

Ormond McKague,*

The Saskatchewan CCF: Education Policy and the Rejection of Socialism, 1942 - 1948.

The origins of the CCF have been well-canvassed.¹ What becomes clear with each additional study is the variety and complexity of the precursors of and the participants in the founding conventions of 1932 in Calgary and 1933 in Regina.

The existence of all [these varied] groups . . . spelled success for the CCF's organization, *although there was no fundamental compatibility in the doctrines the various groups espoused*. There were, on the one hand, the doctrinaire socialists from British Columbia who viewed the farmers with suspicion and distrust, seeing them for what they really were - frustrated *petit bourgeois*. The members of the Dominion Labour party, the Canadian Labour party, and the Independent Labour party in Alberta and Saskatchewan were either Fabians or trade unionists, schooled in the socialism of Bellamy and Blatchford and the Social Gospel. Along with their compatriots in Winnipeg, they were familiar with the literature of democratic socialism and for the most part clear on their doctrine. The members of the LSR [League for Social Reconstruction] were socialist intellectuals who saw the new party as the vehicle for an ideology, and to this they lent their energies. The farm groups were seeking reform. For the most part they were led by men who were acquainted with socialism and had, in many instances, urban backgrounds. The farmers who supported them were less familiar with the doctrines of democratic socialism. Their interest was in reform, not social revolution What brought the groups together was a shared belief in the need for a co-operative commonwealth, *though this meant different things to different groups*; and a common recognition of the inadequacy of the existing system to provide even the necessities of life [T]he fundamental differences that existed could not be eradicated²

Such variety existed as well within each provincial organization of the federated CCF and was evident in Saskatchewan in the different doctrines, history and expectations of the farm organizations and urban groups which became part of the party between 1932 and 1944. In terms of political philosophy, the groups and individuals affiliating with the CCF espoused positions ranging from Marxist socialism to liberal reform and found, as Young has pointed out, a commonality in the need for a change, a unifying engine well-fueled by the realities of the Depression.

Despite this variety, the CCF considered itself a "democratic socialist" party. It used the phrase "socialist" in literature and on the hustings, but did so with declining frequency as the CCF became less a movement seeking social change and more a political party seeking electoral victory. In Saskatchewan, the latter aim meant having to deal with a voting public which was conservative, pragmatic and not interested in "isms."³ When leadership of the Saskatchewan party was assumed by T. C. Douglas in 1942, the articulation of policy on the basis of socialism decreased further. Douglas

"understood" people's problems and their needs; this was to serve him much better than any doctrinaire presentation of the CCF ideology and platform. In point of fact, Douglas was not enamored with socialist theory for the sheer sake of theory; he was much more concerned that governments seize the opportunity . . . to meet human needs both social and economic. If a socialist-oriented program was the most promising method for achieving his humanitarian goals, then socialism he would and did embrace.⁴

*Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan

With electoral victory in 1944, the move was towards specific policy formulation and implementation and away from stating or justifying the underlying philosophical assumptions of the policy. The party moved rapidly from whatever commitment it had had to a socialist transformation of capitalist society to the implementing of policy through efficient government operations and justifying such policy on the basis that it "worked" and met easily understood "humanitarian" criteria.

This paper seeks to examine the nature of the CCF's educational philosophy prior to and during its first term as the government of Saskatchewan (1944-48) and to compare that philosophy to the policy and practice of the Department of Education during that term. The purposes of this comparison are (1) to assess the extent to which the CCF in Saskatchewan was able to articulate an educational philosophy which took into account the socialist aspect of the movement/party's origins and (2) to assess the degree to which such a philosophy became implemented policy in the early years of the Department of Education under the CCF Minister, Woodrow S. Lloyd. Such an examination is part of a larger historical and political question which can now begin to be answered: to what extent were the policies of CCF governments different (that is more socialist) from other provincial governments committed to the maintenance of the capitalist system; what was the nature of those differences, if any; and what were the philosophical and political forces behind such differences?

The CCF's first policy statement on education was formulated by the Saskatchewan CCF Educational Policy committee for ratification by a national "Conference on Provincial Policy" called by the CCF for Regina in late December, 1943. The committee to draft this confidential document had been established in 1942 by the Saskatchewan CCF Executive and consisted of Carlyle King, English professor at the University of Saskatchewan as chairman, J. L. Phelps, a CCF M.L.A. and Woodrow Lloyd, then principal of a Biggar, Saskatchewan, school as well as president of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation.

The document began by attacking the crucial question of quantity *versus* quality in the evaluation of public education: A CCF government in any Province will probably begin its consideration of education by trying to find more money to spend on educational services. It ought to begin by considering whether it wants to spend more money to provide more of the educational fare which is currently set before children in the schools of our province. That is, it ought to begin with the fundamental question of the *quality and kind* of education that is needed for the new order of social and economic democracy that the CCF hopes to build.⁵

Not only did the opening paragraph explicitly question the "more of the same" approach, it implicitly related the goals of education to the goals of society. ("For the schools, naturally enough, take their tone from the society they serve.")⁶ To see the schools as instruments of state policy, to see teachers as civil servants, threatened the liberal ideas of individual intellectual independence and the existence of objective, knowable truth. In this early document, the CCF recognized the falsity of this traditional position.

Our Canadian society is marked by gross inequality, legalized banditry, and ruthless struggle for position, place and power; and, by and large, our schools today prepare students to live in that kind of world. Obviously, then, the schools of today are worthless for the civilized society we hope to create in the world of tomorrow.⁷

The schools were functions of a capitalist society. As such they transmitted knowledge, values and behavior patterns which were unacceptable to a democratic socialist.

The implications were significant. First, the school was seen as a major means by which the transition to socialism from capitalism could be accomplished. Second, it

was radical thinking to label contemporary schools as worthless, and revolutionary to advocate their dismantling and replacement by a new socialist education. These implications were clearly articulated in the closing section of the introduction:

If we are in earnest about changing our society in an orderly and peaceful way from monopoly capitalism to democratic socialism, clearly we shall have to transform our educational system at least as quickly. For education is the psychological means for making the new type of citizen social and co-operative, without whom it is impossible that any co-operative commonwealth can come to be or long endure [The] quality of education in any society determines the quality of its citizens.⁸

The failure of education under capitalism was clearly visible, according to the document, in the absence of social security, economic equality, international order and peace. The generation prior to 1943 had participated in two world wars and a catastrophic depression. To these CCFers, the cause lay in capitalism and in the effects of capitalistic schools which had

... given them neither the understanding of the world they lived in nor the independence of thought and judgment they needed to make the machinery of democracy deliver the goods. The teachers are not to blame; they too are victims of the school system. It is the character and content of the going education that is at fault. The going education insulates its victims from the world of reality, deadens mental curiosity and fails to prepare them for intelligent citizenship.⁹

Here the authors attempted to analyze the mystifying and alienating dimensions of the school: that it does not give us the skills or the knowledge either to understand or to transform the world. Nor does the school provide people with the skills of analyzing and criticizing the world - a fundamental prerequisite to the power of transformation. Secondly, the authors claimed that the fault is with a system. Not only are the workers within that system not to blame - they themselves are alienated from their own work and unconscious of what their actual purpose is.

In terms of curriculum, the document assumed that the school is not a value-free entity, but exists for the purpose of transmitting correct values, sound knowledge selected to support such values and skills useful for intelligent and critical citizenship. All this is seen as a moral rather than a political, ideological or revolutionary task.

First of all, a new set of moral values must be the informing spirit of the whole educational system. We should teach the young from kindergarten to college that the main purpose of work is to increase the good life for all We ought to enthrone co-operation and discredit competition . . . and we ought to begin . . . in the classroom . . .¹⁰

The document went on to deal with two related aspects of the school curriculum: the idea of developing a critical faculty in students, and the more precise and political concern with instruction related to the topic of Canadian capitalism.

If our children are to grow up to be good citizens, we must teach them to look critically at the institutions and practices of their country The school ought to be the inspiration to social change.¹¹

The school as an instrument of social change was an important theme of contemporary North American progressive education. It was often assumed in such literature that "social change" implied "social progress" and that both were synonymous with the dominant capitalist ideology. The CCF authors went beyond this progressive idea. To them, social change implied social transformation and, as such, an ongoing critique of the contemporary capitalist system. In this, they followed the American "social reconstructionists."

Thus, were the authors clear in their recognition of the enemy and in their challenge to the schools to reveal that enemy in all its perfidy. The enemy was

capitalism and the goal of CCFers was its eradication by democratic means. The school was one of those means.

At the end [of their schooling, children] understand very little of the real Canada in which they will try to make a living and in which, under our democratic system, they will be called upon to make political judgements and decisions. For example, they do not know where the sources of economic power are . . . they do not know what Canadian capitalism is, nor what it means in terms of the lives that ordinary men and women lead Because they do not know these things, they do not feel any sense of obligation to those who do the back-breaking work of the everyday world nor any sense of responsibility for improving the living conditions of their fellows.¹²

With its emphasis on the primacy of economic structures and on the working class and its exploitation within those structures, this statement is clearly socialist and reveals more vividly than anything hitherto in the document that despite the lack of an understanding of Marxism and the serious implications of that lack, many CCFers went beyond populism and progressivism and had a deep sense of class, exploitation and concentration of economic power. So firmly did they believe this to be the way the world was under capitalism that they felt that such truth, imparted through the schools, would be so self-evident, so damning, that the result of such learning would facilitate the transformation of the society into a co-operative commonwealth.

The authors moved on to consider administrative and bureaucratic ways by which the schools could participate in this transformation.

A CCF government will have to clear the deadwood out of the Provincial Department of Education and re-staff it with trained educators who are in sympathy with the educational objectives outlined above. The same applies with equal emphasis to the teacher training institutions. . . .¹³

As well, it recommended paying teachers "at least as well as beerstore vendors,"¹⁴ the creation of larger school units, increasing the number of superintendents and establishing mechanisms by which the government could be in closer consultation with trustees' and teachers' organizations.

There are many reasons why the 1943 document of the CCF Educational Policy Committee is important. First, it was the initial, officially-approved statement of any CCF body on the topic of education. The statement was ratified almost unanimously by the provincial executive and was "enthusiastically received by the [national] Conference [on provincial policy], praised by Frank Scott, David Lewis and M. J. Coldwell, and unofficially adopted as CCF 'policy.'"¹⁵ Second, it was a comprehensive document, revealing many of the socialist, social democratic and progressive assumptions of CCF adherents. Third, it was written by Saskatchewan members and, presumably, was based on the current reality of Saskatchewan education. Fourth, those who drafted and ratified the document were to become extremely influential in the future government. Most importantly, Woodrow Lloyd, a member of the drafting committee, was Minister of Education in a CCF government from 1944 to 1960. We have, therefore, with this policy statement and with our knowledge of CCF practice within the Department of Education, a clear opportunity to analyze the evolution of policy from its theoretical and philosophical formulations when out of power to its implementation some two years later when Lloyd became Minister of Education in a CCF Government.

Following the national conference on provincial policy at the end of 1943, the philosophical portion of the approved education policy statement was published in the CCF's provincial newspaper, the *Saskatchewan Commonwealth* with the following editorial comment: "A masterful summary of the dismal failure of today's educational system, it eloquently presents the principles of education for a co-

operative commonwealth.”¹⁶ After that, Carlyle King states, “Nothing more was ever heard of it!”¹⁷

What happened between January and May 1944 is not clear, but on May 17th, the *Saskatchewan Commonwealth* published a long section containing CCF party policy for the election which was to be held the following month. What had been a far-reaching, philosophical, passionate and articulate statement of socialist and progressive principles of education had been replaced by a prosaic, administrative, lifeless statement which offended nobody and could be guaranteed to please many, particularly teachers and parents, who found the education system under the Liberal government a sad affair indeed. The statement was clearly an election campaign document.

This statement began by citing five things which were wrong with the Saskatchewan educational system. The first three were clearly quantitative: school financing, building and equipment facilities, and teachers' salaries. The fourth explored the inequality of educational opportunity and the last was concerned with school curriculum. Of the five, the most interesting was the last, namely the section in the CCF election platform dealing with “courses of study” and how they were to be improved.

The present courses of study, particularly the high school courses, do not prepare children adequately for the world into which they will go and try to make a living. Young people leave high school now, after apparently having been engaged in learning for twelve years and discover that they know practically nothing about how the world is run . . . Their schooling has not prepared them for the social and economic realities of their life, and consequently has given them little or no encouragement to become intelligent citizens.¹⁸

According to the CCF, what Saskatchewan schools did badly, they should do well; that is, to prepare students to live as effective and productive citizens in a capitalist world. It was clearly a “social and economic reality” that most students would grow up to be exploited members of a working class. It was also a “social and economic reality” that power and wealth were concentrated in a small capitalist class. What the earlier policy document condemned as a major function of schools under capitalism — the perpetuation of a class structure which guaranteed maximum profits for the few and a docile and powerless acquiescence in that process by the many — seemed in the official election platform to be accepted by the CCF. To improve the school curriculum so a capitalist “reality” could be more effectively served seemed the extent of their goal. Gone, as well, was the emphasis on developing a critical and active citizenry through whose critique and through whose actions a socialist co-operative commonwealth could come to replace capitalism.

To the five problems mentioned above, the CCF proposed to the electorate ten solutions. The first was strangely centralist for a democratic socialist party which claimed to desire a high level of citizen participation in decision-making.

. . . the Provincial Government has been evading its duty; it has made grants to schools, outlined courses of study and provided for inspection of schools, but it has left the main burden of maintaining school services upon the . . . local school boards . . . [Because of this] a CCF Government will reorganize school administration and finance as to increase expenditure on education, improve the school plant, and raise teachers' salaries.¹⁹

One of the means by which these centralized provincial responsibilities were to be met was through the creation of the Larger School Unit, the second and most highly publicized point in the CCF policy. What was desired by the CCF was that the “efficiency, economy and uniformity”²⁰ of city and town schools be extended

to the large number of rural schools which had heretofore been administered by many tiny local boards.

This would bring about 50 to 75 schools under the administration of a single board . . . The belief of those who advocate this change is that by pooling the resources of a considerable area, the citizens of that area can get a more efficient and more economical administration of their schools. . . and can ensure a uniform standard of schooling throughout the area. . . .²¹

The emphasis on uniformity as a desirable goal which would be achieved through increasing the centralized administrative power and financial responsibility of the provincial department and through the creation of larger school units can only be understood by relating it to the CCF's concern for equality of opportunity for all students, whether rural or urban, whether from rich or poor districts. It has always been a difficult philosophical and political dilemma to separate the two ideas of equality and uniformity. The willingness of the CCF to achieve equality by creating a centralized uniformity is an indication, on the one hand, of their lack of political (or socialist) sophistication and on the other of their serious commitment to improving the quality of education (as they defined it) for *all* students

Other planks in the CCF education platform can be dealt with more briefly: teachers' salaries were to be improved and a salary schedule drawn up; mechanisms were to be established for regular consultation between the Department of Education and both teachers' and trustees' associations; improvements were to be made in health services in the schools of the province; free textbooks and supplies were to be provided; special classes and specially trained teachers were to be established for the mentally handicapped so they would not "get into trouble, become problems in their communities and drift into vagrancy and crime";²² the university was to be accessible to everyone with "the mental ability and the desire to learn . . . irrespective of his parents' income";²³ adult education was to be brought under the jurisdiction of the provincial government and extended.

The tenth and last topic was "Curriculum Revision." It included two main points: "to revise the school curriculum so that the material of school studies may prepare students adequately for intelligent participation in the life of their community" and "to equip the child with the information and attitudes for co-operative living with his fellows in the modern world."²⁴ This was a significant dilution of the earlier policy document and leaves one wondering if the "co-operative living" proposed was the radical move away from a brutal and competitive class society under capitalism as Carlyle King and his committee envisaged or whether it implied the characteristics of docility and obedience which future workers acquired in capitalistic schools and applied in the workplace. The meaning of the term "co-operative" was not much analyzed by CCF educators. This has proved to be unnecessary, however, as such curriculum modifications were never implemented.²⁵

As the CCF entered the election of 1944, it had evolved an educational policy which was practical and easily understood. It responded to many of the most glaring faults of the existing system and promised correctives which were efficient, logical and met broad humanitarian and ideological criteria such as "equality" and "co-operation." In doing so the party forsook a policy statement which was radical and frequently socialist. In the flush of an astounding victory, it seemed clearly to have been a good decision. Despite the requirements of electoral victory, however, this transformation of policy had important effects on the educational policies and practices which followed.

"Few public services fared as adversely as did education during the depression years: underpaid teachers and dilapidated schools made this obvious."²⁶ Thus the Liberal government was easy to attack in this area. Their own platform called for an expansion of existing programs, but proposed few new ones. Neither Hubert Staines, the Minister of Education, nor the Liberals had a good reputation with teachers. In part teachers blamed their low salaries on the government but at least as significant (particularly for the majority who were women) was Staine's cavalier attitude to teacher professionalism. He opposed a salary schedule based on professional training and years of experience and was quoted as saying: "numerous people with Ph.D.'s are utterly incompetent in the classroom and if salaries were based only on experience, some 'old lady in trousers' might receive the benefit."²⁷ Needless to say, teachers, including the Ph.D.'s and the "old ladies" voted overwhelmingly for the CCF!

The issue of larger school units did not figure widely in the election, but both it and the seemingly safe curriculum recommendations resulted in the most vituperative aspects of the campaign. The CCF, despite the moderation of many of its policies, was still capable of raising in its opponents' minds the spectre of Bolshevism and totalitarianism. To some, the larger school units were a means by which a centralized socialism would take children away from their families and manipulate their minds into accepting false socialist ideas.

Who is backing the campaign for the Larger School Unit? The Teachers' Federation . . . [and] men who dream of a socialist 'paradise' for Saskatchewan. The sprouting socialists want to use schools to further their electoral campaigns and . . . to turn schools overnight into state-controlled education as in Russia and Germany By adopting the proposed system you are transferring to five men who will be nothing but party-paid functionaries the complete formation of your children. . . .²⁸

Virulence took other forms in the election campaign, primarily because of the war, the universal hatred of Hitler and the attempt by some opposed to the CCF to equate it with German National Socialism. Such fear tactics were particularly effective when they included the "destruction" of innocent children. The following appeared in the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald* during the last days of the campaign:

. . . The youth of Germany was Socialized, — the State claimed the child as its property, and made the schools its propaganda centers to Socialize the mind of the child Of course, this could never happen in Canada, not, at least, on the German plan. But it could happen "democratically" under a Canadian plan if the parents voted for it. . . . The CCFers would "Goebbelize" the Schools of Saskatchewan; it's the INHERENT NATURE of National Socialism.²⁹

Examples such as these make clearer (and perhaps more justifiable) the reasons for the modification and moderation of educational policy described above. CCF electoral policy in 1944 is an example of one of the ways by which the democratic left can see social change. Given an electoral structure, and assuming the power of governments to transform society, do you qualify your political principles to achieve that power which will make possible the ends you desire? Many Canadians who say "yes" to that question have found a congenial home in the CCF-NDP. Those who say "no" are apt to raise such thorny Marxist issues as the subservience of the state and its governmental apparatus to the real power in capitalist society which resides in an economic class, the bourgeoisie. The CCF has proven, such socialists would say, the futility of assuming that a revolutionary transformation can occur through the actions of governments.

Such historical proof began, if you like, with the victory of the CCF in Saskatchewan in June 1944.

There was little indication when Woodrow S. Lloyd was appointed Minister of Education in the first CCF government that he would remain in the position for

sixteen years, that he would become the most well-known and widely respected provincial education minister in Canada, or that his direct and indirect influence on education policy would so significantly affect the daily lives of generations of Saskatchewan school children. He was born in a small village of south western Saskatchewan in 1913, the youngest of a family of thirteen. His schooling ranged from a one-room country school, through a town school, a city collegiate, the provincial Normal School and the University of Saskatchewan. He taught and administered rural and town schools of various sizes, playing an increasing role in the newly-formed Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF) and in the CCF. He was STF president from 1940 to 1944. In 1944, he was the successful candidate in Biggar constituency where he had been principal of the school.

While still a young man, Lloyd had acquired a reputation as a thorough, serious and scholarly public speaker. As Minister, he was always considered the thinker, the "idea man" of the cabinet — quiet, introspective, pipe-smoking, reflective; he did not appear to be a politician. He firmly believed that all actions must be carefully considered and based on consistent and clear philosophical assumptions. "... What is more practical," he asked a group of educational philosophers, "than a continuing search for the guide which can come only from philosophical belief?"³⁰ As a result of this refreshing and unusual commitment to philosophical speculation and articulation, we have a vast body of speeches made by him as Minister of Education which make clear the assumptions behind his policy decisions. As historical documents, these speeches clarify not only the educational philosophy of the CCF in power, but add new dimensions to what we know of CCF political philosophy and its socialist content. They can, unfortunately, only be briefly summarized here.

Woodrow Lloyd saw public education as a powerful and necessary means by which two great purposes could be achieved: first, satisfaction and fullness of life for each schooled individual and second, the creation of a social collectivity which was equitable, just, co-operative and dynamic. The relationship between a freely functioning individual and a dynamic society was not a difficult one for him. He clearly recognized that individual rights and freedoms would be limited by the demands of the social whole and at the same time that the demands which a society could make on an individual were equally limited by his freedoms and rights. It was this relationship between the society and its individuals which was (or should be) dynamic, a constantly changing give-and-take, hopefully within a framework of justice and co-operation, which was exciting to Lloyd. For him, to improve the quality of that relationship justified and legitimated education, politics and his membership in the CCF. But, although he recognized that to effect such a transformation required politicians, institutions and bureaucracies, there were, as well, other, deeper considerations.

What is the aim of education is a question that admits of no answer without a reference to ultimate convictions about human nature and destiny, about society and how the individual stands related to it.³¹

A change of such magnitude in the way human beings lived their lives together was nothing less than a spiritual rebirth, a transmogrification of the soul. "It is the problem of effecting a change in the spiritual motivation of the people from competition to co-operation."³² It was also an attitudinal change which moved society's members away from materialistic goals to a perception of ends which were more humanitarian. Such a change required a social rather than a highly individualized consciousness.

More and more our students must think in terms of people and humanity rather than in terms of things They must learn to appreciate the impact of their lives on the lives of others. They must develop a sympathetic social consciousness which involves a sincere respect for the welfare of all people everywhere.³³

Even more vividly expressed was this description of the ideal student who would emerge from ideal schools: "[schools lead to] the autonomous function of the pupil's mind and the habitual exercise by him of a character that is free, charitable and self-moving."³⁴ Thus the relationship between the autonomous individual and the co-operative community within which he would function was always clear to Lloyd. So was the role of the school in the creation of both.

The democratic problem in education is not primarily a problem of training children, it is the problem of making a community within which children cannot help growing up to be democratic, intelligent, disciplined to freedom, reverent of the goods of life, and eager to share in the tasks of the age. A school cannot produce this result; nothing but a community can do so.³⁵

Thus did Lloyd's commitment to co-operation, community, individualism, social consciousness, intelligence and the human spirit coalesce in the view of the school as a dynamic community functioning as an integral part of a larger community, which was itself constantly learning as it chose its destiny.

There is, at this point, a serious paradox in the seeming consistency of Lloyd's thoughts on education. The purpose of schooling was relatively clear. The means by which the purpose was to be achieved, however, were filled with dangerous ambiguities. As we have seen, Lloyd championed a school and a teaching profession which related to students in an egalitarian way and did not impose its views in a hierarchical way. It was in such a "learn by doing" atmosphere that the possibilities of co-operative community could be experienced as part of the learning environment. Such a liberal approach to the student-teacher relationship was tempered by some surprising references to "modification of behavior."

. . . [T]he essential task of the school is not that of merely providing training in the three "Rs" or in the facts of history and science. *The more essential task is that of properly modifying human behavior.* It is important, of course, that standards of achievement in academic knowledge be attained, but such achievements are most inadequate unless accompanied by attitudes, which lead to a properly modified way of looking at life and of using those achievements. Knowledge in itself is not a virtue.³⁶

To Lloyd, knowledge and intelligence alone were not sufficient for the creation of a co-operative commonwealth. Nor could one rely on the dialectical nature of human encounter in a democratic milieu. It was fundamentally a question of attitude. Attitude guided intelligence. Attitude tempered and directed knowledge. Attitude qualified and determined human relationships. Attitude, in short, determined behavior and, as behavior could be "moulded" or modified, and indeed must be, if the co-operative commonwealth was to be established, then that clearly became the primary means by which the schools carried out its fundamental purpose — the formation of free individuals operating intelligently within the co-operative framework of a dynamic democracy.

That Lloyd failed to see the inconsistency of means and ends is understandable given the emotional strength of his commitment and the superficial approach he took to philosophical ideas. The result was confusion where there should have been clarity regarding the functioning of schools in his philosophy of education. As we shall see, such confusion resulted in inconsistent policies and practices between 1944 and 1948.

Assessing the extent to which Lloyd's philosophy of education was "socialist" is difficult, partly because of its strong liberal humanitarian emphasis. It is possible,

however, through an analysis of his writings and through the recognition of nuances to be able to discern some philosophical assumptions which go beyond liberal progressivism and which can be seen to be socialist at least to the extent that the CCF was socialist.

The first and most obvious aspect of Lloyd's socialist thought was his emphasis on co-operative and participatory communities. A socialist sees commune-ism as a post-revolutionary formation indicative of a classless society — a dynamic and continuous involvement by all members of the commune in the decision-making, policy formulation and action vital to the ongoing life of the group. Such activity is non-hierarchical and production within the commune is no longer the alienating process it is for the proletariat under capitalism. A democratic socialist (which Lloyd considered himself) would share the same view of Communism, but would see it as an ideal which did not require a revolutionary transformation of society, but which could be worked at through taking advantage of the possibilities within bourgeois parliamentary processes. The end result of this parliamentary process does not erase class distinctions but works to create (by legislation and by education) the co-operative milieu within which such differences could be ameliorated and new accords based on class co-operation and dependent upon the beneficent intervention of a democratic state could be established. To Lloyd, alienation and injustice existed within communities, but they were not a function of class antagonisms so much as they were the result of man's individual failure to achieve his obvious potential, a failure which could be corrected by an effective and humanitarian educational system operated by a democratic government. He did understand that to share adequately in the making of one's life and one's community required an economic transformation. The poor required a greater share of the wealth of the community.

... [I]f men are going to live at all, men must live in peace, and if men are to live in peace, they must first of all live in economic justice at home.³⁷

The above would indicate that Lloyd accepted the continued existence of classes as they existed under capitalism, but expected a beneficent government would ameliorate the worst injustices of a class system. At the same time, it must be pointed out that he had a socialist's healthy hostility to the ruling class and equally healthy awareness that the search for equity and justice was a struggle against that class, a struggle which involved the organized action of those who were exploited. To produce people who would be effective in such a struggle was, to him, one of the functions of the school. "The struggle for freedom and for abundance of life is a struggle of today. Of this the school must be aware, and students must be equipped to participate in this struggle, not lulled to sleep by any impression that such struggles are all in the past."³⁸ In order for the school to prepare its members for such struggle, the curriculum must become "a social and personal enterprise in living — in real not artificial living."³⁹ In such a "real" curriculum, it was necessary to understand the class constituents of a community and the antagonistic relationships among them.

He [the student] must realize that . . . men must not only refuse to hand over much of that fullness [of the earth] to a privileged few, but must organize collectively to produce and distribute that fullness . . . [Students] must have an understanding of the social and economic structure of modern society.⁴⁰

Woodrow Lloyd was not a Marxian socialist. Nonetheless his philosophy of education contained within its essentially liberal assumptions enough indication of a socialist understanding of the structures of society, the direction of history and

the concept of communism to indicate that he was considerably to the left of those who had, between 1905 and 1944, shaped Saskatchewan's educational system. It is thus logical to assume that, with the victory of the CCF and his assumption of the Education portfolio, changes in the educational system would be in response to and would reflect this socialist tendency.

Lloyd moved quickly to implement Larger School Units. In a special session of the Legislature in the fall of 1944, a bill was introduced to establish such administrative boards. A Larger School Unit was formed by bringing schools in four or five municipalities under the direction of one central Unit Board. Such a unit usually included about eight schools. Board members represented five geographic sub-units. The original local boards, which continued to exist, sent a representative to these sub-unit meetings which, in turn, selected a representative to the unit board. Thus the democratic link between the ratepayers of a unit and the unit board lay through the traditional local boards. The Unit Board had the responsibility of managing all the educational affairs of the unit. Assistance in this responsibility came from local boards and from a provincially appointed school superintendent. The creation of the Unit Board would take place unless a petition signed by 20 per cent of the ratepayers in a proposed unit, representing a majority of the local school districts, was received. In such a case, a referendum would be held. As a result of such petitions, fifteen units remained unorganized by 1948. By that time, forty-five Larger School Units had been established representing about 75 per cent of the province.

The main reason for the rapid implementation of Larger School Units was that, to Lloyd, they represented the structural modification necessary to implement the other policies which he felt were necessary, particularly in the areas of equality of educational opportunity and a fairer distribution of education costs. This is the main argument Lloyd used with his cabinet colleagues, some of whom anticipated (quite correctly) considerable opposition to the move.

School units had been financed by a provincial government grant and from taxes levied on property owners based on the assessed value of their land. The inequities of this system in a province where land varied considerably in quality were to be alleviated by the creation of Larger School Units. The overall real financial effect of the formation of Larger School Units was that ratepayers on poorer land had their mill rates and thus their school taxes lowered while the ratepayers on superior land had their school taxes increased. This latter group constituted the main opposition to the policy in its early years.

Here was the application to educational financing of the social democratic-welfare state principle of making payment for essential and humanitarian purposes proportionate to wealth. It was a policy with which the CCF was ideologically comfortable. As *CCF Action* stated in 1949:

[Wealthy ratepayers] have not yet realized that education of all the children is the responsibility of all the people. It is not a matter which can be left to the individual any more than we can leave control of communicable diseases and noxious weeds to the individual. If education is to be advanced, the people with higher incomes must accept a greater share of financial responsibility than the people with lower incomes.⁴¹

The second major criticism of Larger School Units was that the decision-making process in education was moving away from parents and ratepayers and was becoming centralized, bureaucratized and professionalized. The rapid and unilateral action of the provincial government in implementing the larger units was the initial cause for concern, but the nominal list of unimportant respon-

sibilities assigned to local boards in the new structure ("providing water for the school" and "assisting the teacher to plan hot noon lunches" were two examples⁴²) and the overseeing power of a provincially appointed unit superintendent were equally important factors.

The decision to implement Larger School Units by means of a provincial act rather than by holding local referenda is an important one in that it points up potential discrepancies between the CCF's commitment to good and effective government under skilled and dedicated leaders on the one hand and its desire for individual and community involvement in governmental decision-making on the other. Thus Lloyd's response to this criticism is particularly important.

The fact of the matter is that it is very convenient and very comfortable for governments to shelve their responsibility in making decisions in this manner. We do not intend to shelve or shirk our responsibility to the taxpayers and to that more important group — the children of this province — in that manner. Nor is it suggested that we "shove it down people's throats." Before organizing a larger unit in any area the plan is to be thoroughly explained in that area by competent officials of the Department of Education.⁴³

It is important to understand that Lloyd hoped and believed that his principle of decentralized decision-making by a dynamic and co-operative community could be made easier by the larger school unit structure. In addition, the process of such decision-making would itself be educational in the ever expanding evolution of the co-operative commonwealth which was his goal.

Administrative techniques that encourage and require the participation of many people in the formation of policy are essential. People must feel that they are a part. The unit board that is skillful in arranging such participation . . . will make educational progress. Such educational progress [is] not confined to school children because such a process is an extremely valid education of adults in democratic procedures.⁴⁴

I feel that a measure of our own success is the extent to which the educational administration can be decentralized . . . still retaining certain provincial direction in those matters in which it is desirable to attain certain provincial standards and objectives.⁴⁵

This last point is, of course, highly significant. What Lloyd neglected to mention was that the matters remaining under provincial jurisdiction represented the crucial areas of educational policy: curriculum and text book policy, student evaluation and grade standards, teacher education, teacher certification, grant policy, etc. In addition, some critics of the structure claimed that the power and influence of the provincially-appointed superintendent combined with the cosmetic retention of local boards in effect made the unit board less powerful than the former local boards had been.

Despite the criticism of the Larger School Units, they gradually came to be implemented and respected as the administrative base within which other educational improvements could more easily occur.

The CCF did not significantly modify the structure of educational financing. What they claimed to do was first, to make the tax burden more equitable by increasing the proportion paid out of provincial taxes and by increasing equalization grants; and, second, to increase substantially the actual amount paid into education funding. This shift in the sources of funding and the department's control over the equalization grants once again raised the question of the locus of decision-making. Control of equalization grants and special capital grants made it possible for the department to determine where (and what) expansions of educational services would take place. In stating that these financial trends did not erode local autonomy, Lloyd made certain provisos which could lead one to the opposite conclusion.

The [grant] system does not entail any strict control over local expenditures except in those cases in which boards come to us for special help. At that point, we do, of course, control by virtue of the extent of the help we can give and by virtue of making our support conditional on doing those things which we consider advisable It is gratifying to say that we have been able to develop a relationship with most boards to the extent that they do ask our advice before making many of their more serious decisions.⁴⁶

Such a complacent sense of authority, rooted as it was in the assumption of expertise in the central institution, was becoming acceptable in educational as in other administrative structures. What it threatened was the concept of the dynamic decision-making community. The extent to which Lloyd was able to rationalize centralized power with the idea of local autonomy in education was the extent to which the latter had become merely political rhetoric.

At the time the CCF came to power, the perception of school curriculum was that it must be centrally determined and rigidly adhered to. It was assumed that the formation of a sequential curriculum required a sophisticated understanding of such matters as learning theory, pedagogy and an epistemological awareness of what knowledge is, what knowledge should be transmitted, when in a child's development that transmission should occur and to what level of complexity. Thus curriculum (content, methodology and evaluation) could not be left to the teacher or even the school to determine, but must be handled by a professional. This concept of curriculum determination was accepted by the CCF. The only modification which they made was to involve, in a consultative capacity, more groups in the educational system. They made only two concessions to the concept of centralized control over all aspects of the curriculum. One was to establish for high school students a number of optional curricular routes (university entrance, vocational, non-matriculation) which the school could provide and which the student could choose. The second was to allow school to "recommend" certain Grade XII students, thus exempting them from writing prescribed departmental examinations.

It is not surprising, given the semi-sacred nature of the curriculum and given the amount of energy going into the administrative questions of larger school units, educational financing and teacher salary, welfare and supply problems, that there would be little effective change in the curriculum during the government's first term in office. Thus the choice of priorities in curriculum change becomes significant. These came in three areas: a new high school curriculum, new support systems for teachers to increase their effectiveness in the standard curriculum, and considerable work on developing a classroom Guidance program for high school students.

Conditions after 1944 made it possible for more students to attend and complete high school and it was because of this that an early focus was on the high school curriculum. Another reason was that the CCF had campaigned on a platform of transforming the curriculum so that it would prove useful to all students and not just those going on to university. This became the initial emphasis of the revised high school curriculum.

Saskatchewan is preparing a new high school curriculum which is less a preparation for university and will place a greater emphasis on social responsibility and character education: a course of diversified study which will retain adolescents in school with a program fitted to their needs.⁴⁷

Two years later, Lloyd, in a radio broadcast, was more cautious and more precise.

Our aim in preparing this curriculum has been to attempt to more nearly meet the individual needs of all students The curriculum provides a pattern for growth and both facilities and teachers will have to grow in order to put it into operation.

He described the emphasis of the new curriculum as being in the areas of Guidance ("so that the students may better know themselves, know where they want to go in life and know how to get there"), Social Studies ("so that a student may have a better grasp of the society in which he lives and may be more aware of his responsibility in that society") and the Fine Arts - music, drama and art ("so that living may be enriched").⁴⁸ At the end of his talk, he gave a more immediate reason for preparing a high school curriculum which was attractive to adolescents: "Probably the only answer to widespread employment - or unemployment - of youth is to have the type of education which encourages them to remain in school."⁴⁹ The usefulness of schools in keeping young adults off a competitive labour market and at the same time off unemployment rolls was being recognized at this time and the double desire of a capitalist economy to keep youth in school and to justify this by championing the need for technical and vocational education as preparation for a work world which was increasingly technological was beginning to be felt in Saskatchewan. Lloyd tended to accept both propositions uncritically.

In the new high school curriculum, Guidance became a timetabled class during which vocational, social and sometimes personal issues were discussed by a class of students with a teacher. This, combined with an increasingly important one-to-one relationship between student and teacher, was expected to form the basis of a school system more relevant and more responsive to individual student needs. In his concern for this aspect of the school curriculum, Lloyd was influenced by the American progressive movement in education. Guidance was, to him, "the topic most in the focus of educational thought."⁵⁰

It becomes clear when examining Lloyd's views on guidance the extent to which he viewed the schooling process as a very personal, almost intimate experience. Such intimacy he saw as its great value. (He was far from being anti-intellectual, but knowledge, to him, must be placed on a solid base of personal, social and attitudinal maturity.) The maintenance of an intimate school experience would be enhanced by its "community" nature. It would, on the other hand, be lost if the community lost its interest in or its sense of control over the school and if the school became an impersonal aspect of an increasingly centralized and monolithic structure. It is unfortunate that, as a bureaucrat, he failed to recognize that the creation of the latter affected the maintenance of the former, that personal and community values were being replaced by institutional ones, and that he and his department were in fact encouraging the trend.

In the area of teachers' salaries, security and benefits, the CCF moved relatively quickly. Along with the formation of the Larger School Units, the first action of the new Department of Education was to increase the minimum salary for teachers with a professional certificate to \$1200 *per annum* and for teachers with an interim certificate to \$1000.⁵¹ In 1948, the Teachers' Salary Negotiation Act was passed making it mandatory for a school board to negotiate a schedule to govern salaries of teachers employed by that board. A Teacher Tenure Act was later passed providing that a teacher, having been continuously employed by a board for two years, had recourse to a Conciliation Board to be appointed by the Minister of Education in the event of termination of contract and that such a teacher could require a board to state the reasons for the termination.

Improvements were made in the in-service education of teachers and in the quality of teacher training in the Normal Schools of the province. The latter included improved selection procedures for admission and the addition of "a class in world sociology which will include some study to co-operative principles and of

the co-operative movement.”⁵²

By the end of the CCF Government's first term, (1948), the Department of Education had established itself as a large and complexly-structured bureaucracy, administering sixteen statutes, numerous orders-in-council and programs in the following areas: school administration, teacher training, curricula, supervision, examinations and office of the Registrar, Canadian Vocational Training and Trade Schools, vocational education, adult education, physical fitness and recreation, correspondence education, the provincial School for the Deaf and the book bureau.⁵³ It is clear that the department offered many more resources and expert personnel than had ever been the case before in Saskatchewan. Nonetheless, for a province with a population of less than a million, it was an awesome structure.

It was also a self-satisfying one for those officials who had created it, who headed its major divisions and who could look forward (barring the inevitable exigencies of political life) to many years in such capacities. Thus the operation of the Department of Education, after an initial flurry of new legislation between 1944 and 1946, came to be based less on initiation and more on perpetuation. At the end of 1946, Lloyd wrote to the government official in charge of preparing the Throne Speech for the spring session: “I am doubtful whether there will be any proposed legislation for my Department which will be worth while mentioning in the Speech from the Throne”⁵⁴ and a year later he memoed the same official: “I do not believe that we have any new legislation to introduce which will merit mention in the speech from the Throne.”⁵⁵ It should be made clear that the absence of new legislation does not imply total atrophy. Much work was being done during these years to establish the mechanisms for carrying out the work designated to the department in earlier legislation. But by 1947 (and to a large extent thereafter) the Department of Education was more content to establish and hone bureaucratic structures and to solve immediate problems that it was to create innovative educational proposals.

It was at the time that the Department of Education under Lloyd was establishing itself as an efficient and congenial administrative structure that the first director of the new Adult Education Division was appointed. With Watson Thomson, a radical Scottish immigrant, the nest of educational bureaucrats was invaded by an ideologue. The resulting confrontation, brief and sharp as it was, clarified further the nature of Lloyd and the department and their attitudes to educational change, the co-operative commonwealth and democratic socialism.

To establish an adult education program under the provincial Department of Education was one of the goals of the CCF before 1944. An early document (1942) had made clear the need for adult education in a democratic socialist society and the reasons why adult education was neglected under capitalism.

The significant point is that the basic philosophy of even the liberal capitalist state has no place for adult education, with the result that adult education is only “toyed with” in bits and pieces under capitalist governments . . . By contrast *an adult education program is an integral part of socialist society* [which] is built on the concept that every individual shares in the control of the economic as well as the political life of the nation. Co-operation is the motivating force; production for need is the end-all of economic action. Those needs are decided by the people through the various democratic processes; and the economic life is planned and controlled to achieve the needs.⁵⁶

Thus adult education, the ongoing development of individuals able to take their vital places in socialist decision-making, was assumed to be a necessary, formal function of a democratic socialist government.

It was such a view of the purpose of adult education that Thomson brought to his

position as director in October, 1944. Whether Thomson was or was not a revolutionary is an interesting point. Before he came to Saskatchewan, he wrote a manuscript entitled "The New Revolution" in which he rejected equally "the old reformist pattern" and the "old" idea of revolution: "a distant goal preceded by chaos and dislocation and widespread suffering."⁵⁷ Clearly for Thomson a radical transformation of society was necessary and the means to that transformation were as important as the ends.

To evolve into the new society by a long series of imperceptible changes is inadequate. Partly because it ignores the depth and sharpness of the change and of the resistance to that change. But also because, if it could be done so, [we] would miss the experience of real rejuvenation.⁵⁸

To him, the essence of revolutionary social change, and that which guaranteed its permanence was "how much the impetus and responsibility for these changes comes from the mass of the people themselves."

Every solution to a social problem is wrong in which the people are not active participants. Any thing which . . . reduces the responsibility of the people is contrary to the nature of the New Revolution.⁵⁹

Thomson's expectations for the "mass of the people" were high because he believed that man's "personal rationality" was ultimately superior to his mob possibilities or his natural instincts. The second fundamental of the New Revolution was that it was planned. A revolution could be coherent and rational as well as mass-based. "The essence of planning is that an awakened People demand a coherent expression of their common purposes and common intelligence."⁶⁰ His immediate concern was that such a collective expression was strangled in our "bureaucratic democracy" and that the common intelligence of the people was being replaced by the "arbitrary whims of the bureaucrat."⁶¹ Although this article does not clarify Thomson's views of the class nature of any revolutionary struggle, his separation of the bureaucrat from the mass of the people and his assertion that the former muzzled and weakened the latter is clearly class based.

Thomson's philosophy of mass revolution had important implications for adult education.

. . . It can only be done by contacting the people personally and consistently in local communities, trade unions and co-operatives. Everywhere you go throughout the Prairie Region you can find people anxious to do something but not knowing how or what to do . . . This applies to every part of our whole social structure: teachers, trade unionists, members of co-operatives, farmers, etc. These people are looking for an answer, yes, but they cannot be reached by a school. They can only be reached by working with them consistently or by demagogic methods that lead to fascism.⁶²

This comment contained the germ of Thomson's educational philosophy. People of all ages were open to the kind of action that would lead to a liberating social transformation. To lead to such action required an education which was consistent, continuing and which took place in the locales most significant to the lives of individual people, an education carried out by people who were part of that same social fabric, not external to it. The other alternative, according to Thomson, was a fascistic social change based on demagoguery, charisma and exploitation. This last was a continuing concern of Thomson's arising out of his knowledge of Nazi "educational" processes and his belief that such was possible in a Canada wedded to authoritarian and elitist educational styles, a Canada unwilling to accept the propagandist nature of capitalist media. "Knowledge," Thomson said in an early Adult Education pamphlet,

is the ultimate power by which men cease to be victims of circumstance and become conscious controllers of their own environment and destiny. But such power remains dangerously unhumanized until it is in the hands of *all* the people. . . . To bring real, usable knowledge to real people about the

real issues of their lives in order to effect tangible improvements in their circumstances, that is the basic function of a vital adult education.⁶³

It is interesting to note how much Thomson's rhetoric, although more flamboyant, was similar in content to Lloyd's statements on educational purpose as the creation of a "dynamic democracy" and a "co-operative commonwealth." The means to the achievement of a similar end were, however, very different. It could be postulated that Thomson better understood the power, tenacity and subtlety of capitalist social relations and realized that such co-operative communities would not easily be created but would require critical and sometimes disruptive educational methods.

Among the programs established by Thomson and his fledgling department was one entitled "Living Newspaper" which was linked to "Radio College" - ten weekly verbal and written analyses of contemporary affairs designed to reach as many Saskatchewan citizens as possible with a "more correct" interpretation of recent events and to stimulate discussions in local communities. The analysis was often clearly socialist and highly critical of capitalism's role in the post-war world. Reaction from listeners and readers was overwhelmingly positive. However, the analysis, combined with false rumours about Thomson's links with the Labour Progressive Party and international Communism, distressed a CCF national establishment anxious to separate the party from the bogey of Communism in the mind of the Canadian voter. Pressure was put on Lloyd to dismiss Thomson, which he did in December, 1945.

Aside from this pressure, there were, to Lloyd, two main reasons which made dismissal inevitable. The first was that the philosophy of adult education espoused by the government was not the same as that held by Thomson. To Lloyd, education did not indoctrinate and that was what Thomson was doing.

I do not think that it should be expected that Adult Education should assume the responsibility of doing more than placing before the people a complete picture and leaving the ultimate decisions and opinions to the people themselves.⁶⁴

The second reason justifying dismissal was Lloyd's perception that politicians make political statements, but civil servants, within the context of their work, must not.

I think you will agree that a Minister can hardly accept the situation in which one who is employed by the Government takes the position that if it is a matter of the employee's point of view or that of the Government, then the employee's view will have to prevail . . . the employee must . . . accept and represent the Government's point of view.⁶⁵

Thomson had made it clear to Lloyd that such a restriction was inconceivable to him and such recalcitrance, to Lloyd, threatened not only the program of the Adult Education Division, but the power of the Department and its democratically-elected Minister over the division. To Lloyd, the issues of bureaucratic stability, democratic representivity and pedagogical objectivity were closely intertwined. Each one was threatened by Watson Thomson.

Thomson felt he had made mistakes — he talked too openly, falsely assuming a high level of social consciousness; he assumed the CCF was a movement with "a genuinely socialist purpose";⁶⁶ he did not demand an understanding about policy with Cabinet at the beginning. Despite these errors, it was Thomson's opinion that the government had been primarily at fault: it had no social goal or method; "when forced to take a theoretical stand, it stands on laissez-faire liberal-democratic principles"; its "Anti-Red phobia" was irrational; "when principle and

vote-catching expediency clash, it is obvious that the former loses out pretty quickly." The basic conclusion reached by Thomson was that the CCF was a social democratic party and that "the whole social democratic idea has to be challenged and subjected to radical evaluation." In short, Thomson concluded, "I've now seen Social Democracy in action, and I don't like it."

A socialist political philosophy which has been as a red thread through the pale pink garment of CCF-NDP history, occasionally dominant, frequently invisible, always part of the fabric, exists as well within that aspect of the CCF's work as party and as government concerned with matters of public education. We have noted its presence in the early educational policy statements of the party, in the rhetoric of Watson Thomson as Adult Education director in the CCF government and in certain aspects of the thought of Woodrow Lloyd as Minister of Education. It became invisible in the implemented educational policies of the CCF government. Those policies were based on liberal-progressive ideas of the role of the school and the nature of knowledge and on bureaucratic-administrative ideas of efficient operation and responsible centralized decision-making. Both of these influences were being felt by departments of education in the other provinces so that, despite the presumed differences in political ideology, Liberal, Conservative, Social Credit and CCF governments were restructuring their provincial educational systems in much the same way. This essentially pragmatic response to educational change, and the rejection of a more specific socialist dimension to such change, had, for the CCF in Saskatchewan, four main causes: (1) the need for electoral victory, (2) the desire to retain power (the CCF assumed a pragmatic, essentially conservative electorate in Saskatchewan), (3) the continuing powerful domination of a capitalist ideology regarding the definition of what a school should be and what a school should produce, and (4) the pressure to function well as a department which made innovation, being unpredictable and therefore potentially inefficient, less desirable than the bureaucratic effectiveness of existing well-honed programs.

It is important, however, not to separate the *method* of policy implementation from the *philosophy* behind the policy. According to one writer, efficiency did not become an end in itself, but always operated in a "socialist" manner for a "socialist" purpose.

Two fundamental elements stand out in the Saskatchewan experience. The first and basic element was socialism and its advocacy of public means to achieve goals The second element . . . was a concern with the machinery and conduct of government itself — the need to perfect the chosen instrument . . . involved conversion of government to a rational, developmental, planning institution of the highest possible order, [a government] . . . quite firmly rooted in traditional socialist thought although this is easily obscured by the pragmatism of implementation.⁶⁷

It is easy to agree that there was an overall consistency in CCF philosophy and its implementation. One must disagree, however, that such a philosophy was socialist. As another scholar has pointed out:

It becomes apparent from party documents that despite the many differences of opinion within the Saskatchewan CCF there was a relatively consistent thread of philosophy in its policies and programs. It consisted of a passionate belief in the common man: in his ability and his right to govern himself, his right to the dignity and self-assurance to which all men are born, his right to the kind of economic and social security which the CCF believed to be essential to self-realization. Around this core of belief one found on the fringes smatterings of the theories of Henry Wise Wood, tinges of Marxist theory and other elements of the heritage of the CCF. But the main body of theory came from the 19th century idealists, influenced to some considerable degree by the Fabian Society and the British Labor Party.⁶⁸

Such a philosophy was typical of the social democratic reformist tradition which found its expression in the twentieth-century welfare state. Such was the essence of Lloyd's idealism and his consequent rejection of the more precise socialism of the 1943 policy document on education and of the adult education theories of Watson Thomson. Both assumed that education and the school could be instruments in the destruction of capitalism and the creation of socialist society. Lloyd made no such revolutionary assumption and was content to allow schools in Saskatchewan to operate as full-fledged institutional participants in a slightly-modified capitalist social order.

In doing so, he fell into the trap, predicted in a small town Saskatchewan newspaper ten years before, of strengthening capitalism by making it more humane and therefore more acceptable.

The CCF program of action calls for nothing else but repairs to capitalism. . . . It is pointless to answer that there is a difference between the CCF's immediate action and the ultimate goal. Its proposed repairs to capitalism are not steps to socialism if that's what it wants. They are steps in the opposite direction, steps towards making capitalism more efficient and more satisfactory to the public.⁶⁹

That Lloyd was party to the legitimation of capitalism through his educational policies becomes clearer when one evaluates his emphasis on co-operation as a goal of the individual, the school and the community. To some historical critics of such an educational philosophy, the ideology of co-operation, by opposing class confrontation and by encouraging a smoothly functioning economic order, was an essential element in the operation of monopoly capitalism.

Molding the psychology of the mass of individuals to the co-operative principle was a particularly important task for the functioning and survival of the division of labor. That goal was to be developed by correct methods of rule by the state. The state institution given a weighty responsibility in this task was the educational system. Ideological training was crucial for the owners of the means of production. The very survival of monopoly capitalism depended upon a wage-laborer who placed the co-operative principle above individual or class interests. In the final analysis, "co-operation" was a principle expressly in the interests of monopoly capitalist production.⁷⁰

The unchecked expansion of such capitalist production into Saskatchewan between World War II and the present and the acquiescence of both schools and "socialist" governments in that expansion seems proof that the function of the school as ideological legitimator of what has now become monopoly capitalism has not been seriously challenged by CCF education policies.

Notes

¹See especially, J. W. Bennet and C. Krueger, "Agrarian Pragmatism and Radical Politics," in S. M. Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism*, (New York: Doubleday, 1968), pp. 347-363; P. Sinclair, "The Saskatchewan CCF: Ascent to Power and the Decline of Socialism," *Canadian Historical Review*, 54 (Dec. 1973): 419-433; D. Spafford, "The 'Left Wing' 1921-1931," in N. Ward and D. Spafford (eds.) *Politics in Saskatchewan*, (Don Mills: Longmans, 1968), pp. 44-58.

²W. D. Young, *The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF 1932-1961*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), pp. 33-34. Italics mine.

³See especially E. Eager, "The Conservatism of the Saskatchewan Electorate" in Ward and Spafford, pp. 1-19.

⁴A. W. Johnson, "Biography of a Government: Policy Formulation in Saskatchewan 1944-1961," (Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1963), p. 75.

⁵"Saskatchewan CCF Policy on Education," 943, p. 1, Lloyd Papers, Saskatchewan Archives Board (Regina), hereafter SAB.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 1-2.

¹¹Ibid., p. 2.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Memorandum from Carlyle King to the author, Nov. 3, 1975.

¹⁶Jan. 12, 1944.

¹⁷King memorandum, Nov. 3, 1975.

¹⁸"Education and Democratic Rights," *Saskatchewan Commonwealth*, May 17, 1944, SAB.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Lloyd's attempt to balance his view that schools should prepare the young for co-operative living and society's view that schools should be neutral and not take "political" positions was clearly revealed in this statement to a conference on co-operative education (Oct. 4, 1944):

It was not the intention [of the Department of Education] to insert extensive and intensive courses on co-operation into the school curricula to the disregard of other ways of doing business. . . . The aim was to make our education more practical, more useful, more closely connected with actual life and since so much business was being done by co-operatives, it appeared desirable that students should understand what was meant by the co-operative way of doing business It was definitely not the intention to indoctrinate. (Lloyd Papers, SAB)

²⁶R. M. Sherdahl, "The Saskatchewan General Election of 1944," (Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1966), p. 82.

²⁷"Education Policy of CCF Party Flayed by Staines," *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, n.d., Lloyd Papers, SAB.

²⁸*The Prairie Optimist* (Gravelbourg), Jan. 12, 1939, Lloyd Papers, SAB.

²⁹Moose Jaw *Times-Herald*, June 5, 1944, as quoted in Sherdahl, "The Saskatchewan General Election," p. 96.

³⁰W. S. Lloyd, "A Practical Response to the Problem of Selection," Speech to the Annual Meeting of the North West Philosophy of Education Society, 1966, p. 5. Lloyd Papers, SAB.

³¹W. S. Lloyd, Speech to Canadian Teachers' Federation, Montreal, May 9, 1971, Lloyd Papers, SAB.

³²C. B. Koester (ed.), *The Making of the Man: Selected Speeches of Woodrow Stanley Lloyd*, (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1976), p. 60.

³³W. S. Lloyd, Radio Speech, Nov. 7, 1944, CKCK Regina, Lloyd Papers, SAE.

³⁴Speech to the North West Philosophy of Education Society.

³⁵Koester, *Selected Speeches*, p. 61.

³⁶Ibid., p. 66. (Italics mine).

³⁷W. S. Lloyd, Speech to the Teachers of Wapella, 1945, p. 7, Lloyd Papers, SAB.

- ³⁸Koester, *Selected Speeches*, p. 57.
- ³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 58.
- ⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 59.
- ⁴¹"A Weekly Presentation of Important Measures Implemented by the CCF Government of Saskatchewan from the Time it Took Office Until the Present," *CCF Action*, Jan. 1949, p. 1, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁴²*Ibid.*
- ⁴³W. S. Lloyd, Radio Broadcast, n.d., Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁴⁴W. S. Lloyd to T. C. Douglas, May 10, 1950, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁴⁵W. S. Lloyd to Dorothy G. Steeves, Chairman CCF Research Committee, Vancouver, Jan. 11, 1954, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁴⁶*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷*Saskatchewan Commonwealth*, Nov. 29, 1944, p. 1, SAB.
- ⁴⁸"Education for Practical Living," radio address by W. S. Lloyd, *Saskatchewan Commonwealth*, Feb. 6, 1946, p. 21, SAB.
- ⁴⁹*Ibid.*
- ⁵⁰W. S. Lloyd, "Locating the Needs of High School Pupils," n.d., p. 1, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁵¹The average teacher's salary at the time was approximately \$780 p.a.
- ⁵²W. S. Lloyd to R. B. Evans, Country Organization Department, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Aug. 1, 1945, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁵³Information on the structure and functions of the Department of Education at this time is from A. McCallum, *Brief of the Department of Education to the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, 1953*, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁵⁴W. S. Lloyd to M. C. Schumiatcher, Dec. 9, 1946, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁵⁵W. S. Lloyd to M. C. Schumiatcher, Dec. 12, 1947, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁵⁶"Socialism with Freedom," Study Document V, n.d., p. 22, CCF Papers, Public Archives of Canada. (Italics mine.)
- ⁵⁷W. Thomson, "The Nature of the New Revolution," n.d., p. 1. Watson Thomson Papers, Special Collections, University of British Columbia Library.
- ⁵⁸*Ibid.*
- ⁵⁹*Ibid.*
- ⁶⁰*Ibid.*
- ⁶¹*Ibid.*
- ⁶²W. Thomson, "Letter to Prairie School for Social Advance Contacts (Proposed)," n.d., Watson Thomson Papers, Special Collections, UBC Library.
- ⁶³W. Thomson, "Knowledge is Power," Adult Education Pamphlet, Regina, 1945, Watson Thomson Papers, Special Collections, UBC Library.
- ⁶⁴W. S. Lloyd to F. Hart, Jan. 22, 1946, Lloyd Papers, SAB.
- ⁶⁵*Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶The following quotations are from a New Year's letter written by Thomson for his close friends, Dec. 31, 1945, Watson Thomson Papers, Special Collections, UBC Library.
- ⁶⁷M. Brownstone, "The Douglas-Lloyd Governments: Innovations and Bureaucratic Adaptation," in L. LaPierre (ed.), *Essays on the Left*, (Toronto, 1971), pp. 66-67.
- ⁶⁸Johnson, *Biography of a Government*, p. 124.
- ⁶⁹Melville *Canadian*, Aug. 8, 1934. Quoted in Sinclair, "The Saskatchewan CCF: Ascent to Power and the Decline of Socialism," p. 425.

⁷⁰G. Gonzalez, "The Relationship Between Monopoly Capitalism and Progressive Education," *The Insurgent Sociologist*, Fall, 1977, p. 33.