of education by promoting ". . .excessive adherence to financial return as a measure of worth" (Brown, 1993, p. 451). Business–school partnerships indoctrinate and manipulate children into the commercialized consumer culture whose ethos can be summarized as "I shop therefore I am." Schools, thus, betray their public mission.

O. Ichilov, *The Retreat from Public Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-9570-2_7, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Are markets more efficient than government in delivering educational services?

Scholars and policy makers tend to overlook the possibility that market policies can introduce inefficiencies and exacerbate problems. Decline in the number of students, for example, could trigger a downward spiral that could last a long while because unattractive schools do not close abruptly. Such schools may be forced to cut down programs, fail to make revenues, consequently losing more students. Those students who are unable to leave could be studying in impoverished schools that cannot provide them with the quality education they deserve. Overall, existing research on the various models and components of markets in education provides a mixed picture. While some studies suggest positive impacts, others report of neutral or negative effects. Cumulative results from charter school research in the United States indicate that, on the whole, charters perform similarly to traditional public schools. The advantages of markets over public delivery of education have thus far remained invisible on a large scale. The disadvantages, however, are glaring. I argue that markets must not be primarily assessed by criteria such as cost effectiveness and test scores. Its consequences for democracy must supersede all other criteria. For the sake of argument, let us assume that research would prove dictatorship to be more efficient than democracy because decision-making processes in dictatorship are less cumbersome, faster, and more decisive. Would we be willing to replace democracy, however imperfect, by dictatorship? The democratic and humanistic ideas embodied in public education have been undermined by markets and should be restored. Public schools should be improved not by ideas and practices that are alien to their essence and transform their identity and mission.

Can public education be restored to fulfill its democratic purposes? Does it have a future? The foregoing discussion in this volume of the retreat from public education in Israel and in many other countries may lead to a pessimistic conclusion concerning the future of public schooling. Given international processes of globalization and the preeminence of postmodern and multicultural ideologies, given the iconized status of markets, and the already fragmented and market-dominated public education systems, serious doubts can be raised about the future of public schooling. It also remains unclear how interested in social cohesion and unity are citizens of multicultural societies or of societies that are dominated by postmodern ideologies? Will citizens be willing to support public education through their taxes? How willing are parents to send their children to integrated schools? Will governments resume their commitment to public education reinvigorating public schooling, and will they be willing to provide the consistent flow of public funding necessary for doing so?

I believe that the pendulum can swing back, and at the same time stress that I do not envision a return to a golden age that has never existed nor do I attempt to idealize the current state of public education. Schools must be improved. However, trusting the improvement of public schools mainly to market processes will only exacerbate existing problems. School improvement is a fundamental responsibility of government and must not be left to the interplay of market forces.

What are the fundamental principles for a public education system that is loyal to the democratic purposes of education and to children's right to quality education?

In the discussion that follows, suggested principles are not necessarily mutually exclusive, nor are they exhaustive. They echo ideas that are prevalent in modern democratic theory, social democracy, and humanistic pedagogy. They are simultaneously child-centered and sensitive to children's rights and needs, as well as to the desire of democracies to be reproduced from generation to generation.

Reinvigorating Public Education

Raising Public Awareness

The public education movement, once considered one of the most progressive movements in recent history, is currently being defamed and aggressively replaced by market ideology and practices. To restore public faith in public education, people must become aware of the faults and damages caused by markets. The foregoing discussion revealed that the market gospel is premised on false assumptions, that market policies do not deliver the promised results, and that markets defy the democratic purposes of education.

The public must realize that markets in education, and the formulation of education policies and practices through decision-making processes dominated by business, are not necessarily fashioned in the best interest of democratic society. There are clear limits to corporate responsibility. Even the most civic-minded companies are primarily accountable to making profits for their shareholders. A democratic society is "a society where no social good serves or can serve as a means of domination" (Walzer, 1983, pp. xiv–xv). The power of money must not allow business a legitimate advantageous access to shaping the ideology and behaviors of government, citizens, and educators.

Challenging Consumerism

Consumer capitalism heavily relies on the deliberate manipulation of consumer demand and is exploitative, fabricating, or subverting the needs and desires of the individual. Advertising plays a central role in today's consumer culture. Galbraith (1958), for example, maintains that "many of the desires of the individual are no longer even evident to him. They have become so only as they are synthesized, elaborated, and nurtured by advertising and salesmanship. . ." (p. 2). Consumerism is bonding people through brand loyalties, forging identities, and images via the consumption of goods. The current extent of children's immersion in consumer culture is unprecedented. In the past, consuming was modest in comparison to other activities, such as work, play, school, and religious involvement. Now, marketed leisure has replaced unstructured socializing, and most of what children do revolves around commodities. Many American youngsters believe that their clothes and brands describe who they are and define their social worth (Cronin, 2000;

2004). Consumerism represents the opposite of what education is. Education is about empowering youngsters to make conscious and willful choices, cultivating the belief that human beings are of intrinsic worth no matter what their material possessions are. Commercialized schools promote the consumerist culture. Turning children over to the market assures that they will be treated as an expense to be reduced or a resource to be harvested (Molnar, 1996). School commercialism may also interfere with youngster's ability to critically evaluate candidates for public office. Politicians too are aggressively advertised and sold to the public during election campaigns using similar techniques to those promoting branded commodities.

Markets must be kept out and away from schools. Schools must remain free of the presence of business and advertising. It is the responsibility of schools to educate students to think critically about consumerism, contemplating the consequences of the consumerist culture for society, for the environment, and for themselves. Parents too must take an active role in the de-commercialization of childhood and schools. Students should learn to decipher commercials, understand their manipulative intentions, and be able to resist the temptations. Rejecting the consumerist culture could invigorate solidarity among citizens and make them realize that markets cannot fulfill the democratic mission of education.

Regaining Democratic Control over Education

Public education has been associated with the very essence of democratic statehood, as it relates to both sovereignty and the social contract which grounds it. Democratic deliberation should aspire to be inclusive, without disadvantaging particular groups and without letting specific interest groups eclipse the interests of others. Yet, markets in education clearly allow business and parents, especially parents who are better off, a highly prominent role concerning education. Market policies tend to play down the role of political structures and democratic decision-making processes in education in favor of letting the market and its consumers to decide.

Markets, no doubt, perform vital social tasks and are a legitimate stakeholder when it comes to education. The problem begins when markets invade and overtake public domains, such as education, and subvert the public missions of the invaded spheres.

The entry of markets into the sphere of public education blurs the distinction between public and private schools, gives ascendancy to the private, individual goals of schooling over its collective, public purposes, and erodes government's responsibility and democratic processes of decision making by transferring control to parents and business, and away from public deliberation and control. Cookson (1994) warns that the market should be the servant not master. Public schools must regain the characteristics and ways of conduct that would allow them to fulfill their democratic purposes and public mission. The boundaries of the education public sphere must be re-drawn via broad citizenship participation in democratic deliberation processes, not via external pressures exerted by international economic institutions,

globalized business enterprises, and NGOs, nor by internal pressures of parents and local business. Governments should exercise their legitimate power to regain control and regulate the public education sphere. The public sphere represents the core sovereignty of governments and consists of responsibilities and assets that must not be delegated, outsourced, or sold to corporations or NGOs. Democratically elected governments are public trustees in charge of public goods. Their main duty is to make the good life accessible to present and future generations of citizens.

The mandate of public schools is to develop "human resources" that would nurture all spheres of social life and to secure quality education for all children. It is a core responsibility of the government to create the optimal conditions for the adequate functioning of public schools. A major responsibility of government is to make sure that public schools are properly funded, instead of making schools raise money through family fees and from non-public sources. Educators must focus on educating youngsters not on fund raising.

Inadequately funded schools, however efficient, rarely provide quality education. Schools need adequate funding and support and assistance in righting the balance when wide disparities exist between one place and another. Equalizing funds that would cover the cost differences between poor and rich communities and districts must be allocated. Gutmann (1987) claims that the decision to involve other institutions (libraries and television in particular) in democratic education must rely on a thorough examination of the democratic purposes of these institutions and consequently if and how a democratic society should allocate authority over to them. By these criteria it is highly unlikely that corporations would qualify as partners in the education of future citizens. Markets can offer no guidance on matters of justice and fairness that are at the heart of democratic societies and that should be at the heart of its schools and other institutions. Schools should be declared a public space which is totally free of any school–business partnerships. Advertising in schools and on school buses must be strictly banned as well as providing schools with instructional packages. Schools must not be driven into disputable partnerships because of financial want. It is the responsibility of democratic governments to liberate schools from their financial dependency upon business and to provide adequate funds for schools to enable them to successfully achieve their democratic purposes. The liberal democratic state must also employ its monopoly over legitimate power to assure pluralism of content and heterogeneous student body in each school. It must protect and implement children's right to quality education. Markets cannot and should not accomplish these goals.

Commitment to the democratic purposes of education is an insufficient condition for determining who should be allowed to be involved in education. Voluntary imposition by companies and industries of ethical codes of conduct through what is known as "corporate social responsibility" is insufficient as well (Vogel, 2005; Crowther and Rayman-Bacchus, 2004). Non-public institutions that are contracted to deliver a public good, and privatized public enterprises, should be regulated, be legally defined as the "long arm of government," and be obliged to abide by the ethical and legal codes of conduct that apply to public institutions and officials. It is a core responsibility of democratic governments to impose effective

supervision, making certain that the public is adequately served and that no democratic values, such as liberty, equity, and equality, are being compromised. Those involved in public education must be committed to fairness, social integration, assure quality educational for all children, and promote participation, tolerance, and respect for "others" and "otherness".

Democratic control over education must be resumed, meaning that business, parents, and those who are not elected or democratically nominated should be relegated from their current privileged position.

Encouraging Cooperation Instead of Competition

Market reforms encourage competition among schools as means for improving schools. Yet competition reinforces the inherent status hierarchies of schools, exacerbates divisions, and widens rifts instead. Markets draw schools into competition over resources and students instead of fostering cooperation among schools. Competition, by definition, cannot benefit all. It creates masses of losers and fewer winners and is a divisive force.

Divided communities reproduce themselves through divided schooling. I suggest that cooperation among schools in a community is a more promising way for raising educational standards in all schools. Educators may, for example, share knowledge, provide professional assistance, and coordinate various educational activities among schools. Choice interferes with long-term planning in schools by creating high student-and-teacher mobility. Cooperation among schools facilitates the successive progression of students from one educational level to the next, i.e., from kindergarten to elementary, to junior high, and to high school, and enable the schools to plan ahead. This could lower dropout rates.

Compulsory education laws and assignment of students to public schools by the authorities justifiably interfere with the autonomy of parents over their children's education. Governments are responsible for the public good and must interfere to secure school attendance, prevent students from dropping out of school, and integrate children with special needs in regular schools. Local authorities should assign students to local schools. Students should be distributed evenly and proportionally among all community schools to create similarly heterogeneous student body in each school. Public schools must be committed to reaching out, to serving and working with all sections of the community striving to ensure equality of access to quality education. Research evidence suggests that the most effective schools are those with a balanced ability range within their student body (Woods, Bagley and Glatter, 1998).

But what about school choice by parents? Parents' voice should be heard, when it comes to the education of their children. However, choice as means for encouraging competition among schools must be replaced by less-destructive forms of participation, such as becoming active in Parent–Teacher Associations (PTA) and being represented on school boards. I concur with Inbar's (Ministry of Education, 1994)

contention that choice must follow the improvement of schools instead of being implemented as tools for school improvement. It is the responsibility of government, not markets, to make schools "equivalent" in terms of the quality of education they provide, prior to the implementation of choice. Choice among "equivalent" schools could steer schools clear of the pitfalls of choice, namely, exacerbated inequality and greater ethnic, social, and scholastic segregation.

Government bears responsibility for guarding and implementing children's rights. Markets exacerbate inequality of educational opportunities, thereby violating a fundamental human right of children – the right to quality education, i.e., education that offers an open future to all children – a future that is not restricted by youngsters' gender, cultural, ethnic, or socioeconomic background. A fair and equitable society would seek to ensure that all children received the highest quality education possible (Walford, 1994). Children and children's rights are totally missing from the school choice discourse. We should be reminded that the right to education is the right of each child, not of parents. Children should participate in decision-making processes where their fate is concerned taking into account children's evolving capacities. Children's right for quality education and the welfare of the child must reign supreme over the interests of parents. The active interference of the state in the family is often required and justified not only to protect children, but also when vital rights of children are violated.

I believe that parents should be restricted and more closely supervised when it comes to educational preferences. Home-schooling, sectarian education, or education based on gender inequality must be strictly regulated. There are circumstances under which certain forms of schooling, including home-schooling, should be ruled out as violation of the right of children to quality education and as subversion of the democratic purposes of education. Government must interfere to protect children's right to quality education. These issues must be democratically deliberated and decided.

Schools' Commitment to a Breadth and Depth of Learning

Markets encourage schools to distinct themselves from each other by specializing. Schools become "branded" to compete with each other. I suggest that instead of offering limited curricular variations within specialized schools, content variation should exist within each school. Within-school variation instead of between-school variation enables schools to better cater to the interests and needs of a heterogeneous student population.

Public schools in democracy must be a place where students can meet, interact, and learn to respect each other and "others". Democratic schools must also introduce children to a wide array of ideas and develop their critical capacities to evaluate ideas and make choices. This means that student population in schools must be heterogeneous, consisting of students with a great variety of abilities, talents, and competences; disabled students; and students from a variety of socioeconomic, racial,

ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Securing integrated schools is a moral obligation of democratic governments. Integrating schools is justified to combat prejudice and inequality even when it goes against the will of the majority and when it interferes with parental choice in education.

Public schools must provide the widest curricular opportunities, rather than specialize. In other words, choice must be available within the schools to accommodate students' interests and needs, instead of choice between specialized schools. Specialized schools should not be the default option, but a special option offered to parents and children whose legitimate and recognized needs cannot be accommodated within a community school. Criteria should be set to determine what the legitimate circumstances are to allow parents to opt out of inclusive public schools, and if and under what circumstances should government finance the choice of non-public school. I suggest that public schools must remain inclusive with very rare exceptions only. Fragmentation of the educational system into schools serving distinct value communities may decrease social integration and mutual understanding. Special religious and other cultural needs must be respected and should be met in after-school clubs and through various community NGOs. For many decades this has been the tradition in immigrant-absorbing Western democracies. Specialist schools compel students to specialize at an early stage of their educational career instead of exposing them to broad curricular and other educational experiences, enabling children to experiment, discover, and make choices.

Schools must be evaluated and judged by the breadth and depth of learning experiences that they provide, by how they cater to the interests and needs of a great variety of students, by the personal development of their students, and by providing students with a secure and supportive learning environment. The pursuit of high standards should encompass all aspects of education: the academic and the personal as well as the social. Educators must possess a sense of vocation and professional commitment and expertise. They are at the forefront of the educational process, and democratic societies must make efforts to attract and mobilize the best-qualified people to education.

Reading List

Achdut, L.; Cohen, R.; Endelbald, M. (2004). "Poverty and Inequality in the Distribution of Income." *Annual Report 2004*. Jerusalem: Institute of Social Security.

Ackerman, B.A. (1980). *Social Justice in the Liberal Stare*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Adalah, The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. (February, 2007). *Draft: The Democratic Constitution*. http://www.adalah.org/eng/democratic_constitution-e.pdf

Adan, S. (1971). "The New Curriculum: Principles and Processes," pp. 21–70 in: Adan, S. (Ed.) *About the New Curriculum*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture. (In Hebrew).

Adva Center, (2005). *Social Implications of the Budgetary Policy: The Proposed 2005 Budget*. Tel-Aviv: Adva Center (In Hebrew).

Allahar, A.L. (2001). "The Politics of Ethnic Identity Construction." *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 1(3): 197–208.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Apple, M.W. (1998). "Selling Our Children: Channel One and the Politics of Education," pp. 135–151 in: McChesney, R.W.; Wood, E.M.; Foster, J.B. (Eds.) *Capitalism and the Information Age*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Apple, M.W. (2004). "Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, Neo-Conservatism and the Politics of Educational Reforms." *Educational Policy*, 18(1): 12–44.

Apple, M.W. (2006). "Producing Inequalities: Neo-liberalism, Neo-Conservatism, and the Politics of Educational Reform," pp. 468–490 in: Lauder, H.; Brown, P.; Dillabough, J.A.; Halsey, A.H. (Eds.) *Education, Globalization, and Social Change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Aran, Z. (1971). *The Toil of Education*. (Chvlei Chinuch). Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture (In Hebrew).

Arnett, N.; Davies, P. (2000). *Education as a Positional Good: Implications for market-based reforms of state schooling*. Stoke on Trent: Staffordshire University Business School. Division of Economics, Working Paper Number 2000.10.

Ascher, C.; Fruchter, N.; Berne, R. (1996). *Hard Lessons: Public Schools and Privatization*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund Press.

Ball, S.J. (2000). "The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity." *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2): 215–228.

Ball, S.J. (2007). *Education Plc: Understanding Private Sector Participation in Public Sector Education*. London and New York: Routledge.

Barak-Medina, A. (2007). *Allocation of Resources in Education, School Integration, and Magnet Schools*. Jerusalem: The Knesset, Center of Research and information.

Barber, B.R. (1989). "Liberal Democracy and the Costs of Consent," pp. 54–69 in: Rosenblum, L. (Ed.) *Liberalism and the Moral Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barber, B.R. (1992). *An Aristocracy for Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America*. New York: Ballantine books.

Barber, B.R. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Times Books.
Barber, B.R. (2007). *Consumed: How Markets Corrupt Children, Infantilize Adults, and Swallow Citizens Whole*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
Bar-Natan, R. (2004). *Unimplementation of the Law of Integrating Children With Special Needs in Regular Schools*. (Background document prepared for the Knesset's Education, Culture, and Sports Committee). Jerusalem: The Knesset, Department of information and research. (In Hebrew).
Battistoni, R.M. (1985). *Public Schooling and the Education of Democratic Citizens*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
Bauman, K.J. (2002). "Home-Schooling in the United States: Trends and Characteristics." *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(26).
Belfield, C.P.; Levin, H.M. (2002). *Education Privatization: Causes, Consequences and Planning Implications*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning. www.unesco.org/iiep
Belk, R.W. (1985). "Materialism: Trait Aspects of Living in the Material World." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(3): 265–280.
Ben-Gurion, D. (1953). *Vision and Path* (Hazon va-derekh). Vol. 3. Tel-Aviv: Labor Party (MAPAI). (In Hebrew).
Ben-Gurion, D. (1953). *Vision and Path* (Hazon va-derekh). Vol. 4. Tel-Aviv: Labor Party (MAPAI). (In Hebrew).
Ben-Gurion, D. (1957). *Vision and Path* (Hazon va-derekh). Vol. 5. Tel-Aviv: Ayanot. (In Hebrew).
Berenstein, B. (1971). On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge, pp. 47–70 in: Young, M.F.D. (Ed.) *Knowledge and Control*. London: Collier-Macmillan Publishers.
Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.
Bidwell, C.E. (1974). "Some Observations on Client trust in Client-Serving Organizations," pp. 252–278 in: Cave, W.; Chesler, M.A. (Eds.) *Sociology of Education*. New York: Macmillan.
Bielick, S.; Chandler, K.; Broughman, S.P. (2001). *Homeschooling in the United States: 1999*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
Bourdieu, P.; Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
Boyles, D.R. (2000). *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to School*. New York: Falmer Press.
Boyles, D.R. (Ed.) (2005). *Schools or Markets? Commercialism, Privatization, and School-Business Partnerships*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Boyne, R.; Rattansi, A. (1990). "The Theory and Politics of Postmodernism: By Way of an Introduction," pp. 1–45 in: Boyne, R.; Rattansi, A. (Eds.) *Postmodernism and Society*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Bridges, D.; McLaughlin, T.H. (1994). "Education and the market place: An introduction," pp. 1–9 in Bridges, D.; McLaughlin, T.H. (Eds.) *Education and the Market Place*. London: Falmer.
Brighouse, H. (2000). *School Choice and School Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 349 U.S. 294 (1955) (USSC+) (Brown I).
Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) (1955) (Brown II).
Brown, L. (Ed.) (1993). *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. UK: Clarendon Press.
Brownlie, I. (Ed.) (1992). *Basic Documents on Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press (Third Edition).
Brzezinski, Z. (1970). *Between Two Ages*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
Cadbury, A. (2006). "Corporate Social Responsibility." *21st Century Society*, 1(1): 5–21.

Caldwell, J.B.; Spinks, M.J. (1993). *Leading the Self-Managed School*. London: Falmer Press.
Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and Educational Reform: What Planners Need to Know*. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001202/120274e.pdf
Central Bureau of Statistics, (2003). *Annual Survey 2002*, Jerusalem: Ministry of the Interior.
Central Bureau of Statistics, (2006). *Israel Statistical Abstracts -2006*, Jerusalem: Ministry of the Interior. http://www1.cbs.gov.il/reader
Chen, M. (1997). "Continuity or Separation Between the Junior High school and the High School." *Journal of the Department of Secondary Education*, 3: 43–49.
Chubb, J.; Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington: The Brookings Institute.
Clark, J. (1991). *Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Agencies*. London: Kumarian Press.
Cohen, P.A.; Kulik, J.A.; Kulik, C.L. (1982). "Educational Outcomes of Tutoring: A Meta-Analysis of Findings." *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(2): 237–248.
Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society*. New York: Academic Press.
Commission of the European Communities, (2001). *Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility*. Brussels, CEC. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/soc-dial/csr/greenpaper_en.pdf
Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) (14/12/90), General comment http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/(symbol)/CESCR + General + comment + 3. En?OpenDocument).
Converse, P.E. (1972). "A change in the American Electorate." in Campbell, A.; Converse, P.E. (Eds.) *The Human Meaning of Social Change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Conway, S. (1997). "The Reproduction of Exclusion and Disadvantage: Symbolic Violence and Social Class Inequalities in 'Parental Choice' of Secondary Education." *Sociological Research Online*, 2(4). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/4/4.htlm
Cookson, P.W. (1994). *School Choice: The Struggle for the Soul of American Education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Cremin, L.A. (1957). *The Republic and the Schools: Horace Mann on the Education of the Free Man*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Cronin, A.M. (2000). *Advertizing and Consumer Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
Cronin, A.M. (2004). *Advertising Myths*. London: Routledge.
Crowther, D.; Rayman-Bacchus, L. (2004). "Introduction: Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility," pp. 1–21 in: Crowther, D.; Rayman-Bacchus, L. (Eds.) *Corporate Social Responsibility*. Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.
Curti, M. (1959). *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams & Co.
Dagger, R. (1997). *Civic Virtues*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dahrendorf, R. (1994). "The changing quality of citizenship," pp. 10–19 in: van Steenberger, B. (Ed.) *The Condition of Citizenship*. London: Sage.
Dahrendorf, R. (1996). "Citizenship and social class," pp. 25–48 in: Bulmer, M.; Rees, A. (Eds.) *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshall*. London: University College.
Davidson, M. (2002). *The Birth and Implementation of State Education Law – 1953*. Tel-Aviv University, Faculty of the Humanities, The Chaim Rosenberg School of Judaic Studies (Ph.D dissertation). (In Hebrew).
Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.
Dewey, J. (1965). *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier.
Diamond, L. (2006). "Empowering the Poor: What Does Democracy Have to Do With It?" pp. 403–427 in: Narayan, D. (Ed.) *Measuring Empowerment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, M. (2001). "Introduction," pp. 1–17 in: Edwards, M.; Gaventa, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
Edwards, M.; Gaventa, J. (Eds.) (2001). *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
Elliott, J. (2001). "Characteristics of Performative Cultures: Their Central Paradoxes and Limitations as Resources of Educational Reform," pp. 192–211 in: Gleeson, D.; Husbands, C. (Eds.) *The Performing School*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
Emmot, M. (2002). *Perspectives: Corporate Social Responsibility*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
Etzioni, A. (1992). "On the Place of Virtues in Pluralistic Democracy," pp. 70–79 in: Marks, G.; Diamond, L. (Eds.) *Reexamining Democracy*. Newbury Park: Sage.
Etzioni, A. (2004). *The Common Good*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Filler, L. (1965). *Horace Mann on the Crisis in Education*. Ohaio: Antioch Press.
Fishman, Y. (2000). *Autonomous Management in Schools: Social Consequences and Effects for Inequality*. Jerusalem: The Knesset center for Research and Information.
Fitch, M.; Huston, A.C.; Wright, J.C. (1993). "From television forms to genre schemata," pp. 38–53 in: Berry, G.L.; Asamen, J.H. (Eds.) *Children and Television: Images in a Changing Sociocultural World*. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.
Fitz, J.; Beers, B. (2002). "Education management organizations and the privatization of public education: a cross-national comparison in the USA and Britain." *Comparative Education,* 38(2): 137–154.
Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (2000). "Cross age tutoring: Should it be required in order to reduce social exclusion?" pp. 307–315 in: Walraven, G.; van Veen, D.; Day, C. (Eds.) *Combating Social Exclusion Through Education: Laissey-faire Authoritarianism or Third Way?* Leuven: Garant.
Forgace, D. (1988). (Ed.) *An Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writing, 1916–1935*. New York: Schoken Books.
Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books.
Frank, R. (1997). "The Frame of Reference of Public Good." *The Economic Journal*, 107(445): 1832–1847.
Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of Indignation*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
Friedman, M. (1955). "The role of government in Education," pp. 123–144 in: Solo R.A. (Ed.) *Economics and Public Interest*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Friedman, M.; Friedman, R. (1982). *Free to Choose: A personal Statement*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
Gal, N. (1995). *The Individual, the Authorities, and the Law*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Institute for the Study of Educational Nurturing. (In Hebrew).
Galbraith, J.K. (1958). *The Affluent Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Gardner, P. (1994). "Schooling, Markets and Public Agency 1833–1944," pp. 9–19 in: Bridges, D.; McLaughlin, T.H. (Eds.) *Education and the Market Place*. London: Falmer.
Gary, P. (July 8, 1991). "Whose America?" *Time,* 138(1): 12–17.
Gavison, R. (2003). "On the Relationships Between Civil and Political Rights and Social and Economic Rights," pp. 25–69 in: Coicaud, M.J.; Doyle, M.W.; Gardner, A.M. (Eds.) *The Globalization of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations University Press.
Geuss, R. (2003). *Public Goods Private Goods*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Gewirtz, S. (1998). "Can All Schools Be Successful? An Exploration of the Determinants of School 'Success'." *Oxford Review of Education,* 24(4): 439–457.
Gibbins, J. (1989). "Contemporary Political Culture: An Introduction," pp. 1–30 in: Gibbins, J. (Ed.) *Contemporary Political Culture: Politics in a Postmodern Age*. London: Sage.
Gibton, D. (2004). "Comparative and Critical Analysis of the Supreme Court's Position on School Integration in Israel." *Studies in Law* (Iyunei Mishpat), 28(2): 473–515. (In Hebrew).

Gilbert, R. (1992). "Citizenship, Education and Postmodernity." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 13(1): 51–68.
Giroux, H.A. (1989). *Schooling for Democracy: Critical Pedagogy with Modern Age*. London: Routledge.
Giroux, H.A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling: A critical Reader*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
Giroux, H.A. (2002). "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4): 425–465.
Goodlad, J.I. (1990). "The Occupation of Teaching in Schools," pp. 3–34 in: Goodlad, J.I.; Soder, R.; Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds.) *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.
Green, C. (2005). *The Privatization of State Education: Public Partners, Private Dealings*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
Gross, N. (1997). "Israeli Economy," pp. 137–151 in: Zameret, Z.; Yablonca, C. (Eds.) *The first decade – 1948–1958*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi. (In Hebrew).
Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gutmann, A. (1989a). "Undemocratic Education," pp. 71–89 in: Rosenblum, L. (Ed.) *Liberalism and the Moral Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gutmann, A. (1989b). "Democratic Theory and the Role of Teachers in Democratic Education," pp. 183–199 in: Hannaway, J.; Crowson, R. (Eds.) *The Politics of Reforming School Administration*: The 1988 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association. New York: Falmer.
Gutmann, A. (2003). "Assessing Arguments for School Choice: Pluralism, Parental Rights, or Educational Results," pp. 126–149 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Ha'aretz, 2 July, 2006, pp. 1, 6. (Daily newspaper in Hebrew).
Ha'aretz, 7 April 2007, p. 6. (Daily newspaper in Hebrew).
Ha'aretz, 9 July 2006, p. 7. (Daily newspaper in Hebrew).
Ha'aretz, TheMarker, 16 June 2006, p. 6. (Daily newspaper in Hebrew).
Ha'aretz, TheMarker, 26 April 2006, p. 4. (Daily newspaper in Hebrew).
Haley, M. (1904). "Why Teachers Should Organize." *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, pp. 145–52.
Harrigan, P.J. (2001). "Church, State, and Education in France from the Falloux to the Ferry laws: A reassessment." *Canadian Journal of History*, 36: 51–71.
Hayek, F.A. (1944). *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge and Sons.
Hayek, F.A. (1960). *The Constitution*. London: Routledge and Sons.
Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: The Civic Idea in World History*. London: Longman.
Henderson, D. (2001). *Misguided Virtue*. London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
Hepburn, M.A. (1998). "A disquieting outlook for democracy: Mass media, news and citizenship education in the US," pp. 130–149 in: Ichilov, O. (Ed) *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World*. London: Woburn Press.
Heying, C.H. (1997). "Civic elites and corporate delocalization: An Alternative explanation for declining civic engagement". *American behavioral Scientist*, 40(5): 656–667.
Higgott, R.; Bieler, A. (Eds.) (1999). *Non-State Actors and Authority in the Global System*. London: Routledge.
Hill, P.T.; Pierce, L.C.; Guthrie, G.W. (1997). *Reinventing Public Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hirsh, F. (1976). *The Social Limits to Growth*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Hochschild, J.L.; Scovronick, N. (2000). "Democratic education and the American dream," pp. 209–243 in: McDonnell, L.M.; Timpane, P.M.; Benjamine, R. (Eds.) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*. Lawrence, Kansas: The University Press of Kansas.

Hodges-Persell, C. (2001). "Teachers and Privatization," pp. 279–303 in: Levin, H.M. (Ed.) *Privatizing Education: Can the Marketplace Deliver Choice, Efficiency, Equity and Social Cohesion?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ichilov, O. (2003). "Education and Democratic Citizenship in a Changing World," pp. 637–669 in: Sears, D.O.; Huddie, L.; Jervis, R.I. (Eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ichilov, O. (2004). *Political Learning and Citizenship Education Under Conflict*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ichilov, O. (2008). "Citizenship education in Israel: A contested terrain," pp. 189–205 in: Arthur, J.; Davies, I.; Hahn, C. (Eds.) *Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Ichilov, O.; Salomon, G.; Inbar, D. (2005). "Citizenship Education in Israel – A Jewish-Democratic State," pp. 29–50 in: Cohen-Almagor, R. (Ed.) *Israeli Institutions at the Crossroads*. London & New York: Routledge.

Ichilov, O.; Mazawi, A.E. (1997). *Between State and Church*. Germany: Peter Lang.

International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (1966). Article 13: 2(c) www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SOCIAL_E.PDF

Iram, Y.; Schmida, M. (1993). "Recurring Reforms and Changes in the Israeli Educational System: An Analytical Approach." *International Journal of Educational Development*, 13(3): 217–226.

Ishiyama, J.T.; Breuning, M. (1998). *Ethnopolitics in the New Europe*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Janowitz, M. (1983). *The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jonathan, R. (1990). "State Education Service or Prisoner's Dilemma: The 'hidden hand' as source of educational policy." *Educational Philosophy*, 22(1): 16–24.

Kallinikos, J. (1995). "Cognitive Foundations of Economic Institutions, Markets, Organizations and Networks Revisited." *Scandinavian Journal of Management,* 11(2): 119–137.

Kanpol, B.; McLaren, P. (Eds.) (1995). *Critical Multiculturalism: Uncommon Voices in a Common Struggle*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Keat, R.; Whiteley, N.; Abercrombie, N. (1994). "Introduction," pp. 1–23 in: Keat, R.; Whiteley, N.; Abercrombie, N. (Eds.) *The Authority of the Consumer*. London: Routledge.

Kecht, M.R. (1992). "The Challenge of Responsibility: An Introduction," pp. 1–25 in: Kecht, M.R. (Ed.) *Pedagogy is Politics: Literary Theory and Critical Teaching*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Keck, M.; Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Trans-national Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. London: Cornell University Press.

Kenway, J.; Bullen, E. (2001). *Consuming Children*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Kiernan, A.K. (1997). "Citizenship – The Real Democratic Deficit of the European Union?" *Citizenship Studies*, 1(3): 323–335.

Kimmerling, B. (2001). *The Invention and Decline of Israeliness*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Klein, N. (1999). *No Logo*. New York: Picador.

Klinov, R. (1989). "Private funding of primary education." *Economics Quarterly*, 25(1): 132–136.

Kober, N. (2006). *Why We Still Need Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Center on Education Policy.

Kohn, A. (2004). "NCLB and The Effort to Privatize Public Education," pp. 79–98 in: Meier, D.; Wood, G. (Eds.) *Many Children Left Behind.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Kop, J. (2004). *Allocation of Resources for Social Services-2004*. Jerusalem: Taub-Center for the Study of Social Policy in Israel. (In Hebrew).

Kop, Y. (1987). *Israel Social Services, 1986–1987*. Jerusalem: Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The Shame of the Nation*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Kunkel, D.; Gantz, W. (1992). "Children's Television Advertising in the Multi-Channel Environment." *Journal of Communication,* 42(3): 134–152.
Kymlicka, W. (1991). "Liberalism and The Politicization of Ethnicity." *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, IV(2): 239–256.
Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kymlicka, W.; Wayne, N. (Eds.) (2000). *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Laitsch, D. (2006). *Assessment, High Stakes, and Alternative Visions: Appropriate Use of the Right Tools to Leverage Improvement*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, Educational Policy Research Unit.
Le Grand, J.; Bartlett, W. (Eds.) (1993). *Quasi-Markets and Social Policy*. London: Macmillan.
Levin, H.M. (1988). "Cost-Effectiveness and Educational Policy." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 10(1): 51–69.
Levin, H.M. (2001). "Studying Privatization in Education," pp. 3–20 in: Levin, H.M. (Ed.) *Privatizing Education: Can the Marketplace Deliver Choice, Efficiency, Equity and Social Cohesion?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Levin, H.M.; Belfield, C.R. (2006). "The Marketplace in Education," pp. 620–642 in: Lauder, H.; Brown, P.; Dillabough, J.A.; Halsey, A.H. (Eds.) *Education, Globalization, and Social Change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Levinson, M.; Levinson, S. (2003). "'Getting religion': Religion, Diversity, and Community in Public and Private Schools," pp. 106–126 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Lewis, B. (1975). *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Leys, C. (2001). *Market-Driven Politics: Neoliberal democracy and the Public Interest*. London: Verso.
Lovibond, S. (1990). "Feminism and Postmodernism," pp. 154–187 in: Boyne, R.; Rattansi, A. (Eds.) *Postmodernism and Society*. London: Macmillan.
Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A report On Knowledge*, (Theory and History of Literature, Volume 10). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Macedo, S. (2003). "Equity and School Choice: How Can We Bridge the Gap Between Ideals and Realities," pp. 51–70 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Macpherson, R.J.S. (1998). (Ed.) The Politics of Accountability: Educative and International Perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
Mann, M. (1996). "Ruling class strategies and citizenship," pp. 125–144 in: Bulmer, M.; Rees, A. (Eds.) *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshal*. London: University College.
March, J.G.; Olsen, J.P. (2000). "Democracy and Schooling: An institutional perspective," pp. 148–173 in: McDonnell, L.M.; Timpane, P.M.; Benjamine, R. (Eds.) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*. Lawrence, Kansas: The University Press of Kansas.
Marshall, T.H. (1977). *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Marshall, T.H. (1981). *The Right to Welfare and Other Essays*. London: Heinemann.
Mathews, J.T. (2000). "Naming a new era: The information revolution." *Foreign Policy*, 119(3): 63–65.
May, T. (1994). "Transformative Power: A Study in Human Service Organizations." *Sociological Review*, 42(4): 618–637.
McDonnell, L.M. (2000). "Defining Democratic Purposes," pp. 1–21 in: McDonnell, L.M.; Timpane, M.P.; Benjamin, R. (Eds.) *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary Multiculturalism: Pedagogies of Dissent for the New Millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundation of Education*. New York: Longman.
McLaren, P. (with Henry A. Giroux). (1995). "Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-Utopianism," pp. 29–58 in: McLaren, P. (Ed.) *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*. London: Routledge.
McLaren, P.; Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching Against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism: A Critical Pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
McNeal, J. (1987). *Children as Consumers*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
Molnar, A. (1996). *Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialization of American Schools*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.
Molnar, A. (2005). *School Commercialism*. New York: Routledge.
Molnar, A.; Garcua; D.; Sullivan, C.; McEvoy, B.; Joanou, J. (2005). *Profiles of For-Profit Education Management Organizations 2004–2005*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University, Educational Policy Studies Laboratory.
Murphy, J.; Gilmer, S.W.; Weise, R.; Page, A. (1998). "Home Schooling," pp. 153–179 in: Murphy, J.; Gilmer, S.W.; Weise, R.; Page, A. (Eds.) *Pathways to Privatization in Education*. Wesport CT: Albex.
Murray, C.A. (1982). "The Two Wars Against Poverty: Economic Growth and the Great Society." *The Public Interest*, 69: 3–16.
Nesher, P. (1996). "Conflicting Logics – Methods for Implementing School Integration and Managing Heterogeneous Student Populations." Chapter 5 in: Brandeis, O. *The Third Jump*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports. (In Hebrew).
Nichiporuk, B.; Builder, C.H. (1997). "Societal Implications," pp. 295–315 in: Arquilla, J.; Ronfeldt, D. (Eds.) *In Athena's Camp: Preparing for Conflict in the Information age*. Washington, DC: Rand.
Nickel, J.W. (1987). *Making Sense of Human Rights: Philosophical Reflections on the Universal Declaration of Human rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nie, N.H.; Erbring, L. (2000). *Internet and Society: A Preliminary Report*. Stanford: Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society. (www.stanford.edu/group/siqss/press_release/preliminary_report.pdf)
Niemi, R.G.; Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What Makes Students Learn*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Nozick, R. (1975). *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Nussbaum, M. (2004). *Hiding from Humanity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Oduaran, A. (2006). "Conceptualizing the widening of access to education as social justice," pp. 69–83 in: Oduaran, A.; Bhola, H.S. (Eds.) *Widening Access to Education as Social Justice*. The Netherlands: Springer.
Oduaran, A.; Bhola, H.S. (Eds.) (2006). *Widening Access to Education as Social Justice*. The Netherlands: Springer.
Oswald, L.J. (1995). "School-Based Management: Rationale and Implementation Guidelines." *Clearinghouse on Educational Management*, 38(7): 76–77.
Ouane, A.; Glanz, C. (2006). "UNESCO policies and conferences: widening access to education to further social justice," pp. 149–165 in: Oduaran, A.; Bhola, H.S. (Eds.) *Widening Access to Education as Social Justice*. The Netherlands: Springer.
Peleg, E. (2005). *Privatized Organizations in the Israeli Public Law*. Tel-Aviv: Ramot, Tel-Aviv University. (In Hebrew).
Pestoff, V.A. (1998). *Beyond Market and State*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Peterson, P.E.; Hassel, B.C. (Eds.) (1998). *Learning From School Choice*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
Public Education Network Weekly NewsBlast, (2008). "Public Involvement. Public Education. Public Benefit." February 1, 2008. http://www.publiceducation.org/newsblast_current.asp

Purdy, J. (1999). *For Common Things: Irony, Trust, and Commitment in America Today*. New York: Alfred, A. Knopf.
Putnam, R.D. (1995). "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1): 65–78.
Rabin, Y.; Shany, Y. (Eds.) (2004). *Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in Israel*. Tel-Aviv: Ramot. (In Hebrew).
Ram, U. (2004). "New Rifts, Global Capitalism, Post-Fordism and Inequality," pp. 16–34 in: Filc, D.; Ram, U. (Eds.) *The Power of Property: Israeli Society in the Global Age*. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad. (In Hebrew).
Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Raz, K. (2008). "Homeschooling in Israel – Current and Desirable Situation" http://www.knklaw.com/hebrew/mahamarim/jinuj.htm (Internet website last update: 22.09.08).
Richmond, A.H. (2002). "Globalization: Implications for immigrants and refugees." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25(5): 707–727.
Rifkin, J. (1995). *The End of Work– The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of Post Market Era*. New York: G.P. Purnam's Sons.
Rosenblum, N.L. (2003). "Separating the Siamese Twins, 'Pluralism' and 'School Choice'," pp. 79–104 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Saltman, K.J. (2005). *The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling and the Assault on Public Education*. New York: Routledge.
Sartori, G. (1997). "Understanding Pluralism." *Journal of Democracy*, 8(4): 58–70.
Saunders, G. (1993). "Citizenship in a Liberal Society," pp. 57–91 in: Turner, B.S. (Ed.) *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage.
Schild, V. (2000). "Neo-Liberalism's New Gendered Market Citizens: The 'Civilizing' Dimensions of Social Programmes in Chile." *Citizenship Studies*, 4(3): 275–307.
Schlozman, K.L.; Verba, S.; Brady, H.; Erkulwater, J. (1998). "Why can't they be like we were? Understanding the generation gap in participation." paper presented at June 1998 APSA Political Socialization Subcommittee Meeting, D.C.
Schneider, M.; Teske, P.; Marschall, M. (2000). *Choosing Schools: Consumer Choice and Quality of American Schools*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Schor, J.B. (2004). *Born to Buy*. New York: Scribner.
Schwartz, E. (2006). *The National Expenditure on Education in Israel and in OECD Countries in the Last Decade*. Jerusalem: The Knesset, Center of Research and Information. (In Hebrew).
Schwoch, J.; White, M.; Reilly, S. (1992). *Media Knowledge: Reading in Popular Culture, Pedagogy, and Critical Citizenship*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
Shazar, Z. (1982). *From Shift to Shift: Matters of Education in Israel and the Diaspora (Mimeshmert Le'Mishmeret: Dvarim be'einyaney hinuh ba'aretz u'bagola)*. Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center. (In Hebrew).
Shouldiner, Z. (1996). *A Look at the Budget – 1996*. Tel-Aviv: Adva Center.
Simmel, G. (1968). *The Conflict in Modern Culture and Other Essays*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
Sizer, T. (2004). "Preamble: A reminder for Americans," pp. xvii-xxi in: Meier, D.; Wood, G. (Eds.) *Many Children Left Behind*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Sloane, P.; Battu, H.; Seaman, P. (1999). "Overeducation, Undereducation and the British labor market." *Applied Economics*, 31(11): 1437–54.
Smrekar, C.; Goldring, E.B. (1999). *School Choice in Urban America: Magnet Schools and the Pursuit of Equity*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Spring, J. (2000). *The Universal Right to Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Stein, A. (2007). *A Saving Pack Education?* M.A Thesis. Tel-Aviv University. School of Education. (In Hebrew).

Stephens, W.B. (1998). *Education in Britain 1750–1914*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave, Macmillan.
Sternberg, E. (1994). *Just Business*. London: Little, Brown & Company.
Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. London: Allen Lane.
Stromquist, N.P. (2002). *Education in a Globalized World*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
Swirsky, S. (2004). "Israel in the Global Space," pp. 57–84 in: Filc, D.; Ram, U. (Eds.) *The Power of Property: Israeli Society in the Global Age*. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad. (In Hebrew).
Taylor, C. (1994). "The Politics of Recognition," pp. 25–74 in: Gutmann, A. (Ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining The Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Taylor, F.W. (1947). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
Teachers Union. (2006). "Homeschooling." *Hed Hachinuch*, 80(10): 20–27. (In Hebrew).
Teske, P.; Schneider, M. (2001). "What Research Can Tell Policymakers About School Choice." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(4): 609–631.
The Israeli Council for the Welfare of the Child, (2004). *Selected Data from the Statistical Abstract Children in Israel 2004*. Jerusalem: Ashalim and the inter-ministerial forum for children's statistics. (In Hebrew).
The National Committee of Mayors of Arab Municipalities in Israel, (2006). The Future Vision of Palestinian Arabs in Israel. http://roter.net/forum/gil/7158.shtml
Thompson, R.J.; Rudolph J.R. (1989). "The Ebb and Flow of Ethnoterritorial Politics in the Western World," pp. 1–15 in: Rudolph, J.R.; Thompson, R.J. (Eds.) *Ethnoterritorial Politics, Policy, and the Western World*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
Timpane, P.P.; Miller-McNeill, L. (1991). Business Impact on Education and Child Development Reform: A Study Prepared for the Committee for Economic Development. New York: The Committee for Economic Development.
Toffler, A.; Toffler, H. (1997). "Forward: The new intangibles," pp. xiii-xxiv in: Arquilla, J.; Ronfeldt, D. (Eds.) *In Athena's Camp: Preparing for Conflict in the Information age*. Washington, DC: Rand.
Tomasevski, K. (2006). "Globalizing What: Education as a Human Right or as a Traded Service?" *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies,* 12(1): 1–79.
Turner, B.S. (1993). *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage.
UN Charter of 1945. http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/un/unchart.htm
UNESCO. (2000a). *Final Report*. World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26–28 April 2000.
UNESCO. (2000b). *The Dakar Framework For Action: Education For All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments*.
UNESCO. (2000c). World Declaration on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs. Jomtien, Thailand, 5–9 March 1990. in: *The Dakar Framework for Action: Education for All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments*.
Union of High School Teachers, (2006). *Kesher Ein* (Eye Contact) no. 161, July, p. 3.
United Nations, (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. General Assembly resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989; entry into force 2 September 1990. http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm
Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948 (1992). in: Brownlie, I. (Ed) *Basic Documents on Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press. http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/
Van Dunk, E.; Dickman, A.M. (2003). *School Choice and the Question of Accountability*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
VanderSchee, C. (2005). "The Privatization of Food Services in Schools: Undermining Children's Health, Social Equity, and Democratic Education," pp. 1–31 in: Boyles, D.R. (Ed.) *Schools or Markets?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Veblen, T. (1918). *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Businessmen*. New York: B.W. Huebsh.
Veblen, T. (2006). *Conspicuous Consumption*. New York: Penguin Books.

Viteritti, J.P. (2003). "Defining Equity: Politics, Markets, and Public Policy," pp. 13–31 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Vogel, D. (2005). *The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
Waldron, J. (1993). *Liberal Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walford, J. (1994). *Choice and Equity in Education*. London: Cassell.
Walform, G. (1994). *Choice and Equity in Education*. London: Cassell.
Waller, M. (2005). *London 1945*. London: John Murray.
Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of Justice*. New York: Basic Books.
Weber, M. (1992). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Routledge (first published in German in 1904–1905).
Wexler, P. (1990). "Citizenship in the Semiotic Society," pp. 164–176 in: Turner, B.S (Ed.) Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity. London: Sage.
Whitty, G.; Power, S.; Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution & Choice in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Witzel, M. (2002). *Builders and Dreamers: The Making and Meaning of Management*. London: Pearson Education.
Wolfe, A. (2003a). "Introduction," pp. 1–10 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Wolfe, A. (2003b). "The Irony of School Choice: Liberals, Conservatives, and the New Politics of Race," pp. 31–51 in: Wolfe, A. (Ed.) *School Choice: The Moral Debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Wood, D.N. (1996). *Post-Intellectualism and the Decline of Democracy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
Woodhall, M. (1991). *Education and Training Under Conditions of Economic Austerity and Restructuring*. Paris: UNESCO/IIEP.
Woods, P.A.; Bagley, C.; Glatter, R. (1998). *School Choice and Competition: Markets in the Public Interest?* London: Routledge.
Worgan, Y. (2006). *The Current State of the Implementation of the Law of Integrating Children With Special Needs in Regular Schools*. (Background document prepared for the Knesset's Education, Culture, and Sports Committee). Jerusalem: The Knesset, Department of information and research. (In Hebrew).
World Trade Organization, *The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS): Objectives, Coverage, Discipline*. (http://www.worldtradelaw.net/uragreements/gats.pdf).
Ya'ar, E.; Shavit, Z. (2003). "A society with multiple rifts," pp. 1105–1188 in: Ya'ar, E.; Shavit, Z. (Eds.) *Trends in Israeli Society*. Tel-Aviv: Open University. (In Hebrew).
Yadlin, A. (1971). "The Change in Curriculum Development," pp. 9–21 in: Adan, S. (Ed.) *About the New Curriculum*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture. (In Hebrew).
Yoon, K. (1995). "Comparison of Beliefs about Advertising, Attitudes Toward Advertising, and Materialism Held by African-Americans and Caucasians." *Psychological Reports*, 77(2): 455–466.
Young, B. (1990). *Children and Television Advertising*. London: Oxford University Press.
Young, I.M. (1990). "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Idea of Universal Citizenship," pp. 175–209 in: Beiner, R. (Ed.) *Theorizing Citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Zameret, Z. (1971). *The second decade – 1958–1968* (HeAsor Hasheni). Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi (In Hebrew).
Zameret, Z. (1997). *Across a Narrow Bridge*. Sde Boqer: The Ben Gurion Research Center. (In Hebrew).
Zameret, Z.; Yablonca, C. (Eds.) (1997). *The first decade – 1948–1958* (HeAsor Harishon). Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi (In Hebrew).

Archival Documents

A. The Aviezer Yelin Archive for Jewish Education in Israel and the Diaspora

Protocols of the committee for the examination of the structure of education ("The Rimalt Committee").
Central Committee of the Israeli Labor Party (MAPAI), Discussion of State Education. May-June, 1953.

B. State Archives

Divrei ha-Knesset (Minutes of the Knesset). Jerusalem: The Government Printer.

Ministry of Education: Committee Reports and Policy Documents

Ministry of Education. (1965). Report of the Public Committee for the Examination of the Extension of Compulsory and Tuition Free Schooling. ("The Praver Committee"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (1991). Report of the Public Committee for the Examination of Non-District Bound Schools ("The Kashti Committee"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (1993a). Report of the Committee for Raising Funds from Non-public Sources. ("The Gafni Committee"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (1993b). Report of the Committee for Autonomous Schools. "The Volansky Committee"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (1994). Report of the Committee for Parental Choice in Education. ("The Inbar Committee"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (2000). Committee for the Assessment of the Implementation of the Special Education Law 1988 – The Integration of Children with Special Needs in Regular Schools ("The Margalit Committee") (In Hebrew). http://info.smxb.ac.il/home/home.exe/2148/12285
Ministry of Education. (2001). Position Paper prepared by: Kashti, Y.; Shalski, S.; Alroyi, A. "Reexamination of the Situation Concerning Non-District Bound Schools." Jerusalem: Ministry of Education. (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (2002). Director General, Directive, 2000/3(a), November 1, 2002.
Ministry of Education. (2005). Report of the National Task Force for the Advancement of Education. ("The Dovrat Report"). (In Hebrew).
Ministry of Education. (2006). Directive of the Director General, "Incorporating Commercial Advertisements in Schools." Issued on 2/4/2006. (In Hebrew).

Author Index

Subject Index