Abstract. In this reflective account, I provide an overview of some of the main currents, particularly in sociological research, and specifically sociology of education research, to which I have been exposed as an academic in my thirty or so years tenure at the University of Malta with temporary academic appointments in other foreign universities. I refer to my research in the context of these currents which have contributed to my ongoing formation as an academic, educator and citizen. The overarching rubric for most of my academic oeuvre would be the Politics of Education. I would like to think that my work is that of an engaged sociologist—a value committed one. The major influences in this piece are Antonio Gramsci, Paulo Freire, some classical sociologists, Henry A. Giroux, Antonia Darder and many others within critical social and political thought. I consider historical movements in the education field as having had an influence on my thinking, notably those concerning workers’ education. Lack of space denies me the chance to explore the influence of other currents in political and education thought which made their presence felt in my work but which can easily be tokenized in the restricted space available. I do provide detailed bibliographical references to my several sustained writings, as author and co-author, on some of them, especially those involved in specific forms of difference, race, gender and biodiversity in particular.
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1 Introduction

I thank the editor of this special issue of Xjenza for the invitation to contribute an article covering my research agenda over a span of thirty years. The topics that I engaged with, in my writings, are many, ranging from publications on Antonio Gramsci, Paulo Freire and Don Lorenzo Milani to others in such areas as Adult Continuing Education, Sociology of Education, which provided a substantial part of my teaching over the years, Lifelong Learning and related policy issues at the Maltese and European levels, and Museums Education. My work has been published in a range of journals, many in education research journals, and others in sociology and interdisciplinary (e.g. Capital & Class, International Critical Thought, Das Argument) or regionally-focused journals (Journal of Mediterranean Studies, Holy Land & Palestine Studies).1

2 This Paper

In this paper, I attempt an overview around the one all-embracing area providing the rubric for my teaching and writing since 1988, the year marking my first University Council appointment at Part-time level in Sociology of Education and the years following my full time appointment in Adult Education in 1993. This full-time appointment, coinciding with my obtaining a PhD, also included responsibilities in the field of Sociology of Education. My research focus at Master’s level was in political adult education while the overarching disciplines in my graduate studies in Alberta and Toronto, Canada, were in Sociology of Education and Sociology in Education2 respectively. To maintain a sharp focus and to restrict the length of the piece to manageable proportions, also given the focus of the faculty in which I have been ensconced, I shall develop the article around the Politics of Education.

3 Politics of and in education

The relationship between politics and education is marked by a long tradition of academic work—a huge corpus of
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1I also had articles or interviews with me, on some of these issues, published in international popular outlets such as the Maltese press, Truthout (USA), Counterpunch (USA), Open Democracy (UK), Novosti (Croatia), Sol (Turkey), Bir Gun (Turkey), il Manifesto (Italy) and Times Higher Education (UK). I am a firm believer in wider dissemination of ideas and knowledge beyond academic outlets.

2A PhD in Sociology applied to Education.
literature. This area had a strong impact on my weltanschauung and political orientation since my graduate student days. I have therefore been committed to a value-driven sociology with social justice at its core. In this regard, I need to thank a long list of sociologists based in Canada and a number of my colleagues in the field in Malta: Mary Darmanin, who exposed me to UK qualitative and interpretative traditions, Ronald Sultana, Godfrey Baldacchino and Carmel Borg. I was naturally grounded in European sociological traditions but was also attracted to work forthcoming from the geographical majority world, mainly Latin America and Africa. All this is evident in my latest, co-authored book in a series (critical education) I edit for an international publisher (Mayo et al., 2021).

European sociology owes a lot to France and Germany. The major European exponents of classical sociology were found there, although one can trace earlier origins to at least one 14th century Arab scholar, Ibn Khaldun, from whom later French scholars such as Emile Durkheim (1858–1917) are said to have drawn without mentioning him (Santos, 2017, p. 294)—hardly surprising, I would add, given the provenance of a scholar from Muslim North Africa living in a territory (Tunisia) which was eventually, in 1881 (the time when Durkheim was active), to become a French protectorate. I would never lose sight of the strictures, concerning Eurocentric positional superiority, regarding Khaldun’s influence on Durkheim, made by Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2017). This ties in with my developing, as someone coming from a country with a long colonial history, a keen interest in a decolonizing politics. With Anne-Hickling Hudson, a Jamaican scholar ensconced in Brisbane, Australia, who had thoroughly researched revolutionary education in Grenada during the ‘New Jewel’ government years, I gave rise to a refereed journal, Postcolonial Directions in Education, currently in its tenth volume and run by the University of Malta as an open access outlet. We both also gave rise, with Antonia Darder, a Puerto-Rican scholar, to a book series with an international publisher, ‘Postcolonial Studies in Education’ with over twenty volumes to date. My work is therefore rooted in the European tradition and in the struggles for liberation emerging from the geographical Global South.

Early sociological enquiry in Europe, at the basis of my initial studies in the field, focused on the development of a secular ‘modernist’ society with education regarded as central to this society. Education featured prominently in the talks and writings, gathered in different volumes, of Emile Durkheim. He lectured in both pedagogy and sociology and had some of his lectures on education, at the Sorbonne, gathered in such works as The evolution of educational thought (Durkheim, 2006). By contrast, Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Max Weber (1864–1920), from Germany, the former also living in Paris, Brussels and London, offered little that is systematic when it comes to education, although Marx did promote the idea of a polytechnic education in his address to the First Workingmen’s International, commonly referred to as the Geneva Resolution of 1866. This document underlined the elements of academic, technical and physical preparation for the working class (Marx, 1866, 1867), echoing the 1848 Communist Manifesto (Marx et al., 1848, 1998) and connecting with certain passages in Capital Vol. 1 (Marx, 1887). Max Weber, for his part, did write briefly about the rationalization of education and training (Weber, 1998, p. 240–244). Of course one can find much grist for the mill in their discussion of broader areas such as ‘the production of consciousness’ in Marx and Engels Die Deutsche Ideologie (The German Ideology) or in Weber’s Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism and in excerpts from his unfinished Economy and Society. These works influenced me profoundly as can be seen from many of my early writings and later ones (Mayo, 2020). Education can, in these instances, be viewed in its much broader contexts and well beyond institutional provision which is the way I view the area in this essay. Much later, Karl Mannheim (1893–1947), a Hungarian social philosopher and great contributor to sociology in many ways, not least through his writings on sozialwissenschaft (social science) and of course sociology of knowledge in Ideology and Utopia (Mannheim, 1936), would render education central to his view of social reconstruction and democratic planning in his later work such as A Diagnosis of our time, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction and Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning.

While regarding knowledge as socially relational (to avoid accusations of relativisms) he later saw it as central to a process of social reconstruction and de-Nazification during and after the post-World War II period which saw him, since the Nazi rise to power, spend his days, as a Jew, away from Germany and in England. There he taught at the LSE and was later and briefly (one year before his death) to occupy the Chair of Sociology of Education (subsequently named after him) at the University of London’s Institute of Education (now part of UCL). I would argue that his vision for education as a source of social reconstruction, in reaction to the devastation of two world wars, was in keeping with the zeitgeist of the time which connects with other developments elsewhere such as the creation of Centres for Social Orientation (COS) in Umbria and other parts of Italy. The brainchild of Aldo Capitini, a peace activist and academic, these centres were seen as key to the development of a grassroots democracy called Omnicrazia. Avoiding a repeat of...
Nazi-fascism is something to be worked for, and education in all forms, formal and non-formal, including parent education, was key, a position, for instance, shared by Ada Gobetti.\(^3\) Mannheim also wrote of the importance of adult education and the social sciences for such a purpose. On the importance of the social sciences for adult education see his article published in *The Tutor’s Bulletin in Adult Education* (Mannheim, 1938). The spirit of social reconstruction also runs through the proceedings of the first UNESCO conference on adult education held in Elsinore, 1946.\(^4\) Education was considered crucial for a construction of a genuinely grassroots oriented democratic environment. Mannheim influenced me tremendously in my early years of writing and teaching in the field.\(^5\)

4 Grassroots democracy and the ‘new’ Fascism

As a matter of fact, my first ever published essay in education was on Karl Mannheim’s contribution to the development of a sociology of knowledge (Mayo, 1990). His and other’s ideas on social reconstruction (Capitini, UNESCO CONFINTEA 1, 1949) featured strongly in my writings on adult education and lifelong learning (see especially English et al. (2012, 2021)). A lot is made of the need for grassroots democracy and an education, often within social movements (Borg et al., 2007a), for this purpose. Furthermore, Fascism is not a thing of the past but is very much present taking on different forms. This can be evidenced from various writings on education in the context of a new authoritarianism and its echoes in education.\(^6\)

5 The non-neutrality of Education

There are those, myself included, who would argue that education is not a neutral enterprise. This contention is widely attributed to Paulo Freire (1921–1997), much reviled by the Bolsonaro government (Accioly, 2020) and the previous interim government in Brazil, on whom I have written voluminously (Mayo, 1999, 2004, 2013, 2020). Indeed, there is no denying that Freire is my major source of influence as an educator. As a southern and a decolonizing voice, he appealed to me from the time of my very initial in-depth studies in education as a graduate student. His *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 2018), which I read in its earlier published editions in English, and the School of Barbiana’s *Letter to a Teacher* (henceforth the Lettera, Borg et al. (2009))\(^7\) are the two most inspiring books in education that I have read, the latter in the Italian original. They highlight the nexus between education, power and personal and collective subjectivity. This view helped fashion my politics. These books are about not only schooling but society in general, as Pier Paolo Pasolini once remarked concerning the Lettera. In this regard, I have written comparative works on Milani and Freire, in English and Italian, in edited books and journals (see Mayo (2013)), underlining the collective dimensions of learning and engaging in action, reading and writing the word and the world critically to ‘care’ about the world and its reconstruction from the standpoint of the marginalised. Freire’s work also has its limitations within what bell hooks calls his ‘phallocentric paradigm of liberation’ (hooks, 1993, p. 148). She and others help reinvent his work to resonate with the experiences of Afro-American women and men, among others, important mediations and reinventions (hooks, 1988; Sheth et al., 1997; Weiler, 1991) that enhanced my knowledge of oppression and aggressions, micro or macro, rendering my understanding more nuanced (Mayo, 1999).

The non-neutrality of education has been the mantra of several other movements. The politics and non-neutrality of education lie at the core of that long tradition of educational provision known as independent working class education (IWCE) as manifest, for example, in the work of the Plebs league and the labour colleges in Britain. They represented an attempt at a break with bourgeois culture. IWCE occurred through classes and schools, working men’s institutes, alternative libraries and sporting events (Waugh, 2009). There are echoes of the Proletkult here as Richard Hoggart infers (Hoggart, 1947, p. 7). For instance, when the Plebs League of working class labour colleges in England and Scotland argued in...
favour of their secession from the trade union and nominally socialist-oriented Ruskin College, they underlined, in an editorial of their standard publication, *The Plebs’ Magazine*:

> the worker is either robbed or not robbed: Labour is either paid or unpaid. To ask the workers to be neutral is both insulting, and absurd. The “impartial education” idea has its source in a very “partial” quarter, and so long as the control of education comes from that quarter the working-class movement will be poisoned and drained...

(as quoted in Waugh (2009, p. 24)).

The idea therefore that education is value driven and is connected to class, ethnic, and gender interest, not to mention many other possible interests, colonial, able-bodied and heterosexual or heteronormative interests, is part and parcel of the various struggles throughout history for greater democratic inclusion. This entails renewal of institutions such as schools, universities and forms of recognised education (e.g. the struggle for the affirmation and validation of Indigenous knowledge/s). These struggles of primarily race, class and gender, feature prominently in my writings (see, for instance, Borg et al. (2006), English et al. (2012) and Mayo et al. (2017, 2021)).

These include the struggle over what kind of lifestyle is to be encouraged, often connected to specific variations in the mode of economic production. Schooling in the steam-propelled first industrial revolution served a particular purpose benefiting the specific type of capitalism in those days, getting people to learn how to work together under one roof and in cities rather than the countryside. It also entailed getting used to routine, ‘alienated’ work—boys to sell their labour for a wage, while girls to help nourish the male labour force within the domestic sphere at no cost (unwaged labour). They would thus generate surplus value for the company owners. Different political organisations and movements with different views of how society ought to be run considered education a site of contestation. Socialist oriented organisations challenged the dominant Capitalist view of education. Whose interests does it serve?

The Editorial from *The Plebs’ Magazine* reflects this kind of struggle, a radical class struggle. Ruskin college, which novelist Thomas Hardy once referred to as likely to be called Jude Fawley’s (main character in Hardy’s novel, *Jude the Obscure*) college, was not considered radically socialist enough for the Plebs league which gradually ran its own colleges. Later other socialist thinkers such as Raymond Williams, Richard Hoggart and E. P Thompson taught a more complex approach, working ‘in and against’ established institutions by reinterpreting what was taught in a manner that connected with a ‘whole way of life’ (Williams, 1958, 1990, p. 239). This was often a way of life of a community (working class) that was different from the mainstream (the middle class mainstream student). This entails, as in Smith’s (1987) feminist approach, reading texts according to a particular communal class standpoint and/or other standpoints (mainly women’s,9 in Smith’s feminist sociology, eclipsed in mainstream versions of the subject) and in a manner that connects or otherwise with particular everyday frameworks of relevance. Quite relevant, in this regard, is also the work of Levi (2006) concerning different communities’ interpretations of historical events, rooted in their own contextual experiences, and at the furthest remove from that of mainstream interpretations. One can therefore teach against the grain as there is nothing neutral about teaching. This also applies to the interpretation of texts, in Raymond Williams’s view, which appeal to different ‘structures of feeling’. According to my interpretation, these are ‘elements that have been felt, often deeply, but have not always been articulated in specific communities.’ (Mayo, 2019, p. 68).

### 6 Change within: tactically inside, strategically outside

One can also work for change ‘within’ the interstices of established institutions, curricula and systems. This is a far cry from the dominant ‘technicist’ discourses around education which often promote a monocultural education and hide a dominant insidious ideology, made to look like the innocent flower while being the serpent beneath, as Leona English and I argue, echoing Shakespeare (*Macbeth*) in a recent book about Lifelong learning (English et al., 2021). This position of working relatively outside and in and against, or, as Brazilians put it, tactically inside and strategically outside the system, has been a key mantra throughout my work as indicated, for instance, in Borg et al. (2006) and Mayo (2019).

### 7 The Neoliberal Scourge

Over the last four decades, we have been swamped by a discourse about education strongly wedded to the market ideology. This is Neoliberalism whereby education is seen as a consumption rather than a public good; responsibil-
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8The difference in amount from the sale of a product and the cost of manufacturing it: materials, labour power and plant.

9This, in Dorothy Smith’s view, would be opposed to ‘generic’ constructions by men ensconced in and dominating institutional apparatuses using ‘objective’ measures that serve to render their [male] standpoints universal. The same holds for social class and racial invisibilities.
isation became a key term in the lexicon. Emphasis was placed on individual self-interest and responsibility when it came to education, as with other areas such as health and now even pensions. This has been the staple of my critique ever since I taught and researched as an academic (English et al., 2021; Mayo, 2019). People like me contrast all this with the concept of education as a democratic public good evoking a variety of thinkers. Henry A. Giroux (b. 1943) has been a very powerful voice in this regard, together with many others including those who contribute to the international book series on critical education I edit. Wedding John Dewey’s ideas to critical theory formulations and those of other thinkers, Giroux has been arguing passionately for the urgent need to safeguard public spaces against neoliberal encroachment and commodification. He actually broadens the notion of education (Giroux, 2018) to include several sites of public pedagogy ranging from schools to cinemas and youth entertainment areas, as well as many engaged in producing consumer culture and military culture ideologies. He does this when analyzing the devastating effects and ‘terror’ of neoliberal policies and when arguing for universities, schools and other learning agencies to help reconstruct, safeguard and revitalise democratic public spheres. Giroux, a good friend, constitutes a great influence on my work. Equally influential, especially in my formative years, has been Michael W. Apple (b. 1942) who argued for the democratisation of the curriculum which he presents as a site of contestation mirroring other sites of struggle such as the state and the domain of textbook publishing. He has been detailing the economic, political, and ideological processes that enable specific groups’ knowledge to become ‘official’ (Apple, 1993) while other groups’ knowledge is ‘popular’. His influence on me is apparent in my ideas and those of my friend, co-author and curriculum specialist, Carmel Borg with regard to our joint work on the curriculum and museums (Borg et al., 2006; Mayo, 2004). Like curricula, museums also represent a selection from the cultures of society. In whose interest is the selection made?

8 Bicultural Education

Another good friend and collaborator, Antonia Darder (b. 1952) has engaged with issues of cultural democracy and consistently with notions of culture and power concerning conditions of schooling in disenfranchised and racialized communities (Darder, 2011). Coming from a small ex-colony, caught between the need to assert a ‘national-popular’ culture and vision, manifest through the Maltese language, and a language or languages of international currency, not to remain at the periphery of global political life, I find much purchase in her ideas on bicultural education. This entails the ability to straddle two or more cultures (Hispanic and English, in her case working among Latin Americans in the USA, and Maltese and English in Malta). This influence is reflected in some of my writings with her, in Truthout, in book editorial introductions (Darder et al.) and an essay on her in Mayo (2013).

Most of these writers are exponents of critical pedagogy. One major exponent, Peter McLaren (b.1948) describes critical pedagogy as concerned with the power nexus insofar as it raises questions on ‘the relationship between what we do in the classroom,’ and on ‘our effort to build a better society free of relations of exploitation, domination, and exclusion...’ (McLaren, 2015, p. xxvi). Critical pedagogy is very much inspired by Freire. Colleagues and I however (Borg et al., 2009; Mayo et al., 2017, 2021) have pointed to many others, especially from the geographical Global South, who demonstrate, in multiple ways, the political nature of education. These include Gabriela Mistral, with her ideas on rural education, Ada Gobetti and once again, Lorenzo Milani (1923–1967) of Barbiana fame. The Lettera and Milani’s Esperienze Pastorali (Pastoral Experiences) anticipate writings associated with critical pedagogy and the ‘new sociology of education’, the latter born of a series of writings (Young, 1971), more specifically Michael Young’s editorial introduction, that signaled an approach indicating the ideological basis and class biases of schooling, a largely ‘phenomenological’ approach he recently repudiated arguing for learning what he terms ‘powerful knowledge’ irrespective of its social moorings (e.g. Maths, Science, Logic— shades of Gramsci). The 1971 ‘Knowledge and Control’ group’s demonstration of the affinities between the culture of middle class homes and that of the school, and this institution’s traditional rupture with working and peasant class cultures, resonated with Plebs and the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002). In Bourdieu’s case, reference is made to his writings concerning the school’s ‘cultural arbitrary’ and the issues of ‘habitus’, and cultural and social capital as determinants of educational success or failure (addressed for instance in Borg et al. (2006) and Mayo (1999, 2015a).

9 Education and the State

These readings and concerns enabled me to veer into other areas with regard to the intimate link between education/culture and power, namely cultural studies, enhanced through my readings of Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, and theories concerning the state and state formation. To focus on one, the state, Roger Dale (b. 1940), a good friend, analyses the immensely complex relationships occurring between capitalism, state and education. Drawing on Claus Offe, he analyses the process whereby education is linked to both capitalism’s legitim-
ation function, by persuading us that inequality is not endemic to the system but a consequence of our different ‘abilities’, and to the production of necessary ‘human capital’ for national and global economic ends. Dale argues that the ways those tensions are felt and addressed through education are central to our understanding and experience of the world. Other authors have also analysed education in the context of the state’s legitimisation and accumulation functions (Carnoy et al., 1985), while Green (1990, 2013) has analysed education within the context of state formations in Europe, the USA and South East Asia, among others. Here I would mention another figure from sociology who worked in educational institutions (held positions at Institute of Education-University of London and OISE—University of Toronto), focusing on the social relations of cultural production (as opposed to mere reproduction) in education and drawing on cultural studies. This is the recently deceased Philip Corrigan (1942–2021) whose broader areas of historical sociological research included state formation (see Corrigan et al. (1985)). These influences make their presence felt in my work which deals with both the constant and changing features of the state in neoliberal intensive-globalisation times and their effects on public and higher education. I seek to dispel the neoliberal myth, complementing another good friend, Green (1990, 2013, p. 316–318) in doing so, that the nation state has receded into the background in these periods of intensification of globalisation (Capitalism has always been global). To the contrary, I argue that the nation state plays crucial (Mayo, 2019, p. 9), albeit contrasting roles (goods can move freely while labour power does not, often being blocked by the nation state) in the process of capital accumulation, mobility of capital and of labour.

10 Noblesse oblige Gramsci

I re-examine Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) in this context, expanding his national concerns and analyses into more regional ones, such as the ‘Southern Question’, focused on Italy, being expanded to a more Southern European and larger Mediterranean context. I sought to do this in a paper first published as a stand-alone piece in English, Italian and German and subsequently incorporated into a book (Mayo, 2015a).

Gramsci, of course, wielded a lot of influence on critical education thought, manifest in the works of sorely missed close companions and scholars such as the late Paula Allman who draws rigorously on his work (Allman, 1999) in light of her deep and extensive knowledge of Marx (Allman, 2001). Gramsci’s work has been providing me with an overarching vision of moral and intellectual reform which lies at the core of my work, enhanced by insights from feminism, anti-racist politics, postcolonial politics, policy studies and cultural studies. All these features in my oeuvre, though, alas, I cannot address each in the required depth here because of a prescribed word limitation. To do so would result in an absurd exercise in tokenism which I am seeking to avoid. They deserve much more serious treatment which I hope can be found in co-authored books (Borg et al., 2006; English et al., 2012, 2021; Mayo et al., 2017, 2021), both transversally and as entire chapters. They also appear in stand-alone papers (e.g. Borg et al. (2007b) and Grech et al. (2020)), especially insofar as race/ethnicity and gender and women’s issues are concerned.

It would have been amiss to leave Gramsci out, given his centrality and those of his signature concepts, to my oeuvre. The concepts he elaborated on, such as those of hegemony, the intellectuals’ roles, the factory council theory and the integral state, have had a great impact on educational thought and have become central concepts in most discussions on the relationship between education and power in which I have engaged (see Mayo (2015b, 2015a)). Education, from a Gramscian perspective, is viewed in its broadest context and not just in the context of the ‘Unitarian school’ (Gramsci’s notes on schooling), therefore incorporating all elements of the hegemonic apparatus. Gramsci’s major pedagogical philosophy would be the ‘pedagogy of praxis’, inferred from his elaboration of the ‘philosophy of praxis’. Other issues concern the role of education and the integral state, the latter encompassing the heuristic political/civil society divide (Mayo, 1999, 2020, 2015a). It is to an understanding of his conception of education, culture and power that I lay claim to having made my major scholarly contribution (see Buttigieg (2015)), allaying his insights to those expressed by Paulo Freire, captured in many of my writings, including a book (Mayo, 1999) which gained traction as it has been published in translation in seven other languages. My ideas have evolved further since then and will hopefully lead to a second much-revised edition with several new insights.

In this oeuvre of mine, including pieces concerning the state (see Mayo (2015a)), the image of Gramsci looms large. Engagement with his ideas and conceptualizations will continue to mark the rest of my academic work. It is fitting therefore that I round off this essay review with him, having referred to key areas, such as theories of the state and state formation (not to mention cultural studies), on which he has exerted and continues to exert such telling influence.

10Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
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