

**FIVE TESTS FOR
GORDON BROWN AND A FEW OTHERS
OR
HOW DID WE GET INTO THIS MESS?**

INTRODUCTION

NOTE: this is the second version of my still incomplete response to Gordon Brown's book. At a time when our government seeks to prove that brains are not needed to do the job I believe that it is very useful, even salutary, to read the words of a political grown up, even a flawed political grown up.

Brown's *Famous Five* were the tests he set to be passed before Britain would join the Euro. He was always good at tests. At school and university he passed an awful lot of them at a very early age. In government he liked setting tests. I suggest that this overemphasised government by measurement, though there is more to Brown than simply that. Blair also depended upon government by measurement but the difference is that what Blair wanted measuring changed frequently and as long as he could get a useful sound bite out of a result TB, as friends and colleagues know him, seemed to be happy. They had different approaches to evidence and to detail but perhaps their public values created the clearest contrast; that and their personalities.

I have set five tests for Brown and others arising from my reading of his book, *GORDON BROWN, My Life, Our Times* (2017). The tests are derived from a conceptual framework I have been using since 2010 and the establishment of our Coalition Government. In that year we gained a government that was committed to what I saw as **Social Fracking**. Perhaps the tests will help me make sense of far more than Brown.

Reflecting on that notion it seems to me that 1979 and Margaret Thatcher was the real start of Social Fracking. It has long been accepted that Thatcher destroyed the post-war political consensus that stood on the foundations of the Attlee administrations from 1945 to 1951. By doing so she attacked what she famously declared did not exist: society. We in Britain are all, in one-way or another, the beneficiaries of Attlee and Bevan and Beveridge and,

particularly when he was Minister for Housing, Harold Macmillan. It is interesting that the politicians I have mentioned represent three political parties: the consensus.

Let me emphasise that I do not simply wish to review Brown's book. My intention here is to use the book to help me make critical sense of how the UK in particular has been making such a mess of government and politics.

As the Chief Examiner setting the five tests and assessing and evaluating not just Brown's performance I take responsibility for the definition of terms and shall try to explain myself, especially if my definitions depart from normal usage.

I wish to examine Gordon Brown and others on the following.

- 1. Politics and Democracy.**
- 2. Intellectualism.**
- 3. Education.**
- 4. Society.**
- 5. And upon what he and others have left us.**

However, before the examination starts, I want to address the issue upon which almost every reviewer of the book seems to have concentrated. This will not be the last time that I refer to the rivalry between Brown and Blair nor endeavour to compare and contrast the two of them but two moments stand out for me. Possibly they deserve to be called 'defining moments'. I am not talking about the Granita Restaurant or any subsequent row over the succession.

TWIN PEAKS

I believe that 9/11 gave us **PEAK BLAIR**. It really was his Date with Destiny: Cometh the Hour, Cometh the Man. What action did he choose to take? Whose voices did he listen to? Whose voices did he choose not to hear? On what basis did he make his case for intervention? How much medium and long term planning did he undertake? Was truth the first casualty of his decision-making? Has truth ever been allowed to revisit him?

We saw him on television alongside the President of the USA posing as the wise Greek counselling the inexperienced Roman. Soon he would be in front of the cameras again pictured against a backdrop of our 'gallant lads' in khaki. This was a fulfilled Blair. Once again he was the lead singer not this time of The Ugly Rumours but of a very ugly alliance of murderous liars. He was where he always wanted to be: at the front; of what it did not matter. Neither did it matter who bore the bloody cost.

PEAK BROWN was very different. It was the 2009 G20 meeting in London, eighty years after the Wall Street Crash of 1929. In *Saving the World? Gordon Brown Reconsidered* (2013) by William Keegan the point is made that outside

the UK Brown has a very high reputation based upon the actions he took on behalf of the entire world, rich and poor, to prevent 2009 repeating the mistakes of 1929. The point is also made that inside the UK his huge achievement hardly registered.

Brown bemoans what he sees as a personal failure to follow through his action to deal with the crisis by inducing a culture change in banking. Losing the General Election in 2010 put an end to any chance of that especially when in George Osborne we acquired the worst Chancellor of the Exchequer since Churchill in the mid to late nineteen twenties.

Comparing Brown with his predecessor and successors as prime ministers can only enhance his reputation. Comparing him with Osborne as Chancellor is not worth the effort. Osborne was incompetent and Osborne was nasty.

PEAK BLAIR and PEAK BROWN contrast in many ways. The greatest contrast is in their public values. They both intervened in the lives of others. Blair generated continuing death, destruction and displacement. It is his legacy. Everyone knows it. Brown prevented financial and economic calamity. It is his legacy. No one remembers it.

TEST ONE, POLITICS AND DEMOCRACY

The Greeks, particularly the Athenians, gave us these words and because they pondered upon meaning so much we see them as concepts for us to define, re-define and re-define again. The Athenians did not, however, invent discussion or variants of group decision-making. We constrain ourselves if we imagine that in order to define Politics and Democracy our only reference point is ancient Athens.

Nevertheless, those words have a gravitational pull and Aristotle, for one, refuses to leave the stage. In *Of The People By The People, A New History of Democracy* (2011) Richard Osborne alerts us to the tendency to conceptualise but by beginning his book with the Greeks he firmly plants in the mind the notion that we are dealing with a Greek/Athenian invention. John Keane in *The Life and Death of DEMOCRACY* (2009) provides a perspective on the development of democracy that allows us to take into account societies far beyond Greece.

I see **POLITICS** as the inclusive discussion of and consensual arrival at public values. In my opinion defining it as the struggle for or the games that people play to obtain power is to seriously undermine and devalue it's meaning. I find it disappointing that so many politicians and commentators upon the actions of politicians effectively see politics as a dirty game of manipulation. Reading Brown's book I found it necessary to stay alert to signs of what I regard as the misuse of both word and concept. It is the same with any book written by a politician. They tend to believe that politics is defined as what politicians do. Too often what they do is to hurt politics.

DEMOCRACY can be perceived in a number of ways. The Peasants Revolt of 1381, the Putney Debates of 1647, the French Revolution of 1789 are among many examples of people exerting a right to participate in governmental decision making. To sit on the far right in the French Assembly of 1789 indicated your preference for absolute government in the form of a monarch. To sit on the far left indicated your preference for wide participation. I keep this in mind when I hear or read the words Right Wing and Left Wing used as labels for political behaviour. This, of course, places Tony Blair far to the right. Having worked in a local authority run by Militant Tendency it is also where I would place them.

Some reviewers of Brown's book judge him to have been a less effective prime minister than his predecessor. Making that judgment indicates to me a current belief that prime ministers must be absolutist. Brown describes his efforts to restore cabinet government and a proper relationship with the civil service. I see that as neither weak nor foolish. In his book he does make use of Macmillan's famous reply when asked what could throw government off course: 'Events, dear boy, events.' He also makes use of Wilson's 'A week is a long time in politics.' This gives the impression of someone surprised by the job: by the lack of control he had compared with his job as Chancellor.

'Overwhelmed' is the word used by some to describe Brown as prime minister, probably because he came to believe that times had changed and prime ministers were now constantly 'in the thick of it'. Quite possibly his early developed sense of responsibility and attention to detail exacerbated the problem, though he did try to spread power across his government. He was, of course, constantly under attack from, particularly, the Murdoch press who had previously supported Blair.

But it concerns me that we seem to have formed the notion that only the strong (and the stable) can be in charge. Theresa May has recently demonstrated the limitations of that belief, certainly as an empty war cry. Yes, Blair had a lot of control but it was based upon carefully crafted narratives (often lies) and the tendency to keep chucking short-term policies at the electorate rather than to think even medium term. His long term amounted to slogans such as 'aspiration' and 'choice.'

To put it in a different way, strength and stability can emerge from democracy. They do not have to reside only within autocracy. I would argue that part of Brown's problem as prime minister was that he tried to take some steps towards democracy at a time when too many people had come to believe that effective government was autocratic government.

Both politics and democracy require truth. Lies pervert politics and damage democracy. The referendum on EU membership was neither politics nor was it democracy. It was manipulation.

Did Brown do politics? Where might he have sat in the French Assembly? Is Jeremy Corbyn a threat to society because he sits towards the left?

His book provides abundant evidence of early development of a social conscience together with the urge to do something to give effect to it. So much of his early life seemed to be spent writing, campaigning, organising, canvassing and, as ever with the Labour Party, in meetings. I think that was doing politics. Later on I am not so sure.

His 'pact' with Blair, if that is the right word, gave him enormous power over domestic policy. But for two politicians to effectively say to each other, 'You have that bit and I'll have this bit and after a while I shall stand down and you can have my bit', well, is that even close to my definition of politics? Does it fit any definition of democracy no matter how conceptualised? The Labour Party had (still has) properly established procedures for selecting its leaders. Yes, there have always been internal stitch-ups, punch-ups, deals and a little light back stabbing but my objection to this pact derives mostly from seeing the damage it did to politics and to democracy. It became about power: obtaining it, keeping it and seizing it.

Later I hope to say something about the contribution of that 'pact' to allowing an unhindered and unchallenged Blair to act as a war criminal.

TEST TWO: INTELLECTUALISM

I have made this into an 'ism' because it seems to me almost impossible to discuss government and politics without wading through lots and lots of 'isms'. Once, I seem to remember, there was an attempt to suppress the term 'Blairism' because it was being used disrespectfully. And, of course, since 1979 'Thatcherism' has dominated political discourse. Let me take a moment to explain what I believe Thatcherism to be.

I was listening to Patrick Minford, a free market enthusiast, at a small seminar in the University of Liverpool and, just as I would be, was bemused and befuddled by the statistics. Then I realised that it was not about numbers; it was not even about a religious conversion to the beliefs of Austrian economists in Chicago; it was a deeply held conviction that productivity depends upon two things: stimulating already rich people to work harder by offering them the chance of yet more riches while simultaneously stimulating already poor people to work harder by threatening them with yet more poverty.

Theresa May calls all this 'Christianity'.

It is not essential to wear glasses to earn the label 'intellectual' and it is wise to bear in mind that the label is not always applied as a compliment but even as an insult the word suggests a critical thinker.

Tony Blair is very fond of the word and in his book uses it to denote what he wishes us to perceive to be the high brain power of so many of his advisers, particularly Andrew Adonis. Working for Blair were a number of people with high brainpower but were they intellectuals?

We might remind ourselves that under Blair there was huge effort to hit targets: to deliver policy no matter if this week's policy was replacing last week's policy without everybody being told. Doubting the wisdom of the policy was not encouraged. But doubt is the stock-in-trade of an intellectual. Andrew Adonis now doubts the wisdom of a policy he authored and pushed for even although it was against agreed party values. The damage done by the commodification of university learning has at last come home to him. Taking so long to have doubt is hardly what is expected of an intellectual.

Geoff Mulgan was Blair's Director of the Strategy Unit and Head of Policy in Number 10. He had previously worked for Gordon Brown. He wrote a real heavyweight of a book called, *GOOD AND BAD GOVERNMENT* (2006). His book is awash with references that demonstrate his wide reading and scholarship. I think he has caught the virus that has been spreading throughout academe for some years. I call it Mad Citation Disease (MCD). With Michael Barber he once lectured a group of experienced parliamentarians on how government was done these days: New Labour meant New Governance, to borrow a word from the title of Harold Wilson's book of 1976 while demonstrating just a little MCD.

Underpinning all this is the notion that government is what you do *to* people. They only get involved at the implementation stage. And since the targets (really, Blair's idea of a policy) kept changing the people could only ever be reactive in one form or another. In fact we are looking at government without that untidy thing called politics.

Before I say more about Blair's army of intellectuals it might be useful to reflect on a few earlier politicians and their advisors who might wear that label.

Maynard Keynes ('When the facts change I change my mind.') was a member of the Liberal Party who, on those occasions when they were on speaking terms, worked closely with Lloyd George. William Beveridge (a Liberal MP) is famous for his Report but also wrote importantly on unemployment and a fair society. Harold Macmillan (a Conservative) also did a lot of deep thinking on the same subject, especially in the 1930s. Each could frame questions research, analyse, reflect, assess and evaluate. Each was also willing to be questioned.

Writing a book does not automatically make you an intellectual. Reading a few political memoirs should be enough to establish that. Self-justification often masquerades as self-criticism and critical reflection. Yes, I am thinking of Blair's book. Even writing within a conceptual framework is not enough, especially when authors are unaware of the framework within which they write or fail to critique it. Brown, for example, knows all about neo-liberalism and yet often uses its language without realising that he is doing so. 'Terrorism' is not a word to be used without raising questions about how careless use of an abstract noun can justify war. It is part of the language used to obtain support for the greater concentration and application of power by governments and Eisenhower's military industrial complex. And surely he should have raised a

critical eyebrow when he saw Blair deploying 'reform', that beloved word of old school history lessons, as he deformed the school system.

Twice a Lord, Hailsham (very Tory) wrote a lot mostly in defence of a stratified society in which he tried to present the preservation of an upper class as somehow a middle position. In his autobiography he loudly declares his belief in elitism. The fact, however, that as a prefect at school he fiercely beat a younger A.J. Ayer the philosopher gave him no rights to call himself an intellectual. The cane transmits pain, not brain.

Attending a public meeting addressed by, for example, Michael Foot or Tony Crosland in the run up to the 1964 general election could be an intellectual treat as you listened to people who did far more than simply sell you an idea as a nice shiny new policy proposal. Such people had done some very deep thinking and were prepared to have that thinking questioned.

But it is not just the depth of research or the width of the reading or even the cleverness of the questions that makes a politician an intellectual. Let me offer a perhaps surprising example, Charles Clarke. Clarke is a defender of Blair and yet, when Mary Russell, as Chief Executive of the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), wrote complaining that a speech of his demonstrated a woefully out-dated vision of universities he agreed to a meeting.

On behalf of UCET I wrote the briefing paper. He had the sense to ensure that the last remaining civil servant in the department who knew what this was all about was present. On every point he admitted that he was wrong. And then, my paraphrase, he uttered what might almost be regarded as the intellectual creed: "I am learning so much from losing arguments that I need to have more such meetings." We arranged to have them. He was then moved to be replaced by Ruth Kelly who cancelled them all. Not any kind of intellectual was Ruth.

The Field Marshall of Blair's intellectual army was probably Michael Barber known, to his own satisfaction, as Mr. Deliverology. Like me he is a supporter of Liverpool Football Club. He once wrote to the club telling them what they were doing wrong and how they should fix things. They have not won many trophies since. Bill Shankly, remember, equated football with socialism. Winning was important but not as important as the values for which you stood.

Barber was/is known as 'The Control Freak's Control Freak.' I am sure that some people must have an addiction to torture by flow chart and PowerPoint. If so then Barber is for you. Never question the wisdom of the chosen target; just hit it or else. This set the tone for New Labour's New Governance.

It would have helped if the targets had not changed so frequently and it would have helped even more if their philosophical underpinnings had amounted to something more substantial than 'choice' and 'aspiration' and 'modernisation'. Blair loved words such as these. He used them as labels to apply to anything he fancied doing.

As for the late Phillip Gould, Blair's Focus Group Master, inventor of so many New Labour slogans, supposed Hegelian who married the Consciousness of the People to Marketing, whose book on New Labour (both editions) was devoured by the Cameroons (as was Blair's book) well, I called my review of his book **Ersatz politics and deviant governance**. It was a dispiriting disgrace, though written enthusiastically. Blair wrote a long foreword to the second edition of Gould's book. Perhaps he finally nails down something that can stand as his philosophy. He repeatedly says that New Labour was all about CHOICE. Who got to choose? The powerless have little chance to choose.

Another member of the intellectual army was John Birt. This former Director General of the BBC famously gave us the word 'Birtism' for his approach to management. Restructuring was what you had to cope with if you worked for him as well as constantly having to learn new words to describe old jobs. Blair made him his Blue Skies Thinker without seemingly any awareness that Private Eye had for years made merciless fun of him. I have often wondered if the fact that he went to the boys school almost over the road from Cherie's girls school influenced the appointment.

Jonathon Powell is another. Among his books is *THE NEW MACHIAVELLI: How to Wield Power in the Modern World* (2011). I titled my review **The Diary of an Apparatchik**. It is a good read because of the gossip it contains.

Perhaps I should mention Peter Mandelson and Alastair Campbell but I think that Peter Osborne has said enough about them in his, *THE RISE OF POLITICAL LYING* (2005). They have never sued him I believe. Mandelson's grandfather, Herbert Morrison, harboured an ambition to replace Attlee. He did, however, write a book on British Government that was so well thought of that it was required reading for my degree. I am not sure if that gets him the title of intellectual but his notion of government was rather different from that of New Labour. Yes Morrison was for getting things done but not by commodifying policies and bypassing the civil service.

If agonising when presented with unexpected information is a sign of an intellectual then we might consider Keith Joseph. He once came to a Politics Association Conference. As a founder member of the Executive Committee for this association of teachers of government and politics I thought I had read most of what we had produced. In preparation for speaking to us Joseph had really done his homework. He had read stuff I did not know we had written. But he was startled to discover that political education might take place before the age of eleven. He thought primary schools were all about children being prepared for secondary education: preparation for a series of selections up to university I suppose. I was sitting next to my old prof who leaned over while Joseph was talking to mutter, 'Not very bright is he?'

Before leaving this topic I want to mention Edmund Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol in 1774. He reminded them and he reminds us that members of parliament are there to deliberate. They are not elected to follow,

as though they were instructions, the momentary and changeable views of those that elected them. Faced with Brexit our current MPs, and in particular Theresa May, might do well to read that speech. So might Jeremy Corbyn.

It is my view that when in 1997 we thought we had seen the back of Thatcherism with its dumbed down discourse of possessive individualism New Labour further de-intellectualised government and politics. Tony Blair and his courtiers, his intellectual army, must take the blame for this. Gordon Brown's late efforts as PM to add some politics to government were made more difficult because he had not challenged Blair much earlier. Having a row (they had a lot) is not enough. Blair was intellectually empty. Brown was not.

An aside on Brown's chapters on Iraq and Afghanistan

"IRAQ: HOW WE WERE ALL MISLED."

This is the title of a chapter in Gordon Brown's book.

"We"? "All"? Really?

I don't suppose any member of Blair's cabinet of the time has ever made a better constructed defence of how they came to agree to war. As part of his personal case Brown willingly admits that he ought to have barged his way into meetings in order to find out more. The admission is welcome but, I believe, insufficient.

It is true that evidence was withheld and it is also true that Blair did not run cabinets in the same way as, for example, Harold Wilson when, despite enormous pressure, the decision was taken not to join LBJ in Vietnam.

But Brown knew Blair better than most. Blair always looked for evidence to fit his preferred case. Whether you are teaching a child who is doing a project or supervising a PhD you are always on the look out for the tendency to only assemble evidence that "proves" what you want to be proved.

Millions of us could see this. Is Brown's real defence that he was too close and involved in government to have any decent sense of perspective? Had he been a backbencher might he have seen things differently? Possibly. But this was a government packed full of clever advisors few of whom had the intellectual strength of the little boy who shouted that the Emperor Has No Clothes.

Iraq was a consequence of how Blair did things big and small. On this occasion at least I wish Brown had put out of his head that supposed pact he had with Blair and really gone for him. It was a resigning matter. Robin Cook resigned. Had Brown done so I really believe it would not have harmed his chances of becoming prime minister.

Harold Wilson resigned on a matter of principle but went on to become leader of the party, prime minister and to win more elections than Blair. It is not a bar to ambition.

I am afraid that Brown's argument in his chapter on Iraq simply will not do. On weapons of mass destruction and the capacity of Saddam Hussein to use them Blair and his government are often judged either to have lied or to have been too stupid to examine evidence properly. There is a 'Third Way' of looking at this. As I mentioned above Blair characteristically looked only for evidence that suited him. This infected the entire New Labour Project. In fact it poisoned government and politics. It still does.

Brown remarks upon the power of Robin Cook's resignation speech. I believe that on the issue of Iraq it was an unbeatable speech. Blair certainly did not have the capacity to respond to it but had there been any flaws in that speech Brown could have found and highlighted them. In fact, although impressed with the speech, he failed to engage with it.

That was, I believe, a fundamental failure committed by someone who once practised proper politics but whose ambition overrode his values. He tells us a lot about both Afghanistan and Iraq during his time as prime minister. We may applaud his gradual disengagement from Iraq but we are still involved in Afghanistan after how many years? His explanation of how we got into such a mess rests on his belief that Blair always wished to stay close to the USA. Probably that was the case but I believe that it understates Blair's need to be the lead singer in the band. And Brown's introduction of later information about the UK being deceived by the USA about WMDs, although believable in itself, remains irrelevant.

Scott Ritter, the predecessor of Hans Blix, had made it very clear that he did not believe that Saddam Hussein possessed what we claimed that he did. What Ritter had to say was on the bookshelves long before the invasion of Iraq. Brown makes no mention of it. Neither does Blair. And neither of them mentions that the government of Afghanistan twice offered to arrest Bin Laden if they were presented with evidence of his guilt for 9/11. The fact is that the government of the USA was itching to drop bombs and pull triggers and so was Blair. Brown wrote the cheques, lots of them, for the involvement of the UK. Yes, some of that money went to support a range of good causes, as was always the case with Brown, but most of it contributed to death, destruction and displacement.

There are no prizes for guessing the title of the following chapter. It is,

AFGHANISTAN: A WAR WITHOUT END?

To paraphrase the historian AJP Taylor,

“Any fool can start a war but just try ending it.”

Blair was such a fool. Brown might have stopped him at the outset but at least he did his best to end the bloody nonsense.

TEST THREE: EDUCATION

I struggle to find political office holders that have ever had any kind of grasp on education. I have mentioned Charles Clarke and shall make a big exception for Estelle Morris, a fellow member of my teachers union. Her misfortune was probably that she believed in and did her best to implement agreed Labour Party policy. Blair did not want that. He wanted his policy, whatever it happened to be on a given day.

While writing this I received an email from the Commons Education Committee. They are responding to a petition on tuition fees by circulating a small survey. What is their key question? Do universities provide value for money? For them, you see, education is a commodity. They could have asked about the student experience but that is not how they see education. Universities now sell it. Students borrow money to buy it. Is it worth the asking price? I have yet to respond.

In 1970 the Conservatives won the general election and Margaret Thatcher became Secretary of State for education. In terms of achievement no one comes close. She created more comprehensive schools than all other secretaries of state combined. She should have been proud of that: she wasn't. It was a time when professional educators felt able to practise some autonomy: to be proactive rather than reactive. In 1971 the Politics Association began to encourage political education, also using the term 'political literacy'. The comprehensive school movement generated widespread research, often sponsored by the National Council for the Study of the Comprehensive School. And there was lots more creativity and interest in what it was like to be a professional educator. Denis Lawton and Lawrence Stenhouse in particular were writing books and involved in activities that inspired what felt like professional fulfilment.

Thatcher, we have to remember, was inexperienced in government. Her four years in charge of education implementing the policies of Labour's Tony Crosland taught her to be wary of confident and knowledgeable civil servants. When she became prime minister she ensured that they were subservient to ministers. The professional educational autonomy of the seventies began to disappear by the late eighties.

I have already written what seems to be a lot on this so I propose to provide links here with what I hope are helpful comments on my previous writing. There is some repetition and the term 'self-plagiarism' comes to mind.

The title of this piece is FROM STABILITY TO CHAOS. In it I try to describe seven phases through which education, particularly in England, has passed since 1945. At the end is a link to a longer version. It is my view that policy makers have usually had a negative effect upon

education. In *Mental Health and Well-Being in the Learning and Teaching Environment* (2016) my chapter seeks to demonstrate how policy makers have contributed to stress.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/FromStabilityToChaos.pdf>

I offer this very short piece as an antidote to the effects of policy.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/ASheepAPig.pdf>

This also is short. I was writing about a time when I first began to realise that politicians responsible for education had no idea of the existence of normative curves or assessment criteria. I mention Kenneth Clarke who, like Brown, became Chancellor of the Exchequer. Neither of them seems to have had a clue about the meaning of the word 'average' or, even worse, how an average might be constructed. The link includes the link that follows this one.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/SATSAndSherry.pdf>

This is longer. One reason for including it is that Ed Balls was very close to Gordon Brown. In his book Brown writes enthusiastically about visiting Academies without any sense that they were part of the privatisation and commodification of schools. He also conveys no understanding of league tables. This man so fond of footy seems to believe that a school can climb a ladder without any other school having to slide down a snake. The teams he supports only go up the league if other teams come down.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/ALoadOfClarkeAndBalls.pdf>

This is short, on the privatisation of policy making in education.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/OutSourcePolicyMaking.pdf>

Here are twelve points and twelve questions on Blair and education. Not long.

<http://www.criticalprofessionallearning.co.uk/assets/BlairAndEducation.pdf>

Cliff Jones, 9th December 2017 Unfinished.

