Education (A Bourgeois Ideology) Alan Phillips Senior Lecturer School of Architecture Plymouth Polytechnic

It is the duty of Government to provide an education for its people, that in its structure and curriculum, provides, as far as is possible, an equal opportunity for all. That is, an equal opportunity for each child to express an ambition - no matter how naive - and have that ambition served and nourished with knowledge and skills. Within the status quo of centralised Government, there is too great a temptation to have ignorance sustain power, and to design an educational policy that replaces like with like, whereby a sort of political dynasty can exist. Systems of pre-determined socio-economic selection, based more on political sympathies than on academic excellence prevail at all stages of education to such an extent and across so many persuasions that the idea of education as an existential phenomenon is as abstract and ridiculous as the notion of egalitarianism. But if there is to be cultural development that responds, not to a political climate but a societal zeitgeist, free of pedagogy and dogma, the whole notion of our childrens' minds being "governed" by a biased power system must be abolished in favour of a de-centralised and largely anarchic system. Anarchy does not necessarily lead to confusion and disorder. It is only because we have always been governed, that those jealous of their power try to frighten the public into believing the fictitious consequences of its absence. By de-centalisation, organised through an interregnum of apolitical philosophers, there could be designed a primary, secondary and tertiary process of education that, without prejudice to the a prioris of universalism, could provide a regional perspective, with children free to move from, say, a ruralist to an urbanist group as the nature of the intellect develops certain specificities that could be alien to the place of learning.

At present, education is confused with training. Government looks at education as an investment that, like all investments, reaps a return. So long as this view is self-sustained there is no education - only training. Education has for its object the formation of character. It wants no return. It "is" for its own sake. Education is morality. Training is expediency. There will never be a significant development in our cultural awareness if we continue to allow one to be confused with another. Indeed, for as long as training has primacy over education, the people will always be the property of other men's minds, and yet the process continues almost without complaint. Technology is replacing science, vocational courses are financed in favour of the arts and the abstract. Arithmetic pretends to be Mathematics, the computer replaces the philosopher, and the Library is called a Learning Resources Centre. Polytechnics treat Humanities like unwanted children and Architecture is to do with system building and project management. Primary schools call colours numbers, and from the age of eleven children are seen as marketable products rather than free-selves. Our duty to the spirit of the individual is to provide for a basis of independence - of thought, inquiry, speculation and action - independent, that is, from the coercions of state, authority, union and parent. The young mind must resist dogma and epistemology in favour of receiving the Theories of Ideas, from which can develop an intelligence and intellect free from prescribed ideologies of prejudicial opinion. Only then will there be a type of classlessness where thought replaces traditional values, and action replaces complacency. Accordingly the teacher or educator has to be the most important member of society. It is upon the teacher that the whole responsibility for our cultural development lies. Teachers must not be trained. A teacher is born. A teacher is a maieutic, serving to raise latent ideas into clear consciousness. They must be highly rewarded because, like the monk, they have dedicated their lives for the benefit of others. The teachers will be philosophers, poets, scientists, artists, musicians, and athletes. Then there will be no teachers, just a Gestalt - an organised whole of free subscription in which every person affects every other - the whole - which we could describe as culture and society, ultimately becoming greater than the sum of the parts. That is, the inverse of our current condition where the whole (what we might call "the nation") is certainly less in ethical, moral or intellectual terms than the majority of the parts that it comprises. If this reversal, or inversion, is called a revolution, then we must have a revolution!

"There is no field of human activity in which talent plays so decisive a role, as

in education. Only the talented educator, that is, a person with a flair for education, will respect and protect in a student the indescribable miracle of his or her humanity.

Respect for the human being is the beginning and end of an education. Education is a bold venture - particularly in the arts, because it involves the creative spirit of man.

Knowledge of human nature appears to me to be a gift essential to the true educator - who needs to recognise and be able to develop the natural talents and temperaments of those in his charge.

A teacher who communicates nothing but the syllabus laid down by the authorities, using methods he learnt at college, can be compared to a dispenser of pills made up according to prescription, who can never be a true physician."