

An analysis of New Labour's policy on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) with particular reference to socially critical approaches

Environmental Education Research, 14 (1), February 2008, pp. 65 - 75

John Huckle

Summary *This article links the prospects of sustainable development to democratic socialism and those forms of knowledge and learning developed by the global anti-capitalist movement. While socially critical approaches to education for sustainable development (ESD) can accommodate these forms, they are marginalised by New Labour's policies on sustainable development and education. Contradictions between neo-liberalism and social democracy in these policies explain why ESD has made limited progress and suggest the kinds of initiatives and ESD indicators the Government is likely to favour. The article establishes the policy context for a second article that focuses on how the UK ESD community responded to the author's report on possible approaches to an ESD indicator, commissioned by the Sustainable Development Commission.*

Introduction

In 2003 the UK Government's Department of Education and Skills (DfES) published its Action Plan for Sustainable Development in Education and Skills (DfES, 2003). The first objective of this plan states that 'all learners will develop the skills, knowledge and value base to be active citizens in creating a more sustainable society'. The Government's revised strategy for sustainable development, *Securing the Future*, (DEFRA, 2005), announced its intention to develop an indicator of education for sustainable development (ESD). This would 'show the impact of formal learning on knowledge and awareness of sustainable development'. As part of this strategy the DfES launched a national framework for sustainable schools together with a year of action (2006-7) to promote them (DfES, 2006a&b).

This and a subsequent article were prompted by my work as a consultant employed by the Sustainable Development Commission (SDC), the Government's independent advisory body, to research possible approaches to an ESD indicator. This work was carried out between September 2005 and March 2006 and resulted in a report suggesting six possible approaches. These were evaluated by members of the ESD community at two consultative workshops prior to the SDC making recommendations to Government. My report and summary of the consultative workshops, together with the SDC's proposal to Government, can be downloaded from the SDC website (Huckle, 2006a, 2006b, SDC, 2006).

Working for the SDC provided insights into the beliefs and values of influential members of the ESD community and the nature of educational policy making. In particular it made me realise that there is considerable reluctance to apply ESD theory to evaluation; hostility towards attempts to prescribe core knowledge, skills and values; and significant suspicion of anything that can be perceived as testing, attainment or the monitoring of attitude and behaviour change. The SDC proposal shifts the focus of the indicator from the capability of individual learners to the performance of educational institutions, suggesting, for example, that the percentage

of schools rating themselves good or outstanding, using an evaluation tool linked to the sustainable schools framework (teachernet 2006a), should become an ESD indicator. Such proposals need to be interpreted with reference both to the micro-politics of the Commission and ESD community, and the macro-politics of New Labour and the contradictions that pervade its policies on sustainable development and education.

This first article deals with the macro level and my argument is developed in two stages. Firstly I state my own position on ESD, a position that links the prospects of sustainable development to participatory and democratic forms of socialism or a genuine ‘third way’. Such socialism is associated with new ways of producing, organising and learning knowledge that have been developed by workers’ and citizens’ movements. It employs notions of praxis and communicative rationality to address the dilemma of radical democracy and so has links with critical theory and pedagogy. Secondly, examination of New Labour’s policies on sustainable development and education reveals contradictions between neo-liberalism and social democracy, explains why ESD has made limited progress, and suggests those initiatives and indicators that it is likely to favour. These arguments set the scene for the second article which describes my work for the SDC; analyses the responses of those members of the ESD community who attended consultative workshops on my indicator proposals; and seeks to explain these with particular reference to the rise of cultural theory approaches to ESD (Scott & Gough, 2003) and the marginalisation and misrepresentation of socially critical approaches.

Sustainability, knowledge and the participatory left

While neither the first (state socialism) nor second (social democracy) way to socialism has shown itself capable of ‘meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’, the global anti-capitalist (or global justice) movement prefigures a third way to socialism that promises sustainability based on popular control of social development and its impact on the bio-physical world. Wainwright (2003) argues that both state socialism and social democracy resulted in technocratic or social-engineering states underpinned by a restricted view of knowledge. They valued scientific, statistical and codifiable (positivist) knowledge and discounted the creativity, or lay (common sense) and tacit (‘things we know but cannot tell’) knowledge, of their citizens. Hierarchies in state and private institutions suppressed knowledge from below and workers, party members, and voters were given essentially passive roles. In social democratic states democracy is limited to electoral politics, and most face a legitimisation crisis with rising voter apathy and falling electoral turnouts.

Disenchantment with the ‘all knowing’ welfare state has resulted from citizens’ growing sense of alienation from politicians and public services, and from the state’s failure to deliver sustainable development that protects their physical and mental health, provides useful and satisfying work for all, reduces social inequality, and conserves ecological, social, and cultural capital. While such states have provided significant benefits, this disenchantment together with the drain of taxation on capital profitability, has resulted in both neo-liberal and socialist critiques. Neo-liberals see knowledge as an individual rather than a social phenomena; stress the non generalisable nature of knowledge that is unique to time and place; and value the

tacit knowledge of entrepreneurs. The state should not try to second guess or substitute such knowledge and all attempts at socially purposeful intervention in the economy are doomed to be damaging at best and dictatorship at worst. Only the price mechanism of the market can co-ordinate all decisions taken on the basis of this individual knowledge, so free markets should be protected from political interference ('markets know best').

If knowledge is regarded as socially produced and distributed (a social structure), the neo-liberal case for free markets falls. People can transform and improve lay, tacit and academic knowledge and use it to shape sustainable development. The participatory left has realised this through campaigning on such issues as socially useful production; the defence of public services; fair trade; debt; peace, the environment, and human rights. The global anti-capitalist movement (trade unionists, students, feminists, environmentalists, and others) is a movement of movements that seeks the devolution of power, local democracy; a rejuvenation of the commons (common public goods, common land, common social goals); a reining-in of corporate and financial power; and a diversity of economic and political systems within one global community, rather than the uniformity of the global market (Bircham & Charlton, 2001, Hubbard & Miller, 2005, Kingsnorth, 2003, 2006, Saad-Filho, 2003).

Anti-capitalism is a networked and emergent system of people and ideas that is the both a product and shaper of network society (Castells, 1999). It is characterised by a desire for autonomy or self management; a willingness to resist state oppression; direct action to test ideas, demonstrate alternatives and confront existing power structures; carnival or making revolution fun; and empowerment to persuade citizens that alternatives are possible (Notes from Nowhere, 2003). It has no one big idea to change the world but its constituent movements supplement lay and tacit knowledge with that of other kinds, including knowledge that is theoretical, academic, historical and statistical. Radical philosophy and critical social and political theory inform and are informed by the movement with anarchism, Marxism, critical realism, and postmodernism, being particularly significant. The movement has its 'transformative' intellectuals, such as Naomi Klein, Arundhati Roy, Noam Chomsky, and George Monbiot, and its belief in global solidarity, together with its recognition of the need for new institutions to regulate the break up of corporate power and co-ordinate self-managing societies from above, has resulted in much theoretical debate about alternative forms of post-industrial socialism (Little, 1998); ecological and sustainability citizenship (Dobson, 2003, Barry, 2005, Valencia Saiz, 2005) and global governance (Held & McGrew, 2002, Monbiot, 2004). Central to this debate are notions of radical democracy that link the movement to critical education and pedagogy.

Radical democracy and critical education

Having recognised that both social democracy and state socialism distort citizens' understanding of society and their interests, due to the influences of positivism, technocracy and ideology, the dilemma for radical democrats is to reconcile the demands of radicalism with those of democracy. People's lack of understanding of environment and development issues and their underlying causes, together with their false perceptions of their true interests and those of society more generally, can prompt radicals, including radical teachers, to adopt the role of experts who 'know

best'; assume 'greener than thou' attitudes; and impose their views on others in authoritarian, paternalistic, or indoctrinatory ways. Much criticism of socially critical ESD assumes that it falls into this trap, but the reality is that it has well developed defences against indoctrination.

These defences will be a focus of my second article but for the moment it is sufficient to note the arguments of Hayward (1994). He suggests that the dilemma of radical democracy can be resolved by first redefining the nature and scope of democracy so that it is truly participatory and covers all aspects of citizen's lives. Such democracy allows the expression and pursuit of common interests but the provisional nature of much knowledge (of the environment and society) requires participation to be reconciled with pluralism. Dialogue that fosters individual autonomy and communicative rather than instrumental rationality is the key to such reconciliation and this can avoid relativism provided there is sufficient attention to ecological and other truths (limits). If civil society is to generate the will to regulate the market and green the state, in the common interest of realising sustainability, citizens should be able to reflect and act on what is technically possible, culturally appropriate, and morally and politically right, in conditions of equality that acknowledge real imbalances of power and the inadequacy of many claims to knowledge.

In seeking to develop the knowledge, skills and values that enable such reflection and action socially critical ESD draws on notions of education as praxis (Gadotti, 1996), participatory action research (PAR) (Rahman, 1993, Rennie & Singh, 1995), and critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1983, Grundy, 1987, Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998). These reflect the participatory left's view of social learning by involving people in the process of generating and refining socially useful knowledge as they repeatedly test ideas in action.

Rahman outlines the role of professional knowledge in this process:

In this reflection-action-reflection process of the people (people's praxis), professional knowledge can be used only in a dialogue with people's knowledge on an equal footing through which both can be enriched, and not in the arrogance of assumed superior wisdom. Altering thus the relations of knowledge, to produce and advance 'organic knowledge' as part of the very evolution of life rather than abstract (synthetic) knowledge produced in academic laboratories to be imposed upon life, is a central commitment of what is being termed 'participatory research'. (Rahman, 1993, p.196)

He suggests that PAR offers a new role for intellectuals (that of Gramsci's transformative intellectual) who as a class are in a more privileged position than ordinary working people to take a leading role. Essentially PAR invites them to exercise leadership, 'inviting, stimulating and assisting the people to collectively inquire and act for themselves' (p. 196). As states offer new forms of public participation in such fields as environmental management, in an attempt to ameliorate legitimization crisis, teachers and educational institutions can play a key role developing what has been termed 'citizen science' (Irwin, 1995, Keen et al, 2005).

Critical pedagogy confronts the real problems of existence; involves processes of conscientization; confronts ideological distortion; and incorporates action as part of

knowing (Grundy, 1987, p. 157). It shapes socially critical approaches to environmental education and ESD (Fien, 1993a&b, Gough, 1997, Plant, 1998, Antunes & Gadotti, 2005, Kahn, 2006) and my own work has sought to combine critical pedagogy with political literacy (Huckle, 1988), Habermas' critical theory (Huckle, 1996); and concepts of environmental, ecological and global citizenship (Huckle & Martin, 2001, Huckle, 2005). In all this curriculum development I have encouraged students and teachers to consider critical ideas regarding the environment and development alongside other ideas, and have offered experiential and democratic activities to enable them to do this. The continuing marginal status of such approaches is partly due to New Labour's policies on sustainable development and education to which I now turn.

New Labour and Sustainable Development

According to Stuart Hall (2003) New Labour is difficult to characterise. It is a hybrid regime, composed of two strands: the neo-liberal which is dominant and the social democratic which is subordinate. The dominant part involves setting the corporate economy free through deregulating labour and other markets; maintaining restrictive trade union legislation; establishing weak and compliant regulatory regimes; and opening doors for the corporate penetration of the public sector. The subordinate part involves a certain measure of indirect taxation and redistribution; reforms like the minimum wage and family tax credits; and substantial injections of public funds into health and education. Its long term 'project' is the transformation of social democracy into a particular variant of free market neo-liberalism.

New Labour's modernisation of Britain continues then where Thatcherism left off. It involves trying to govern in a neo-liberal direction while maintaining Labour's traditional working-class and public sector middle-class support. To do this it has sought to update social democracy with a form of 'active government' or 'entrepreneurial governance' that promotes competition between service providers, favours a shift from bureaucracy to 'community'; focuses not on inputs but on outcomes; redefines clients as consumers; and prefers market mechanisms to administrative ones. Only the private sector is 'efficient' in a measurable way. The public sector is by definition 'inefficient' and out of date, partly because it has social objectives beyond economic efficiency and value for money. It can only save itself by becoming more like the market (the true meaning of modernisation).

The primacy of neo-liberalism in New Labour's 'third way' means that the whole sustainable development agenda is as yet 'nowhere near the heart of government' (Porritt, 2004) or that the Government *Shows promise. But must try harder* (SDC, 2004). According to the Sustainable Development Commission's assessment there has been progress in such policy areas as farming and food, sustainable communities, air and water quality, and overseas aid and debt. In other areas, notably eco-taxation, air and road transport, and municipal waste, progress is too slow or non-existent. Anti-capitalists would claim that the commission's vision is not compatible with New Labour's modernisation of Britain and that it requires new and participatory forms of green socialism.

We see a society and a Government whose primary objective is still the achievement of economic growth as conventionally understood and measured, with as much social

justice and environmental protection as can be reconciled with that central goal. We envisage a society whose primary goal should be the wellbeing of society itself and of the planetary resources and environment that sustains us all, with economic objectives shaped to support that central goal rather than the other way round.
(SDC, 2004, Chapter 1, para. 9)

Barry and Paterson (2004) expand on the SDC's claim that the Government's primary objective of economic growth limits its delivery of environmental protection. They argue that New Labour's environmental policies are best understood as an attempt to implement a weak version of ecological modernisation. This suggests that economic growth is compatible with environmental protection since technological advances can decouple growth from increased pollution and rising energy and material throughputs. Critics of such 'greening of capitalism' (Harvey, 1996, Sutton, 2004) suggest that technological fixes cannot solve what are essentially political problems, and that the efficiency gains predicted are wildly optimistic. Ecological modernisation does not seek to limit overall levels of consumption nor does it share sustainable development's commitment to global justice. It is underpinned by utopian premises that 'do not adequately and accurately take into account the socio-economic dynamics of the capitalist system they are meant to reform' (Pepper, 2005, p. 18).

Barry and Paterson further argue that it has only been possible for advocates of environmental policies and commitments to advance policies fitting with an ecological modernisation agenda to the extent that such policies can be understood as consistent with how New Labour understands the constraints and possibilities that economic globalisation presents for the British polity and economy. Policies are viable to the extent that they can be shown to be contributing to the 'competitiveness' of the national economy. Hence renewable energy technologies are favoured as 'leading edge' and providing competitive advantage; GM technologies are favoured despite public opposition; and growth in air and car transport goes unchecked as it is seen as essential to promoting the UK economy in conditions of globalisation. New Labour realises the need to make certain environmental claims for legitimisation purposes, but its policy intervention occurs in an ideological climate of neoliberalism where fiscal stability is an overriding imperative. Hence financial support for renewable energy is far smaller than in Germany or Denmark, and the level of public investment needed to provide sustainable public transport cannot be realised.

New Labour and education

The neoliberal strand of New Labour's education policy involves opening education to business values, interests, and methods of management and funding. Rikowski (2002) argues that such privatisation is prompted by the World Trade Organisation's desire to open public services to international capital, a process encouraged by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and sought by corporations who regard education as a potential source of profit. New Labour believes that the future of British business largely rests on the export of services and is able to conceal the GATS agenda, partly due to its complexity and lack of clarity. Legislation before parliament in 2006 would allow a variety of religious, charitable and commercial interests to own and run schools, mainly financed through public spending.

At the same time as it opens education to business, New Labour is carrying out structural and ideological transformations that align education more closely with its economic function of reproducing a graded and skilled workforce, and instilling the myth of consumer choice (Hill, 2002). A more instrumental curriculum gives greater attention to basic skills and testing and less to creativity and critical thinking, while an ever more highly differentiated hierarchy of schools (grammar, voluntary-aided, specialist, foundation, trust, academies, etc) selects pupils on the basis of social background rather than allowing real parental choice. Neoliberal policies are increasing inequality of provision and outcomes in education and undermining the comprehensive principle.

The comprehensive school is an enduring monument to British social democracy (Wilby, 2006). Common schools for all pupils, offering quality with equality, expressing social solidarity, and forging an educated democracy and common culture, are key to realising 'our common future' through sustainable development. New Labour suggests that such schools have failed to deliver and is replacing them with the hierarchy of schools mentioned above. This policy is partly driven by the need to ensure middle class parents continue to use state schools, but providing them with 'choice' runs counter to the Government's claim to be promoting meritocracy in order not to waste talent. Social democracy's concern for children's well-being shapes the policies of integrating children's services and linking schools more closely with their communities found in *Every Child Matters* (DfES, 2006c), but as with sustainable development, the social democratic strand of policy serves only to ameliorate problems accentuated by the neoliberal strand.

Education in the UK is a devolved responsibility. While policy in England and Northern Ireland places emphasis on the neoliberal themes of choice, institutional diversity and collaboration, that in Scotland and Wales is more influenced by social democratic ideals and comprehensive principles that stress the links between schools and communities and the need for common content and standards of provision across all schools (Raffe, 2005). These differences are reflected in policies and guidance on ESD.

Education for Sustainable Development

A report by the Environmental Audit Committee (EAC, 2003), a select committee of the House of Commons, concluded that the DfES had 'failed to demonstrate any clear vision or strategic thinking relating to ESD'. It called for a strategic framework to remedy this situation and as noted in the introduction, the Department published its first action plan later that year and consulted on its framework for sustainable schools in 2006 (DfES, 2006b). My analysis so far suggests that ESD (in England at least) will continue to be constrained by the following factors.

Firstly the emphasis on individual attainment and competition in education, together with the erosion of the comprehensive principle, discourages the principle of care (care for oneself, care for each other, and care for the environment) on which the framework is based. This suggests eight ways of approaching the task of building a sustainable school ('doorways') but the erosion of local community schools part closes the doorways of participation and inclusion, local well-being, and travel and transport. Between 1985/6 and 1996/7 the average journey to school, for pupils aged

11-16 increased by 35%. A Department for Transport study (DfT, 2005) suggests the rate of change in the average length of school journey appears to have accelerated since 1995.

Secondly the increased privatisation of school building, and such services as catering, means that it is less likely that schools will meet high environmental standards or provide healthy food. The Government's Building Schools for the Future programme (BSF) seeks to rebuild or renew every secondary school in England over a ten to fifteen year period and presents major opportunities for the private sector to build new schools, under the much criticised private finance initiative (PFI), encouraged by a new body Partnership for Schools. Such financing is ultimately unsustainable because it encourages borrowing that future tax payers will be required to repay (Hopkins, 2006). The sustainable schools consultation suggests that the programme 'has the potential to create a generation of advanced, eco-efficient school designs' and that new build and refurbishment projects should rate at least 'very good' using the Building Research Establishment's environment assessment method. But the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment reports that 50% of the new schools, built between 2000 and 2006, were poorly designed and built, and that 9 out of 10 of the worst designed new schools were built under PFI (Taylor, 2006). BSF is behind schedule and lacks expertise (Marley, 2006). PFI funded projects are reluctant to experiment with ecological design since 'originality means risk, and risk can be expensive' (Elliott, 2005). As Elliott suggests, the lofty aims of BSF can only be realised by reviving municipal socialism and removing the financial and ideological shackles binding local government.

The privatisation of school catering was the key factor that precipitated the decline of the school kitchen and the low nutritional value of school meals revealed by the television series *Jamie's School Dinners* shown in early 2005 (Channel 4, 2006). The Government subsequently announced more funding for school meals, set up the School Food Trust, and sought to ban junk food and vending machines from schools. Its efforts to improve school meals continue to be frustrated by the lack of local authority control over school catering; the closure of many school kitchens; the commitment of many schools to long-term contracts with commercial suppliers, and falling demand from pupils. Unhealthy food continues to be widely available outside schools, and evidence that some schools 'are striking deals with mobile tuck shop operators, encouraging them to pitch up outside the school gates during breaks in the day' (Bowers & Lewis, 2006), again points to the contradictions involved in seeking sustainable schools in an unsustainable society.

Thirdly as a cross-curricula theme ESD is marginalised by the National Curriculum prescribed for schools. This reproduces academic divisions of knowledge that separate the natural and social sciences and the humanities, and fails to acknowledge lay and tacit knowledge. This makes it difficult for learners to understand the interactions of bio-physical and social structures and processes and so alienates them from nature (Dickens, 1996). It also means that they fail to develop sustainability as a frame of mind (Bonnett, 2003). Critical ideas, from such subjects as economics, politics and sociology, do not feature in lessons for the majority of pupils and together with the decline of project work and community/environment based enquiry, this means that they rarely experience the ways of producing, organising and validating knowledge associated with the participatory left.

Fourthly guidance on ESD is often unhelpful as it fails to recognise the contested nature and politics of sustainable development. ESD has developed at some distance from citizenship education and advice, such as that offered by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, offers key concepts such as interdependence and quality of life, equity and justice, as if these are unproblematic and can readily be translated into the classroom without related considerations of ethics, politics and global political economy. Guidance from NGOs suffers from similar failings. Oxfam's curriculum for global citizenship (Oxfam, 2006) fails to suggest to teachers what model (or models) of global democracy might realise the values (such as commitment to sustainable development) it seeks to promote. WWF's development framework for schools (Hren & Birney, 2004) introduces four cornerstones of sustainability (social justice, environmental stewardship, economic security, and civic democracy) but fails to explore with teachers their contested meanings or the reasons why they are rarely realised in the real world. *Get Global* (Price, 2006) a skills-based approach to global citizenship for older pupils, produced by a number of NGOs with support from the Department for International Development (DFID), demonstrates how critical pedagogy can be cleansed of its critical elements to leave only experiential learning.

Inadequate guidance is also a feature of the DfES action plan and its national framework for sustainable schools (teachernet, 2006b). The action plan suggests that all learners should develop 'the skills, knowledge and value base to be active citizens in creating a more sustainable society' without discussing and/or specifying these outcomes in any detail. For each 'doorway' the framework suggests an integrated approach to the curriculum (teaching provision and learning), campus (values and ways of working) and community (wider influence and partnerships). Schools are to use the curriculum to cultivate the knowledge, values and skills needed to address 'doorway' issues (health and sustainability of food and drink, energy and water stewardship, travel and traffic, sustainable consumption and waste, how the built environment affects well-being and how it impacts on the natural world, inclusion and participation, local issues, global citizenship), but there is little to suggest that these outcomes could, or should, go beyond the ecological modernisation of the school and its community to reveal and challenge those interests and policies that render it difficult to make them truly sustainable.

Education policies in Scotland and Wales are more enabling for ESD than those in England and strategy documents on ESD reflect this (Scottish Executive, 2006, SDELG, 2004, Welsh Assembly Government, 2006). Nevertheless the inspection agency Estyn has found Welsh teachers confused about what to teach with only patchy support from local authority advisers (Waters, 2006).

New Labour, new leader, new direction?

By the time this article is published Labour will have a new leader and deputy leader. Gordan Brown's succession and the election of a new deputy leader prompted renewed debate about the direction of Labour policy including that on sustainable development and education.. The Environment Secretary, David Miliband (2006) suggested to the Fabian Society that climate change required progressive visions of political economy, social justice, internationalism, and politics that could revive notions of active citizenship while meeting the needs of the party and the planet. The

Labour Environment Campaign published speeches by the six candidates for the deputy leadership, including that of Alan Johnson the Education Secretary (SERA, 2007), and these reflect the continuing contradictions between neo-liberalism and social democracy that also characterised new proposed legislation on planning, energy, and waste (Vidal, 2007).

In his speech Alan Johnson spoke of making every new school carbon neutral; of promoting safe and sustainable travel of school; and giving sustainable development a stronger focus in the revised national curriculum being developed by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Its consultation on this curriculum sought to reduce prescribed content, personalise learning, require topic work across subjects, give greater attention to transferable skills, and promote the theme of sustainability within its global dimension (QCA, 2007).

This article has sought to show that there are currently obstacles to pupils developing the 'skills, knowledge and value base to be active citizens in creating a more sustainable society' as the DfES action plan recommends. Its arguments suggest that an ESD indicator could serve to reveal and overcome these obstacles if it provided evidence of the extent to which pupils acquire propositional and procedural knowledge of environment and development issues and the politics of sustainable development; the intellectual, communication, political and action skills they need to 'make a difference'; and the ability to draw on a range of procedural and substantive values when making judgements. Such an indicator might assess the extent to which such knowledge, skills and values had been acquired through participative action research, or community problem-solving, focussed on a range of real or simulated issues, at a variety of scales from the local to the global. Designed and used to meet such objectives it should improve the quality of teaching and learning and the relevance of education to young people.

It was with such premises in mind that I approached the task of researching possible approaches to a UK ESD indicator for the SDC. My second article deals with the background to the six approaches I suggested; the responses of the ESD community when consulted about these; and the SDC's subsequent recommendations to Government. It raises issues relating to the micro-politics of ESD and the continuing marginalisation and misrepresentation of socially critical approaches.

Note on contributor

JOHN HUCKLE is an ESD consultant and visiting fellow at the University of York. He can be contacted via his website at <http://john.huckle.org.uk>

References

Antunes, A. & Gadotti, M. (2005) Eco-pedagogy as the Appropriate Pedagogy to the Earth Charter Process, in: P. B. Corcoran, M. Vilela & A. Roerink (Eds) *The Earth Charter in Action: Toward a Sustainable World*, (Amsterdam, KIT Publishers).

Barry, J. (2005) Resistance Is Fertile: From Environmental to Sustainability Citizenship, in: A. Dobson & D. Bell (Eds) *Environmental Citizenship* (London, MIT Press).

Barry, J. & Patterson, M. (2004) Globalisation, Ecological Modernisation and New Labour, *Political Studies*, 52, 767-784.

Bircham, E. & Charlton, J. (Eds) (2001) *Anti-Capitalism: A Guide to the Movement* (London, Bookmarks).

Bonnett, M. (2004) *Retrieving Nature: education in a post-humanist age* (London, Blackwell).

Bowers, S. & Lewis, P. (2006) Pay more or we quit, canteen operators to tell schools as vending machine purge hits profits, *The Guardian*, 18.09.06, p. 11.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical, Education, Knowledge and Action Research* (Lewes, Falmer).

Castells, M. (1999) Flows, Networks, and Identities: A Critical Theory of the Informational Society, in M. Castells, R Flecha, P. Freire, H. Giroux, D Macedo & P. Willis *Critical Education in the New Information Age* (Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield).

Channel 4 (2006) *Jamie's School Dinners*. Available online at: www.channel4.com/life/microsites/J/jamies_school_dinners/index.html (accessed 14 February 2007).

Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2005) *Securing the Future*. Available online at: www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/publications/uk-strategy/index.htm (accessed 14 February 2007).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *Sustainable Development Action Plan for Education and Skills*. Available online at: www.dfes.gov.uk/aboutus/sd/actionplan.shtml (accessed 14 February 2007).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006a) *Sustainable Schools for Pupils, Communities and the Environment: Consultation Paper*. Available online at: www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations/conResults.cfm?consultationId=1398 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006b) *Sustainable Schools for Pupils, Communities and the Environment: Government Response to the Consultation on the Sustainable Schools Strategy*. Available online at: publications.teachernet.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=productdetails&PageModule=publications&ProductId=DFES-04294-2006 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006c) *Every Child Matters*. Available online at: www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/publications/ (accessed 14 February 2007).

Dickens, P.(1996) *Reconstructing Nature, Alienation, Emancipation and the Division of Labour* (London, Routledge).

Dobson, A. (2003) *Citizenship and the Environment*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Department for Transport (DfT) (2005) *Factors leading to increased school journey length*. Available online at:
www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/schooltravel/research/factorsleadingtoincreasedsch5752?version=1 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Environmental Audit Committee (EAC) (2003) *Learning the Sustainability Lesson*. Available online at:
www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200203/cmselect/cmenvaud/472/472.pdf (accessed 14 February 2007).

Elliott, L. (2005) Public buildings and private finance? That's a formula for tomorrow's slums, *The Guardian*, September 29, 21.

Fien, J. (1993a) *Education for the Environment, critical curriculum theorising and environmental education* (Geelong, Deakin University).

Fien, J. (Ed) (1993b) *Environmental Education, a pathway to sustainability* (Geelong, Deakin University).

Gadotti, M. (1996) *Pedagogy of Praxis, A Dialectical Philosophy of Education* (New York, State University of New York Press).

Giroux, H. A. (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education: a Pedagogy for the Opposition* (London, Heinemann Educational Books).

GMB (Britain's General Union) (2006) Private Finance, A Critique. Available online at: www.gmb.org.uk/shared_asp_files/uploadedfiles/C114B39E-5A1A-4465-AB29-21D4834868AE_PPPFactSheet1.pdf#search='PFI%20critique' (Accessed 14 February 2007).

Gough, A. (1997) *Education and the Environment, policy trends and problems of marginalisation* (Melbourne, Australian Council for Educational Research).

Grundy, S. (1987) *Curriculum: Product or Praxis* (Lewes, Falmer Press).

Hall, S. (2003) New Labour's Double Shuffle, *Soundings*, 24, 10 -24.

Harvey, D. (1996) *Justice, Nature & the Geography of Difference*, (Oxford, Blackwell).

Hayward, T. (1994) *Ecological Thought* (Cambridge, Polity).

Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2002) *Globalization / Anti-Globalization* (Cambridge, Polity).

Hill, D. (2002) The Third Way and Education: New Labour, the dominance of Neo-Liberal Global Capital in European Education Policies, and the Growth of Inequality. Available online at: www.ieps.org.uk.cwc.net/papers1.html (accessed 14 February 2007).

Hren, B. & Birney, A. (2004) *Pathways, A Development Framework for School Sustainability* (Godalming, WWF).

Hubbard, G. & Miller, D. (Eds) (2005) *Arguments Against G8* (London, Pluto Press).

Huckle, J. (1988) *Teachers' Handbook* (What We Consume module of WWF's Global Environmental Education Programme), (Richmond, Richmond Publishing Company).

Huckle, J. (1996) Teacher Education, in: J. Huckle & S. Sterling (Eds) *Education for Sustainability* (London, Earthscan Publications).

Huckle, J. & Martin, A. (2001) *Environments in a Changing World* (London, Prentice Hall).

Huckle, J. (2005) *Citizenship Education for Sustainable Development in Initial Teacher Education*. Available online at: www.citized.info/pdf/induction/John_Huckle.pdf (accessed 14 February 2007).

Huckle, J. (2006a) *A UK indicator of the impact of formal learning on knowledge and awareness of sustainable development*. Available online at: www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications.php?id=402 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Huckle, J. (2006b) *A UK indicator of education for sustainable development: report of consultative workshops*. Available online at: www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications.php?id=398 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Irwin, A. (1995) *Citizen Science* (London, Routledge).

Johnston, R. (1989) *Environmental Problems: Nature, Economy and State*, (London, Belhaven).

Kahn, R. (2006) *Towards Ecopedagogy: Weaving a Broad-based Pedagogy of Liberation for Animals, Nature, and the Oppressed People of the Earth*. Available online at: <http://richardkahn.org/writings/ecopedagogy/towardsecopedagogy.pdf> (accessed 14 February 2007).

Keen, M., Brown, V. & Dyball, R. (Eds) (2005) *Social Learning in Environmental Management* (London, Earthscan).

Kincheloe, J. & Steinberg, S. (1998) *Students as Researchers* (London, Routledge Falmer).

Kingsnorth, P. (2003) *One No, Many Yeses: a journey to the heart of the global resistance movement* (Northampton, Free Press)

Kingsnorth, P. (2006) Protest Still Matters, *New Statesman*, May 8, 8 – 29.

Little, A. (1998) *Post-industrial socialism: Towards a new politics of welfare* (London, Routledge).

Marley, D. (2006) School building chaos. Available online at: www.tes.co.uk/search/story/?story_id=2320736 (accessed 14 February 2007)

Miliband, D (2006) Red-green renewal: the future of New Labour. Available online at: www.fabian-society.org.uk/press_office/display.asp?id=579&type=news&cat=48 (Accessed 14 February 2007).

Monbiot, G. (2004) *The Age of Consent, A Manifesto for a New World Order* (London, Harper Perennial).

Notes from Nowhere (Ed) (2003) *We are everywhere, the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism* (London, Verso).

Oxfam, (2006) *Education for Global Citizenship, A Guide for Schools*. Available online at: www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/teachers/globciti/index.htm (accessed 14 February 2007).

Pepper, D. (2005) Utopianism and Environmentalism, *Environmental Politics*, 14/1, 3 – 22.

Plant, M. (1998) *Education for the Environment, stimulating practice* (Dereham, Peter Francis).

Porritt, J. (2004) Slow progress, *The Guardian* G2, 14 April, 12 – 13.

Price, J. (2006) *Get Global, a skills based approach to active global citizenship, key stages 3 & 4*. Available online at: www.getglobal.org.uk/ (accessed 14 February 2007)

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2007) *The Secondary Curriculum Review*. Available online at www.qca.org.uk/secondarycurriculumreview/ (accessed 14 February 2007).

Raffe, D. (2005) Devolution and divergence in education policy, in J. Adams & K. Schmuecker (Eds) *Devolution in Practice 2006*, (London, IPPR).

Rahman, M. D. A. (1993) *People's Self-Development, perspectives on participatory action research* (Zed Books, London).

Rennie, J. & Singh, N. (1995) *Participatory research for sustainable livelihoods: a guide for field projects on adaptive strategies* (London, International Institute for Sustainable Development).

Rickowski, G. (2002) Globalisation and Education. Available online at: www.ieps.org.uk.cwc.net/papers2.html (accessed 14 February 2007).

Saad-Filho, A. (2003) *Anti-Capitalism, A Marxist Introduction* (London, Pluto).

Scott, W. & Gough, S. (2003) *Sustainable Development and Learning, Framing the Issues* (London, Routledge).

Scottish Executive, (2006) *Learning for Our Future*. Available online at: www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/07/25143907/0 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Sustainable Development Commission (SDC) (2004) *Shows promise. But must try harder* (London, SDC).

Sustainable Development Commission (SDC) (2006) *SD Indicators for Education, SDC proposals to DfES and Defra*. Available online at: www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications.php?id=425 (accessed 14 February 2007).

SDELG (Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group), (2004) *Sustainable Development Education in England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland*, Available online at: <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/sustainabledevelopment/about/nationaldocuments/sustainableeducationdevelopmentintheuk.asp> (accessed 4 June 2007)

SERA (Socialist Environment and Resources Association), (2007) 'SERA's Deputy Leadership Lecture Series', *New Ground*, 72, 9 - 33

Sutton, P. W. (2004) *Nature, Environment and Society*, (Basingstoke, Palgrave-Macmillan).

Taylor, M. (2006) Half of new schools badly designed, says survey. Available online at <http://education.guardian.co.uk/schools/story/0,,1812111,00.html> (accessed 14 February 2007).

Teachernet (2006a) *s3 sustainable school self evaluation*. Available online at: www.teachernet.gov.uk/sustainableschools/tools/tools_detail.cfm?id=2 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Teachernet (2006b) *Sustainable Schools*. Available online at: www.teachernet.gov.uk/sustainableschools/index.cfm (accessed 14 February 2007).

Valencia Saiz, A. (2005) Globalisation, Cosmopolitanism and Ecological Citizenship, *Environmental Politics*, 14/2, 163 – 178

Vidal, J. (2007) 'Keep a watch on this space'. *Society Guardian, Environment*, May 30th, 8

Waters, F. (2006) Shortfall revealed in global issues. Available online at: www.tes.co.uk/search/story/?story_id=2264132 (accessed 14 February 2007).

Wainwright, H. (2003) *Reclaim the State, Experiments in Popular Democracy* (London, Verso).

Welsh Assembly Government (2006) *Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship*. Available online at: www.esd-wales.org.uk/english/ESDreports/reports.asp (accessed 14 February 2007).

Wilby, P. (2006) Where did it all go wrong? *New Statesman*, 06.03., pp. 22 – 25.