



LLAKES is an ESRC-funded research centre led by the Institute of Education, University of London

# Education and State Formation in Europe, the USA and East Asia

**Andy Green**

**Professor of Comparative Social Science and Director of LLAKES Centre, UCL Institute of Education**

**Peking University, Beijing**

**13.4.2018**

# The Theory of Education and State Formation

*Education and State Formation* was first published in 1990, with a later translation into Chinese by Professor Zhu Xudong. A second extended edition (including East Asia) appeared in 2013.

The original text argued that the development of National Education Systems in nineteenth century Europe and the USA (and later Japan) was essentially about nation-building – both a cause and effect of the process of ‘state formation’ that was necessary for the creation and development of new (or re-constituted) states.

National Education Systems, it argued, developed most rapidly in countries undergoing an ‘accelerated’ process of state formation. This has typically occurred when countries:

- recently gained independence (USA)
- reacted to external threats (Meiji Japan in 1868; Prussia after the Napoleonic invasion in 1806)
- re-building after revolutions (France) or major wars (Japan after WW2)
- trying to reverse a history of underdevelopment, to ‘catch-up’ with more advanced regional powers (Germany with Britain and Tiger economies in relation to Japan).

# Education and State Formation in Europe and East Asia

The theory was originally developed to explain the *uneven* development of national education systems in the West in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and particularly in England, France, Prussia and the USA. I did not generalize the argument beyond these countries.

However, subsequent research by myself and others suggested that it had wider applicability.

- Education and the process of state formation (or nation-building) are very closely related in most *new* states – ie in newly formed states or states that are reconstituted after wars and revolutions etc
- The theory stresses the role of education in building both the apparatus of the state and also national identity. It is arguably less applicable in the developed democracies where Governments tend to stress skills formation more than citizen formation.
- In the 20<sup>th</sup> century developing states in East Asia have provided a very clear illustration of the process of intensive state formation.

# What was a National Education System?

National Education Systems were new forms of education first developed in countries in the West during the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

- Previously education had been provided by the churches, religious societies and through the family and apprenticeship systems.
- During the 19<sup>th</sup> Century most western countries developed national education systems (NES) which were at least partly funded and controlled by the state and which sought to provide universal primary (then secondary) schooling.
- These were the precursors of modern forms of mass public education.

# National Education Systems and Citizen Formation

The nineteenth-century national education system came to assume a primary responsibility for the moral, cultural and political development of the nation. It became the secular church. It was variously called upon to assimilate immigrant cultures, to promote established religious doctrines, to spread the standard form of the appointed national language, to forge a national identity and a national culture, to generalize new habits of routine and rational calculation, to encourage patriotic values, to inculcate moral disciplines and, above all, to indoctrinate in the political and economic creeds of the dominant classes. It helped construct the very subjectivities of citizenship, justifying the ways of the state to the people and the duties of the people to the state. It sought to create each person as a universal subject but it did so differentially according to class and gender. It formed the responsible citizen, the diligent worker, the willing tax-payer, the reliable juror, the conscientious parent, the dutiful wife, the patriotic soldier, and the dependable or deferential voter.

# The Historical Question: The Uneven Development of National Education Systems in the West

- Prussia and some other German states developed the basic framework of public education by the 1840s – compulsory schooling; a universal network of state-funded elementary and, later secondary schools; state licensing of teachers and inspection of schools, a national curriculum and examinations etc
- France created the administrative structures of public education by the 1830s and universalized primary education during the Third Republic of 1870s.
- The North of the USA also developed public schooling in the period from 1820 -1860, creating the first entirely free public High Schools.
- However, UK (like Italy and the southern US) was slow to create a NES. A public system of elementary schools was not initiated until 1870 and elementary education not compulsory until the 1880s. Public secondary schools were not created until 1902 – 100 years after Napoleon created the public Lycée in France.

# The Historical Problem

How does one explain why England - the most industrialised, urbanised and economically developed state in its time (Landes, 2008), lagged behind other much less developed states in developing NES?

- Traditional accounts of the rise of NES were based on studies of single countries. They attributed the development of mass education variously to Protestant religion, industrialisation, urbanisation and democratic advance. However, the theories tended to fit only single cases.
- What I (and Margaret Archer, 1988) sought to do was to develop explanations which fitted a range of countries and which could explain the uneven development of systems in the West.

The comparative historical approach, using the logical comparative methods developed by J S Mill and now referred to as ‘macro-social analysis (Skocpol and Somers, 1980), takes positive and negative cases of particular historical outcomes amongst countries which are quite similar and tries to isolate the factors explaining the different outcomes.

Both myself and Archer first looked at how traditional theories fare in explaining uneven development?

# Whig Theory

Whig historiography (Butterfield, 1931) sees history as as a linear story of democratic advance and educational historians in this tradition (Cubberley, 1934) tend to link links NES with Protestantism, the effects of Enlightenment thought and the gradual process of democratisation.

- Protestant countries tended to be more literate because Protestantism was the religion of ‘the book’ whereas Catholicism was the religion of the priest and the image (Cipolla, 1969)
- The Enlightenment gave the basic rationale for mass schooling – all children were educable (eg Locke to Condorcet to James Mill).

However:

- Education in elementary schools tended to be narrow and doctrinaire and bore little resemblance to the enlightenment vision of the rationalist French encyclopedists and Rousseau vision of the education of Emile.
- Protestant countries were initially more literate but Catholic countries caught up. The French Jesuits became know as the ‘schoolmen of Europe’.
- Some of the least democratic countries (German states and Hapsburg Austria) were quite advanced in developing NES whilst one of the most democratic (England) was backward.



# Industrialisation

This thesis drawn from American functionalist sociology (Talcott Parsons etc) argues that public schools were developed to furnish the skills needed for new industrial economies.

- The argument fits the north-east of USA to some degree because industrialisation in the urban areas of the NE from the 1830s coincided with the rapid development of public schooling. However, the vast majority of the population across the North were still Yeoman farmers and education in the agricultural mid-west developed as quickly as in the more industrialised North East.
- The argument fits England less well because industrialisation occurred (from the 1770s) well before the development of a national education system (in the 1870s) and occurred without much assistance from formal schooling. The developing system of voluntary elementary schools may have socialised children in the disciplines needed for future factory work but it provided few technical skills for work. In fact literacy levels declined in the most rapidly industrialising areas (Sanderson, 1972; Stone, 1969). Entrepreneurs and inventors could learn little useful knowledge in secondary schools and were mostly self taught (Hobsbawm, 1977).
- The argument does not fit continental states like Prussia, Austria and France at all, since these countries developed public education systems decades before widespread industrialisation occurred from the 1840s onwards.
- The theory does not explain why the most industrialised country (England) developed NES later than less industrialised countries (Archer, 1979).

# Urbanisation and Proletarianisation

This argues that public schools were developed for social control (Katz, 1968, 1971). Urbanisation and the transition to waged labour broke down earlier (patriarchal) familial forms of discipline for children and created new class conflicts in cities. Schools designed to prevent social disorder.

- The thesis fits England well because half the population were living in cities by the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. Since the development of factory production women and children had started to work in mills and factories. Social reformers were concerned that families were failing to socialise children and that the congested cities were rife with crime, social unrest and political conflict (Johnson, 1976).
- Educational reformers were also concerned about urban disorder in the northern US cities, which were becoming more populous, particularly with waves of immigration from Europe. However, the vast majority of children still lived in rural settings and families were only beginning to become affected by the transition to wage labour.
- The theory doesn't apply well to France and German states either which, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, were all overwhelmingly rural and agricultural. Proto-industrial production in the family was beginning to disrupt family life and undermine traditional apprenticeship systems which put youth socialisation into question and some educational reformers were concerned about this (Melton, 1988). But why the drive by French and Prussian states to universalise schooling in rural areas.
- The theory doesn't explain the uneven development between England and continental Europe (Archer, 1988).

# Education and State Formation

Previous theories could not explain the uneven rise of NES across western countries (although they may form part of the explanation).

- Education and State Formation theory developed to fit all cases in question.
- Countries which developed NES rapidly were undergoing a rapid process of state formation either to reconstruct after revolutions (France) or foreign invasions (Prussia) or to build new nation states (the US after Independence) where none existed before. Education was enlisted to foster loyalty to the new states, to build new national identities and to furnish the state with experts to run the new bureaucracies. Education as the ‘The Pillar of the Republic’.
- Countries which were slow to develop NES either had little need of state building (Britain) or lacked a unified state (Italy until 1870) or were too divided to institute mass education (the Slave states of the American South).

# Why Was the Development of National Education in England so Delayed?

# No Need for Intensive State Building

Britain had little need for intensive state formation in 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

- Early consolidation as a national state under the Tudors.
- National identity already strongly developed – based on Crown; Protestant Church; Parliament; and English language. No strong nationalism in early 19<sup>th</sup> century.
- Absence of extended absolutism and advantages island state with strong navy minimised the need for an extended state bureaucracy and military (which in other states required education systems to produce.)

# Effects of Early Industrialisation

- According to the logic of developmental priority (Gamble, 1981; Marquand, 1988; Nairn, 1981) the first country to industrialise did things differently.
- English industrialisation did not require sophisticated science and technology (Landes, 1969; Perkin, 1985) and could occur from the bottom up with little state intervention.
- Education (beyond basic literacy) played little part. Inventors and industrialists were usually self-taught or gained their scientific education from Scotland or continental universities.
- This entrenched the view that public education was not very important for economic development.

# Laissez- Faire Liberalism

The early industrial revolution entrenched the dominant ideology of liberalism which acted as a brake on the development of NES. Liberal Political Economy argued:

- for ‘laissez-faire’ and against state intervention in general
- against higher taxes for public services like education
- for freedom for families to education children as they wished
- For a voluntarist provision – ie where children were not compelled to attend school (until 1880s) and where the voluntary associations (religious societies) provided the elementary schools with minimal support from the state (until 1870s.)

# Transition to State Education

The development of a NES in England was delayed until after 1870 and not fully in place until 1902.

Change occurs because:

- Voluntarism was failing to provide sufficient schooling
- Britain's industrial lead being undermined by comparative lack of skills during the second industrial revolution (Hobsbawm, 1969)
- Newly enfranchised skilled working class demanding social reforms which Liberal Party begins to support.
- Pure laissez-faire ideology abandoned in favour of New Liberalism



# Education and State Formation in East Asia

# Education and State Formation in East Asia

East Asia since the late 1950s has experienced one of the most rapid processes economic and social development recorded in history.

It took Britain 58 years to double real per capita income after 1780 and the USA 47 years from 1839. Korea achieved this in just 11 years from 1966 (Morris).

Japan, Singapore, Korea and, most recently, mainland China, most clearly exemplify the process of accelerated state formation and economic development. Social development has gone alongside economic development – so-called ‘Growth with Equity’.

In most accounts of the so-called ‘East Asian Miracle’ education and skills have performed a central part. East Asian states provide very clear examples of NES and accelerated state formation.

# The Development of the Theory

By including East Asian states in the analysis in the second edition of *Education and State Formation* I was able to elaborate the argument in several significant ways:

- It shows the wider applicability of the theory bringing the story into contemporary history.
- Introducing different theories of nationalism (civic nationalism ethno-cultural national etc) which were absent in the first account.
- Showing the parallels between state formation theories and other cognate theories of ‘late development,’ ‘state-led development’ and the ‘developmental state’ which are key to understanding development in Japan, Korea and Singapore.

# Accelerated State Formation and the Developmental State

Classical theories of economic development derive originally from the liberal political economy Adam Smith and his nineteenth-century followers and reflect experiences of dominant contemporary economy.

Because Britain adopted free trade and free-market policies from the 1840s classical theory understood the development process through the lens of liberal political economy, extolling the virtues of an individualist capitalism with a minimal state and the greatest freedom for trade and markets.

However, as Ha-Joon Chan has pointed out this substantially distorts the history of British and American development since both powers had adopted mercantilist (and protectionist) policies during their early phase of development – in the British case for 300 years.

# Friederich List and National Political Economy Tradition

The inherent biases in the dominant nineteenth-century theories of economic development were well understood by Friederich List and the German national political economy school who argued that:

- Free trade only favoured the dominant economic powers such as Britain, which had themselves grown strong through mercantilist (and protectionist) policies, but which, when economically developed, preached the virtues of liberalism and free trade (thus ‘pulling up the ladder’ of development from those behind them).
- That less developed countries, such as the German states, needed to adopt policies to protect infant industries until they were able to compete (as Hamilton had done in the US), and to utilize the state more in development if they were to catch up.
- States developing after Britain needed to enlist the power of the state (see also Gershenkron, 1966) As List argued, successful development depended on the ‘unity and power of the nation.’

# Developmental State Theory

Theorists of the ‘Developmental State’ (Johnson, 1982; Amsden, 1992; Wade, 1990; Woo-Cumings, 1999) and ‘state-led development’ (Kohli, 2004) have built on these ideas providing the most convincing explanations of the process of rapid development in East Asian states.

Key to the analysis are notions about:

- The inseparability of economics and politics.
- The leading role of the state in development
- The necessity of combined social and economic development
- The origins of developmental states in what Chalmers Johnson called ‘situational nationalism’ ie the need to assert national identity to survive external threats and to achieve the national unity necessary for rapid economic and social development.

# Explanations of Rapid and Equal Development

Rapid Development in East Asia is a regional phenomenon and need to be analysed as such.

Explanations have focused on:

- Culture
- Geopolitics
- Timing
- Policies (including education)

# Culture and Institutional Legacies

Cultural explanations of EA development include theories about ‘Asian Values’ and specific forms of ‘Confucian’ Capitalism:

- Labour intensive development as ‘Industrious revolution’ (Sugihara, 2003)
- Strong states and Confucian paternalism (Tu, Wei Ming, 2000)
- Mobilization of national identity (Castells, 1992)
- Use of Diasporas and ‘Flying Geese pattern’ (Furoka, 2005).

Atal Kohli (2004) has also stressed the importance of colonial legacies in some states – ie the infrastructures left behind by the Japanese in Korea.

Many of these issues are important. However, theories focusing on culture and values alone are generally insufficient to explain dynamics and timing of development. East Asia is highly diverse in ethnicity and Religion and some non-Confucian states have also developed rapidly. Culture cannot explain why now.



## The Importance of Geography and Geo-Politics

- Proximity to sea lanes and historic trade routes
- Advantages of island and peninsular states – coastal towns
- Cold War stimulus to investment

US and British investment high in Japan, South Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong through period of Korean and Vietnam wars.

Between 1953 and 1958 US aid to Korea was 15% of GDP and war requisitioning helped to kick start the Chaebols. Singapore benefited from UK and US requisitioning.

Geopolitics can only be part of the story. Some states which benefited did not develop (Philippines) and others (Malaysia, Thailand) developed rapidly later, without similar levels of cold war investment.

# Timing

The timing for the first wave of East Asian growth (second phase for Japan) was highly propitious.

- Buoyant global economy in 1960s
- Flexible trade regimes allowed

Conditions for rapid growth now less good

- Slower world economic growth
- More NIC competitors
- WTO limitations to trade policies which arguably helped tigers
- Globalisation restricts use of capital controls which may also have helped tigers

# Factors favouring egalitarian development

- Weakening of old landed and Zaibatsu elites in Japan as result of WW2 and subsequent land reform
- Land reform in 1950s in Taiwan and S. Korea (prompted by US!) redistributed landed wealth and removed anti-modernising elites
- Agricultural improvements in EA states with agricultural economies reduced disparities or rural and urban incomes
- Rapid improvement in access to education reduced growth inequalities (countering the usual Kuznets effect)
- Developmental states overcame entrenched class interests?
- Redistributive policies of governments ie Malaysia pro Malay business policy, Singapore and Hong Kong Housing programmes etc

# Policy Explanations of Growth

- Neo-classical economics
- Market friendly neo-classical economics (WB East Asian Miracle)
- Developmental state theory (Amsden, Wade, Johnson etc)

# Neo-Classical theory

Neo-classical economic explanations argue that East Asian states got the basics right and left the rest to the market:

- Private domestic investment and rapidly increasing human capital were principal engines of growth
- High domestic savings sustained high investment (typically savings at over 30% of income)
- Increased agricultural productivity
- Effective public administration
- Good macro-economic management (low inflation and borrowing; stable exchange rates etc)
- Openness to trade

## Developmental State theorists

DST does not disagree with view that human capital and investment were important and that export led growth was central.

However, they argue that the conventional account ignores the degree of state intervention in growth and the use of ‘neo-mercantilist’ policies which deviated very substantially from ‘free trade.’

With the exception of Hong Kong, Japan and the tigers all had highly state-led development programmes. They developed at a much faster rate than the Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand which were less interventionist.

# Developmental Paths

Each country followed similar development path:

- import substitution and agricultural improvement (late fifties)
- export of cheap manufactured goods (early sixties) (textiles; toys; shoes etc) based on low cost labour
- development of capital intensive goods (late sixties /early seventies) (variously Steel, Ship-building; Petro chemicals etc) and electronic consumer goods
- shift to higher value added manufacturing (1980s)

Singapore and Hong Kong relied heavily on FDI since they had small domestic markets and little domestic capital

Japan and Korea initially preferred foreign loans and technology transfer through licensing but gradually moved towards allowing joint ventures and since 1997 foreign MNCs.

# Developmental Policies in Japan and Tigers

A range of policies used to stimulate economic growth:

To protect home industries:

- Tariffs and import quotas to protect infant industries
- Tariffs, protectionist standards regulations and high taxes on luxury and other goods to discourage unnecessary consumption, encourage saving and to allow exporting manufacturers to reclaim losses on marked down foreign sales through high domestic prices.

To encourage exports:

- Export subsidies; export targets; preferential loans for exporters; tariff reduction on imported inputs for exporters; low exchange rates (which helped exporter); export processing Zones



# Developmental Policies in Japan and Tigers 2

Industrial Policy – building up priority sectors through:

- Preferential loans for companies to develop in certain sectors
- Directing credit through Gov't banks or regulation on private banks
- Encouraging sector rationalisation through forcing market exit or forced mergers of failing companies.
- Tax subsidies and infrastructural development for R and D in favoured sectors.

To Encourage FDI

- Setting up one-stop-shop of Economic Development Boards in Singapore and Korea

# Role of Education

General view : education played major role in East Asian Miracle

WB from growth accounting estimates: 'far and away the major difference in predicted growth rates between HPAEs and sub-Saharan Africa derives from variations in primary school enrolment rates. (EAM p. 54)

# Different Theories of Education's Role

Writers on East Asia differ on how they understand the role of education in rapid growth. Three theories:

- Human capital theory (WB)
- Developmental Skill Formation (Ashton and Green)
- Education and State Formation (High skills Project)

# Human Capital Account

Skills contributed significantly to productivity growth and technology transfer. Educational development was successful because it largely followed the market and was informed 'sound' policies:

- HPAEs had high initial levels of literacy (although so did Sri Lanka and Philippines in 1960s)
- Investment focused initially on universalising primary education which had highest rate of return
- Secondary and higher education were developed sequentially when growth and higher rates of return to higher levels encouraged private investment
- Growth, private investment and declining birth rates (earlier and sharper than in other developing countries) allowed increased in per capita spending and higher enrols in education without excessive public cost.

# Developmental Skills Formation Critique

Developmental skills formation theory (Ashton and Green) does not disagree with many of the human capital assertions. However, it claims they miss:

- Importance and secondary, technical and higher education expansion in later stages of development
- The role played by the state in generating demand for skills
- The role played by the state in coordinating skills supply and Demand.

# State intervention to increase the demand for skills

- Through industrial policy to increase investment in high value added industries
- Through forcing MNCs to bring in more capital and skills intensive operations

The classic example was the Singapore strategy for skills upgrading in 1980s which involved instituting wage minima and taxes on low paying firms which went towards a skills development fund.

# Broader Contribution of Education to Development

Education in Japan and the Tigers has contributed to development in various ways:

- Through provision of skills
- Through inculcation of work discipline
- Through socialisation into 'survival' national ideologies which have helped maintain political stability
- Through popularising meritocratic ideology that encouraged endeavour
- Through other educational policies designed to enhance equality and social cohesion

# Commonalities of East Asian Schooling

East Asian education and training systems differ in some significant ways:

- Japan, Taiwan and Korea are highly egalitarian (Non-selective neighbourhood comprehensive schools; mixed ability classes; equal resource distribution between school)
  - Singapore and Hong Kong are comparatively elitist
- Japan and Korea have extensive company based training in large firms. Singapore relies much more heavily on Gov't funded workforce development
- However, they have a number of features in common (Cummings, 1995)



# Commonalities of East Asian Schooling

- Highly centralised administration (although this is beginning to change now)
- Major stress on dissemination of basic skills
- Bias towards Maths and Engineering (20% get maths A level in Sing'pore and 40% of graduates are engineers)
- Major stress on Moral and Civic education (made possible by centralised control)

# Importance of Socialisation

Arguably the most important contribution of education to economic development in Japan and Tigers has been through effective youth socialisation

- Encouraging disciplined attitudes to hard work
- Generating ‘national spirit’ of struggle and sacrifice in early generation (to encourage saving and effort and acceptance of overpriced consumer goods etc). Koreans went en mass to public collection centres to hand over their silverware during the economic crisis! Japanese have put up with over-priced Japanese rice for years because they have been convinced it is patriotic!
- Creating ability to work in teams (more notable in Japan and Korea than Singapore perhaps)



# EDUCATION AND STATE FORMATION

*EUROPE, EAST ASIA AND THE USA*

---

**ANDY GREEN**

**'A SEMINAL BOOK'**  
– *Times Educational Supplement*

