**Selina Todd, University of Oxford**

**What would a transformative economy look like?**

One that aims for equality for all rather than simply narrowing inequality, or aiming for ‘social mobility’ for the few. This should be Labour’s narrative going forward.

What can we learn from the post-1945 welfare state?

* Important to take risks based on research – the postwar Labour Government did not know whether a welfare state would work in practice (no one had done it before), but based reforms on research not only by William Beveridge but by trade unions, socialist societies and feminists.
* Education stressed ‘social mobility’ for the ‘brightest’ children. In fact, quickly proven that intelligence is developmental, not fixed at birth or by age eleven or sixteen. Better to provide a wide-ranging education for all.
* The generation born in the 1940s *did* do better economically than their parents. This was due to the huge expansion in work, and the revaluing of some forms of work (especially welfare state professions such as nursing and teaching), which we can do again. This was collective uplift, rather than individualised social mobility.

But the future must be better than the past. First steps towards doing this include:

* Make a migrant lone mother our yardstick against whom we judge progress. The 1945 welfare state centred on the needs of the male manual worker and breadwinner. Much of our economic and social policy is based on the idea that families headed by a chief male breadwinner are the norm. This isn’t the case, and by creating a state that works for the most needy – including migrants and lone mothers - we’ll create a society that works for all of us.
* Establishing a National Education Service dedicated to helping people realise their potential, not only vocationally (because vocational skills can become obsolete very quickly) but as critical learners, able to innovate, use their imagination and creativity (these skills tend to be very important in periods of economic and political transformation as workplaces and societies need to change and adapt).
* Re-value all forms of work and reward socially useful work. Why are caring jobs often paid so much less than professionals in the financial services sector, for example? It isn’t good enough to suggest we will narrow this pay gap, or to suggest a few ‘talented’ people will ‘rise’ to become bankers or corporate lawyers. To transform society we need to prioritise taking care of each other and reward those who do so appropriately.
* Create an integrated workforce with job mobility, not mobile workers. At present, the need for workers to adapt to employers’ needs (e.g. through zero hours contracts) is over-emphasised. And while many people do change occupations mid-life, very few people ‘rise’ into the professions after their twenties. There is still a huge class gap between those who enter the professions and those who enter low-paid service sector work. As well as transforming our education sector to ensure people can receive training and education through their life course, let’s also make it possible for people to move between occupational sectors more easily, both for their own fulfilment and for the benefit of society. For example, if we are going to re-nationalise the Post Office, it would make sense for some Post Office workers to be seconded to senior levels of the Civil Service, and for some senior Civil Servants to spend some time working in the Post Office (a suggestion first made by Tony Benn, as Postmaster General, in the 1960s). If a train driver wants to become a doctor, or vice versa, this should be possible. And those undertaking high-pressure jobs like care assistants, teaching assistants and teachers should be able to take regular sabbaticals to undertake further study or to change direction so that they don’t burn out.