Holistic Education Review

Volume 8, Number 2 Summer 1995

Table of Contents

Special Issue: Multicultural Education

Cover design by Stephen K. Sagarin and Anything Graphic.
Cover image by Stephen Keith Sagarin © 1995.

Holistic Education Review is an independent journal that aims to stimulate discussion and application of all person-centered educational ideas and methods. Manuscripts (an original and three copies) should be submitted to the Editor, Jeffrey Kane, School of Education, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY 11530, typed double-spaced throughout with ample margins. Since a double blind review process is used, no indications of the author's identity should be included within the text after the title page. All manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the author-date (Documentation Two) format as described in chapter 16 of the 14th edition (1993) of the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Holistic Education Review (ISSN 0898-0926) is published quarterly in March, June, September, and December by Holistic Education Press, P.O. Box 328, Brandon, VT 05733-0328. 800-639-4122. E-mail: holisticed@vt.ngs.net. Annual subscription rates are $35 for individuals and $65 for libraries and other multi-user environments. (Foreign subscribers, please add $9 to above rates.) Back issues are available at $10 per copy. Second-class postage is paid at Brandon, VT, and at additional offices.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to **Holistic Education Review**. Box 328, Brandon, VT 05733-0328.

Editorial

On Understanding Multiculturalism

Recently I visited a school in suburban New Jersey, approximately ten miles from New York City. The classrooms were filled with children from all over the globe. Seated next to each other were children from Pakistan, Mexico, from the former Soviet Union and Korea, from Africa and Ireland. Some of them were the first of their families born in America and others were members of families here for generations. Some of the families had come in search of political freedom, some in search of economic plenty, and others without desire or consent, simply, in chains.

And so it is, that American cultural history makes its way into the present. These are the children of the slave trade and of the American dream. These are the children of economic despair and the promise of democracy. Political, economic, and racial factors have brought their families to this suburban school district. As the day began, the children, with their varied cultural roots, looked to their teachers to guide them in learning about themselves and the world.

When standing amidst these children, I was immediately faced with the question of how to address their needs as children and cultural diversity. Certainly, it would not be sufficient to create an international foods day nor to include a few stories on people and events from minority cultures. The meaning of a culture to one of its members is not to be found in distinctive foods, histories, technologies, arts, customs, or belief systems. These may identify culture but do not, as objects, reveal how a culture shapes the way individuals learn to live in and interpret the world.

There is a vast difference between learning about a culture and learning *through* one. In the first instance, a culture is associated with a variety of physical and intellectual artifacts. In the second instance, a culture offers the students new perspectives and modes of interpreting virtually every aspect of human experience.

The distinction between the two is often difficult to make particularly with regard to the study of belief systems. I am reminded of a story of the college professor who explained to his class that the Ancient Egyptians placed boats, honey, and jewels beside deceased Pharaohs. The boats were to help their souls travel to the spiritual world; the honey was to provide them with sustenance on their journey, and the jewels were to enable them to purchase or trade for whatever they needed upon their arrival.

A student asked, "Did they actually believe the Pharaohs would get in the boats and eat the honey and barter with the jewels?" The professor responded, "Yes, the deceased Pharaohs will indeed perform such actions when our dead get up and smell the flowers we leave by their graves!"

Often, studies in school are marked by a detachment, a distance between the observer and the observed, between the knower and the known. Consequently, as noted above, learners tend to apply a limited set of assumptions and modes of analysis to understanding others' beliefs, values, and actions. If, conversely, we were to study other cultures through a process of engagement — an imaginative effort to contemplate a statement of belief as it is *spoken* rather than as it is heard — we may be able to enhance and extend the scope of a student's capacity to understand him/herself and the world. This is not to argue for cultural relativism but to suggest that an engaged study of another culture may offer students insights and perspectives that might not otherwise be available to them.

An engaged study of culture does not mean to role-play it or "try it on." Acting as if we were members of other cultures may exacerbate cultural stereotypes without effectively shifting the culture from its epistemological position as a "thing" being studied. We need to look more deeply into the nature and meaning of culture in the everyday lives of children.

In a more immediate context, the children in the suburban school I visited had already begun to define themselves in terms of their culture. They knew something of the distinction of their family heritage and customs that differentiated them from others and identified them as members of a group. They had already assimilated many of the root metaphors of their culture — metaphors that generate the fundamental instrumental definitions of human being, the world, and the place of human beings in the world.

These metaphors are themselves often tacit and acquired informally through participation in the life

of a culture. They are not abstractions; they are not ideas in one's head. They are channels through which interactions with the world are initiated and through which they are interpreted.

Given these contexts, I offer the following thoughts about multicultural education and the more general topic of how to encourage unity across the diversity of cultures:

1. Children acquire cultural metaphors not through studying them or learning about them but through using them in their interactions with their environment — as they interact physically with their parents and others; as they explore a social and physical environment through play; as they are taught to relate to their own bodies and impulses; as they assimilate the foundations of language; as they are given opportunity to express themselves through movement, artistic interpretation, language, and social behavior.

The meaning of a culture is not to be found in distinctive foods, histories, technologies, arts, customs, or belief systems; they do not reveal how a culture shapes the way individuals learn to live in and interpret the world.

When my first son, Gabriel, was quite young, I regularly tossed him into the air, pretended to run a few errands, and returned to catch him. When my daughter, Emily, came along, I held her close, protected. Quite unconsciously I provided each of my first two children with a formative context for experiencing their own bodies, for generating their own movements, and for interacting physically with others. While I am not certain of the importance of the physical maturational differences between males and females in toddlers, I am certain that my actions with my children gave shape and direction to their continued development, particularly with respect to gender roles and definitions.

By way of a second illustration, consider the fact that the average American child sees about 6,000 hours of television before he or she enters the first grade. That's approximately 20% of his or her waking life. During this time, children are learning to process information visually rather than through physical interaction with the environment or through language. They are learning "one directional" social skills where they may seek whatever they please without concern for the needs or interests of others. In essence, as children watch television, they develop a passive, detached, and self-serving mode of interacting with the world. The viewing of television is less significant in terms of content than it is in terms of shaping children's attitudes, dispositions, and capacities as they grow. The experience of viewing television plays a significant role in establishing the metaphors children use in interpreting the world and interacting socially with others.

2. These illustrations also introduce the idea that culture is a complex, deceptively subtle element in human experience. Children do not merely have a racial or ethnic heritage but participate in multiple cultures. These multiple cultures are subtle and powerful; they tacitly shape the way we think beyond what they say and even the meaning of their bodily characteristics beyond formalized custom and dress. They are pervasive in the course of daily life rather than as explicit actions, values, or beliefs. They are inculcated through television, the music industry, sports, franchised food, videos, computers, schools, streets, churches, local communities, and the home.

Each of us, as individuals, is a product of multiple cultures — enhancing or conflicting among themselves. Multiculturalism is a psychosocial fact of life. The name "Madonna" may have two very different meanings for a single individual, each of these meanings being embedded in a uniquely configured cultured universe. This is not to suggest that such multiculturalism is sufficient to meet the aims of a multicultural educator but rather that the cultural contexts within which we operate transcend definitions of culture associated with people of distinctive histories, religions, customs, modes of dress, foods, and the like.

The second illustration referring to the ubiquitous television also points out how cultures around the globe are being homogenized. Advances in technology and changes in the global economic marketplace are creating a homogeneous cultural mix of fast foods and rock music along an information superhighway past borders once closed by political power and tariffs. Now, information, products, and services are speeding their way around the world. With each hamburger and each bit of information, the international corporate world offers a taste of a culture grounded in consumerism and predicated on the

reduction of local cultural characteristics that might otherwise include production and consumption. Just as most children entering American schools embody multiple cultures, so the variety of "traditional" cultures in the world is being diminished by economic and technological forces. (Benjamin Barber insightfully describes this phenomena, along with the reactionary movement to cultural fundamentalism, or "tribalism," in his March 1992 *Atlantic Monthly* article, "Jihad vs. McWorld." In this context, multiculturalists run the risk of confusing the study of cultural anachronism with responsive educational initiative.

3. All cultures have their own epistemologies, in some cases more pronounced than others. Each culture applies its own weights and values to various modes of understanding. Some stress logic and reason, others value poetic inspiration; some center on disciplined meditation and others grasp at simple utility; some emphasize the leading role of the intuition and others the cutting edge of the intellect. Given the value placed on reason and intellect in the modern West, it is difficult to imagine a radically different epistemology of values. One example may be found in the Jewish "Midrash" tradition.

This tradition is concerned with the meaning contained within the spaces between letters and words. When we write a letter in English or Hebrew, we think of a black set of lines on a white background. In Midrash the concern is not for the black lines but for the open spaces between them which carries its own unique meaning. Thus, there are two ways of understanding the biblical text.

In the way most familiar to us we may read the story of how Abraham is visited by three men and how he gets a calf to slaughter for dinner. According to Midrash, however, as Abraham chases a calf he finds his way into a cave where he sees the bodies of Adam and Eve. As he peers more deeply into the cave he sees a pinhole of light emanating from the Garden of Eden. The biblical text does not in any way describe Abraham's search for the calf and there is certainly no indication in the explicit text given that Abraham makes such profound discoveries.

In the Midrash tradition, the story of Abraham's adventure comes out of a dreamlike consciousness found between the letters of the biblical text. This dream consciousness has its place in the text just as dream consciousness has its place for us between our days of wakefulness. Midrash is believed to offer unique insights into the human psyche and human evolution that might not otherwise be available to waking consciousness. While such a contention may seem difficult to accept, think of the importance of dreams since the days of Freud. The imagery of dreams did not represent the physical world as such but the inner workings of human psyche. Similarly, Midrash tradition attempts to understand the human condition not through logic or reason but through imaginative images flowing directly from higher levels of spiritual existence.

4. Each culture offers a unique and incomplete spectrum of metaphors for understanding ourselves and the world around us. As such, they enable us to encounter the world and ourselves only partially. Although each culture provides a generative context for creating our individuality and identifying ourselves, it also limits the spectrum of light available to us.

Viewed in this fashion, multicultural educators cannot confine themselves to studies of lands and peoples. The educational question ought to be how to integrate the root metaphors into the process of learning. Thus, if a child studies a culture, he not only learns about it but learns to see the world through a widened spectrum of root metaphors. When studying a culture, certainly one ought to learn about its particulars, but more fundamentally one ought to see the world and him- or herself through it.

Each of the children in that suburban New Jersey classroom was shaped by a multiplicity of cultures, and each of the children learned to interact with the world through a chaotic matrix of assumptions inculcated by each of these cultures. If we are to address them collectively, we should account for the actual cultural forces that shape their lives. Lessons on the customs and history of different ethnic racial groups will not suffice either to respond to the realities that play into a child's life or to reveal new dimensions of him or herself or the world.

If we are to address these cultures collectively, we need to find ways of integrating their various modes of knowing, of interacting, of dwelling in the world in a manner consistent with the children's development. Through the incorporation of the insights, perspectives, and enhanced capacities for understanding offered through multiple cultures, children may be engaged in learning through various cultures, not only to value diversity but to perceive the universal struggle for meaning and identity.

— Jeffrey Kane, Editor

Responding to the Challenges of Diversity

Domination, Resistance, and Education

Rob Koegel

By addressing how our society converts social difference into relations of domination and subordination, educators can help students resist injustice and imagine more humane alternatives.

Rob Koegel holds a Ph.D. in sociology and is a professor of sociology the the State University of New York at Farmingdale. He has had a longstanding interest in promoting multicultural education, applying feminism to his life and teaching, and creating an equitable society in which partnership prevails and diversity is valued. Reprint requests should be sent to the author at the Sociology Department, College of Technology, SUNY Farmingdale, Farmingdale, NY 11735.

Despite personal and pedagogical differences, holistic educators want to nourish the minds, open the hearts, and enhance the humanity of our students. The reason we became and remain educators is that we care about students. Perhaps this is why it is so painful to acknowledge that the engagement of difference in the United States violates the intellectual, emotional, sexual, and spiritual growth of many students. Nevertheless, educators who view teaching, healing, and social change as inseparable need to understand the social forces that diminish *humane* social relations.

In a complex society, social difference can bring us together or estrange and divide us. That is, a society can turn human difference into a valued resource or into a source of privilege for some and oppression for others. In this paper, I will describe how our society converts social differences into relations of domination and subordination that generate suffering, resistance, and conflict. Many educators and theorists who address *social differences* (such as identity, values, and cultural practices) ignore the structural dimensions of *social dominance* (such as racism, sexism, and homophobia). Rather than concentrating on particular structures such as race, gender, and class, I will use Riane Eisler's (1987) and Eisler and Loye's (1990) work on "domination" and "partnership" to discuss the underlying pattern that these inequitable social relations share. I will then show how some educators have applied this analysis of power relations in different classroom settings. Finally, I will explore some external and internal challenges that educators who focus on domination, resistance, and the possibilities of partnership often encounter.

The devaluation of difference

In the past few decades, many theorists have suggested that human relations and social organizations can be arranged in one of two basic ways.[1] One is built on force-backed, fear-based, authoritarian hierarchies maintained by the subordination of some groups by others. The second is based on collaborative connections that give rise to more reciprocal, caring, and humane social relations. Although both modes of organization always coexist, one predominates in a given society. Recently, Riane Eisler's (1987, 1990, 1995) analysis of "dominator" and "partnership" models of social relations has advanced two key points: First, societies with more authoritarian, unequal, and hierarchical arrangements tend to repress diversity. Second, societies with more caring, cooperative, and symmetrical arrangements tend to affirm diversity.[2] Although Eisler reminds us that the differences between these two models are a matter of degree and emphasis, she lists the main differences between the dominator and partnership models. Table 1 is adapted from Eisler and Loye's *The Partnership Way* (1990, 183).

Table 1.
Dominator and Partnership Models

Dominator Model	Partnership Model
Ranking	Linking
Rejection of diversity	Celebration of diversity
Power over	Power to/with
One-sided benefit	Mutual benefit
Coercion	Participation
Control	Nurture
Manipulation	Open communication
Intimidation	Support
Violence against others	Empathy with others
Sadomasochism	Mutual pleasure
Structural zero-sum competition	Structural empathic competition
Win/lose orientation	Win/win orientation
Fear	Trust
Rigid conformity	Flexible creativity
Indoctrination	Education

Given our reputation for egalitarian ideals, many Americans assume that the United States promotes mutual and respectful social relations. This assumption is not unfounded: Americans not only *speak* about the inherent value, dignity, and equality of all people, we also *care* about people. Nevertheless, the institutions of this nation generate ways of being and relating that have more in common with the dominator model than the partnership model.[3]

The hierarchical institutional structures that shape our lives divide Americans into groups with varying amounts of power and immense — what some call "savage" — inequalities (Kozol 1991). For example, in 1989, the top 1% of American families owned more than a third of the nation's private wealth, the wealthiest 20% of Americans owned 79% of the nation's private wealth, while the "poorest" 50% owned less than 3½% of this nation's wealth (Sklar 1995, 121; Mantsios 1995, 133). From cradle to grave, our class standing shapes our chances for survival, our access to valued resources, and the quality of our lives.[4]

These massive inequalities are part of a larger social pattern characterized by the cultural and institutionalized rejection of difference. This social pattern not only creates subordinate groups, it also encourages Americans to view these groups as inferior. As Eisler notes, "the cultural and linguistic assumptions inherent in a dominator paradigm insist that "human relations must fit into some kind of superior–inferior pecking order" (Eisler 1987, 27).[5] Rather than drawing us together as mutually valued "partners in a living event" (Buber 1966, 15), this "superior–inferior pecking order" alienates and antagonizes people. Kivel's "Power Chart" (See Table 2 on following page) helps us see how American society is stratified into more and less powerful groups that shape many of our daily interactions.

Despite their considerable differences, each category on the power chart shares several characteristics: One group has more power, resources, and status *at the expense of* the less powerful group (for example, men over women).[6] Members of the less powerful groups are not only vulnerable to institutional discrimination as well as verbal, physical, and/or sexual abuse (Kivel 1992, 79), they are also forced to accept their subjugation.

Given the incessant pressure to comply, many subalterns submit to relations of domination. However, subordinate groups usually resent and sometimes resist unequal and demeaning relations.[7] Therefore, dominant groups must not only use personal and institutional coercion, intimidation, and violence to sustain their "unfair advantages" and "unearned privileges" (McIntosh 1988), they also rely on false information and the creation of "social blind spots" (Goleman 1985, 226).

The reproduction of specific kinds of ideas plays a vital role in maintaining all social systems. Our dominator society nourishes attitudes, perceptions, and

Table 2.
Power Chart (Adapted from Kivel 1992, 78)

Powerful Group	Less Powerful Group
Men	Women
Adults	Young people
Rich	Poor
Bosses	Workers
Teachers	Students
Whites	People of color
Christians	Jews, Moslems, Buddhists
Heterosexual	Gay, lesbian, bisexual
Formally educated	Not formally educated
Able-bodied	Physically challenged
Native-born	Immigrant
Normal	"Crazy"

behaviors that consciously and unconsciously support hierarchical "power-over" relations (Eisler 1987, 82–83). To the extent that it is successful, we are systematically misinformed about other people by the social philosophy, morality, science, history, jokes, stereotypes, etc., that surround us. Since, as Jean Baker Miller (1976) puts it, the dominant group "legitimizes the unequal relationship" by incorporating it into society's general cultural outlook,

> it then becomes "normal" to treat others destructively and to derogate them, to obscure the truth of what you are doing by creating false explanations, and to oppose actions toward equality. In short, if one's identification is with the dominant group, it is "normal" to continue in this pattern. Even though most of us do not like to think of ourselves as either believing in, or engaging in, such domination, it is, in fact, difficult for a member of a dominant group to do otherwise. But to keep on doing these things, one need only behave "normally." (p. 8)

For example, most of my undergraduate students believe that heterosexuality is "normal" and that it is "natural" and just to deny gays and lesbians the *rights* that heterosexuals take for granted. As long as they believe this, they will support heterosexual "privileges," such as being able to find neighborhoods where people approve of their household, having the "right" to speak of social events they attend without worrying about how listeners will respond, being accepted, and feeling "normal" in school, at work, etc.[8]

If it is "normal" for people in America to view others through *cultural* blinders, isn't it mistaken to view prejudice as the result of *individual* ignorance? If our consciousness is shaped by the ideas and social practices around us, isn't it more appropriate to speak of prejudice as *socialized* ignorance? As Michael Lerner's concept of the "social unconscious" suggests, much of social life is shaped by "shared meanings that most people assume in their daily interactions with others of which they are not aware and which they would resist knowing should they be pointed out" (1986, 12). Therefore, prejudice is not due to individual ignorance, nor are prejudiced beliefs exceptions to an unbiased norm. On the contrary, they result from the dominator norms generated by our social arrangements and the systematic "layers of denial" that support them (Eisler 1987; McIntosh 1988).

Most people can locate themselves on both sides of the power chart. We have not only had the chance to overpower and/or abuse others, we have also been subjected to the force and/or abuse of those who have "power over" us. In this sense, most people have experienced the intense fear and damage that the powerless can and often do suffer. Since we have experienced this ourselves, isn't it therefore logical to expect that we would be caring and respectful when relating to less powerful people? Unfortunately, this sensitivity is often undermined by the *dominator* logic promoted by our institutions and supported by our culture. Paul Kivel captures this logic well when he notes that "We are trained to pass on our hurt and pain to those around us. We learn how to move out of powerlessness by relating to people who are less powerful" (1992, 82). As a teenage male student of mine observed, "When you are repeatedly subject to relations of domination at home, in school, and at work, it seems as though the only way to feel better is to 'dish it out.' " People who cannot imagine an alternative to dominator modes of relating repeatedly reproduce this pattern of social interaction.

It is, of course, crucial to remember that we are "trained" and conditioned, not programmed and brainwashed. That is, our dominator "training" is incomplete, inconsistent, and can be *resisted*. This is why I frequently use the words "tend," "influence, "often," and "most." Although I want to stress that structural forces and social pressures influence our lives, I also wish to underscore that social structures never fully "determine" how we act or who we become. As a former student of mine suggested, nearly all social circumstances have some "wiggle-room," though we often do not perceive it. In fact, one of the reasons that people accept oppressive constraints is that we cannot imagine any alternatives to them. It is therefore important to focus not only on

the causes of oppression, but on more humane alternatives to it. Consequently, we cannot understand the impact of dominator modes of relating unless we also focus on the existence of partnership modes of relating. As Eisler continuously reminds us, both modes of interactions are always present (1987). Thus, we not only can imagine more partnership-oriented alternatives, we can also experience them. This is fortunate, for our social arrangements tend to generate dominator modes of relating far more than partnership modes of interaction.[9]

Our society converts social differences into relations of domination and subordination that generate suffering, resistance, and conflict.

Every society provides different mechanisms for people to deal with pain, fear, and insecurity. Our society tends to teach people that dominating others is not only the most potent aphrodisiac but the ultimate painkiller. Indeed, the mass media literally bombards us with endless variations on one theme: "you can deny pain by the experience of power" (hooks 1993, 141). People who cannot envision a more satisfying alternative find the seductive promise of the dominator model hard to resist. For example, in the middle of a charged conversation about male domination, an African-American student admitted, "You know how much I've been hurt by racism." But, he insisted, "This is why I try to dominate women in intimate relations: I don't know of any other way of feeling strong after being degraded or of healing myself after I've been wounded."

It is a small step from denying pain by the "experience of power" to preventing pain by the coercive and even damaging use of power. Sadly, the "mean world syndrome" (Prothrow-Stith 1992, 46) nourished by the incessant danger, violence, and distrust depicted by television, movies, etc., leads many Americans to assume the Golden Rule means "do unto others before they do unto you." It is another small step to derive pleasure from the infliction of pain if, but not necessarily when, others resist our needs or thwart our goals.[10] And, it takes but one last step to accept the pain we experience when cast in a subordinate position as the price we must pay to dominate less powerful people. Rather than being limited to specific groups, this cultural dynamic transcends race, class, sex, or sexual preference (Chancer 1992, 10). Despite the biblical injunction to "turn the other cheek," our culture makes Americans more likely to turn oppression *from* others into oppression *of* others. As long as we remain invested in dominator modes of relating, we almost certainly will.

As social differences become converted into dominance and subordination, the very notion of difference becomes equated with better and worse (compare the unequal status of the different groups listed in Table 2). This widespread perception is reinforced by the ethos of our dominator culture, which tends to suggest that there are two types of people: winners and losers (Kohn 1986).[11] The American social creed insists that "losers" of the "competitive race" have no one to blame but themselves. This assumption makes it hard to accept that Americans who have little wealth, power, and status are as worthy as those who have more. Our cultural values not only make many people in institutionally subordinate groups feel inadequate (see the less powerful groups listed in Table 2), even more "successful" and powerful Americans are often plagued with self-doubt (Sennett and Cobb 1973). Sadly, many Americans believe that we cannot feel whole unless we are better than others. Is this one of the reasons that we often try to shore up our shaky sense of self-worth by putting down or finding fault with others?

If our unequal system of ranking makes it difficult to value and respect human differences, zero-sum structural competition turns life into a series of win/lose contests that damage relationships and undermine community. Social arrangements built on this type of competition produce what Kohn (1986, 4) calls "mutually exclusive goal attainment" (which means "my success requires your failure, and vice versa"). Not surprisingly, structural competition unleashes an "against-ing process" that frequently pits people against one another (Kohn 1990, 90). This structurally generated "against-ing process" is a crucial part of the dominator dynamics that shape our lives.

The social forces set in motion by dominator hierarchies and structural competition create a mutually reinforcing social dynamic. On the one hand, the authoritarian, power-over relations embedded in dominator hierarchies infuse dominance and subordination into all of social life. On the other hand, by turning people into rivals, the zero-sum nature of

structural competition breeds a win/lose orientation. The cumulative impact of this interlocking social patterning makes many people believe life only offers two choices: somehow develop the power needed to dominate others, or submit and become a loser. This belief is so pervasive that looking at one another through narrowed eyes becomes, sociologically speaking, expected. The appeal of Michael Korda's best-selling *Power: How To Get It, How To Use It* suggests that this view is as popular as it is narrow: "No matter who you are, the basic truth is that your interests are nobody else's concern, your gain is inevitably someone else's loss, your failure someone else's victory" (1975, 4). By constantly reinforcing what Abraham Maslow (1968) calls "deficit-motivations," competitive structures drive a wedge between people that "creates easily aroused envy toward the stronger ones, contempt for the weaker, and distrust toward everyone" (Karen Horney cited in Kohn 1986, 140). The fear of what will happen if we do not conform is another "deficit-motivation" generated by dominator hierarchies.

Key institutional structures condition Americans to equate power with imposition, intimidation, manipulation, and control (Kreisberg 1992). Most Americans assume that those with power often use force and fear to maintain their control and to achieve their purposes. This assumption is not mistaken. Perhaps this is why Americans are so fascinated with organized crime. "Organized crime presents the ultimate ultimatum — 'if you don't go along with this system, you're dead' — in an extreme and immediate form." Yet our cultural preoccupation with the horrors of organized crime "may blind us to the fears for our lives that we feel on a much more ongoing and daily basis. The crux of these fears is that if we do not conform, we will not survive" (Chancer 1992, 96–97). These fears are not unfounded.

Most children learn what we might call the first commandment of social life at an early age: Thou shalt not be different. The social process of fear conditioning tends to begin at the place where we are not only loved but vulnerable: in the family.[12] Schooling, as a high school student noted, tends to reinforce this lesson by teaching a second but related commandment: "It is safe to do what is expected, to be like everyone else" (Yen 1989). Students learn that success in life depends on the ability to conform to the roles and standards imposed by authorities and by peers. The authoritarian, hierarchical organization of most workplaces makes many workers feel they must "play the game" and conform to the system, no matter how arbitrary or unfair its rules may be. Indeed, many employees learn a third commandment: Directly questioning rules and confronting authorities is dangerous, even suicidal.[13] These interlocking pressures to conform are hard to defy — not only for those in the less powerful groups, but for people in more powerful groups as well (see Table 2).

Although the underlying message of these "commandments" is sometimes contradicted by the media, by religion, and by laws, it usually is not; indeed, a recurrent motif in our society is that difference is not a valued resource, but a social liability that makes one vulnerable and inferior. Most people experience more affirming responses to diversity in some part(s) of their lives. Still, the engagement of difference in America tends to lead to what Jean Baker Miller calls "great difficulty, deterioration, and distortion" (1976, 3).

How can educators respond?

The engagement of difference in our society makes an alarming number of students "at risk" of having their intellectual, emotional, sexual, and spiritual growth violated. How have most educators responded to these threats to our students' well-being? If the experience of the college students I teach is at all representative, the answer is *very little*. Nearly all of the teenage students in my sociology courses, and most of the graduate students in my education courses, agree on two key points: first, that students of all ages desperately need a safe place to explore the causes of domination, the potential of resistance, and the promise of partnership; and second, that this rarely occurs in the classroom.

There is no doubt that focusing on dominator modes of interaction is time-consuming and emotionally demanding. Nevertheless, the question still remains: Why don't more educators invite their students to focus on patterns of oppression? Several compelling reasons come to mind. It is no secret that most school settings provide little room and less support to explore the relation between privilege and oppression, power and powerlessness. Our schools and society place great stress on control, political neutrality, and high test scores. These intense pressures push many educators to engage in a "defensive teaching" that restricts critical dialogues and avoids controversial issues (McNeil 1986). The preservice and inservice training of most educators does not

enhance our ability to understand or respond to the inequities and injustices in our society (Liston and Zeichner 1991). Rather, the training of most educators tends to focus on technical rather than on social, moral, and political issues (Purpel 1989). Educators need organizational structures within the schools that empower rather than infantilize us.[14] As the Boston Women's Teachers' Group noted in "The Other End of the Corridor: The Effects of Teaching on Teachers," it is difficult for educators to expand the horizons of students when existing school structures undermine the very conditions necessary to do so (1983, 3).

Educators who strive to create a "pedagogy of liberation" (Shor and Freire 1987) usually encounter another powerful and often misunderstood obstacle: student resistance. Traditional classroom environments make many students distrust teachers, one another, and the possibility of active, meaningful learning (Shor 1992). Being force-fed academic knowledge that they have little control over and less interest in alienates and angers many students. Students often read about the importance of democracy, but they rarely experience it. The unfortunate result is that students often respond with what Ira Shor aptly refers to as a "performance-strike" (1992, 134). Student alienation often makes it difficult to create a learning community that nourishes resistance and hope.[15]

There is another less visible but equally powerful block. This obstacle exists within educators, in our fear of confronting the powerful forces that damage us and our students and of opening up emotionally volatile issues for discussion (Koegel 1993). It is painful to confront the powerful forces that damage us as well as our students. Perhaps this is why educators find it so hard to address students' suffering and why many of us are uncomfortable calling it oppression: Dealing with the "shadow" aspect of students' lives tends to stir up *our* painful and often buried experiences, thus unleashing despair, vulnerability, and outrage — what Sharon Welch (1985) calls "dangerous memories." Nevertheless, as the work of Alice Miller (1988) shows, it is imperative that children have at least one "enlightened witness" who honors and supports their efforts to come to terms with experiences that wounded them. In this sense, adults are no different than children: we need a supportive environment that encourages us to address our powerlessness, heal our wounds, and recover our possibilities.

Most educators (myself included) did not have the opportunity to explore the causes, consequences, and alternatives to oppression as children and students. Must we also deny our students this opportunity, or can we create the safety and support that educators and students need to move into risky terrain? Moving toward the edge of our own experience is difficult. We often pull back, for fear that we are giving up all control and will be hurt. But, as Daniel Kirkpatrick notes in his article on "Edgework for Educators," we can "begin by acknowledging that being at the edge is not only all right, it is an essential step toward making education relevant to our changing world" (1993, 127). Establishing a classroom climate that supports the risks involved in "edgework" is an "essential step" in creating a "pedagogy of hope" (Freire 1994). Focusing on patterns of domination and partnership as well as the possibilities of individual and collective resistance — what Kohl (1994) calls "creative maladjustment" — is another.[16]

Recently I taught a college course that invited adult students to explore the causes of, consequences of, and alternatives to social injustice.[17] Our class studied the "injustices" generated by racism, sexism, heterosexism, and "classism." Two learning activities nourished students' critical thinking and capacity to resist. The first was a journal of their intellectual, emotional, and practical responses to the domination and subordination they themselves experienced and/or witnessed. In ongoing journal entries, students analyzed the efficacy of their actions and imagined how they (and others) might have responded more effectively. Students also described how the partnership interactions they had felt (or saw), examined what made it possible, and explored how this model of relating could be extended. The second learning activity was that students designed a final project to promote justice in an area of deeply felt concern.

Initially anxious that they might not be able to detect many instances of injustice, one student expressed the feelings of the class when she said, "I rarely noticed injustice before. Now, I see it everywhere. It's painful to behold and even harder to confront." The process of responding to a strongly felt injustice was not only difficult; it was also exciting. One male student's investigation of sexual harassment of women led him to develop a series of related workshops for the police officers he supervised. Another white student's enhanced sensitivity to racism inspired her to develop support groups for

women of color at the social service agency she worked in. A student's examination of the patriarchal roots of Catholicism prompted her to confront her parish priest and to become involved in a more progressive church. A Puerto Rican student found the insights into exclusion of the video *A Class Divided: Blue Eyes, Brown Eyes* to be so moving that he showed it to several classes at the school where his wife taught. Many of the students described how the class changed their lives.

However, the class was by no means as together or successful as these examples might suggest. A few students did not complete their work. Several students initially dismissed many of the "injustices" as "the way things are." Some students did not want to look for injustices because they felt it was "depressing." Nearly everyone found that focusing on injustice and trying to resist it was threatening. Yet everyone seemed to be emotionally and intellectually moved by this class: it got "under their skin" and into their lives. My experience in this class, and in many others, has convinced me that educators can invite students to address social dynamics that generate domination, sustain resistance, and create partnership.[18]

But, some readers may respond, "you were teaching adults in a college. Is it possible, let alone desirable to focus on these issues with younger students?" I am convinced that it is.

Since the practice of exclusion pervades our classrooms, educators can focus on an issue that has tremendous meaning to children of all ages. In *You Can't Say You Can't Play*, Vivian Paley shows how classroom dynamics condition students to accept the morality of rejection and the inevitability of exclusion. By kindergarten, she claims, students must confront an exclusionary "structure" of rejection that is the prototype for all later rejections. This hierarchical structure divides students into a powerful "ruling class" and a group of "outsiders." While the former have "the right to judge others' acceptability" and to "limit the social experiences of their classmates," the latter learn to expect and accept the "sting of rejection" (1992, 3).

Paley did not try to "teach" outsiders how to make themselves more acceptable to the insiders. Instead, she worked to make the *group* more inclusive and her students better able to resist exclusion. As her kindergarten students passionately debated the merits and drawbacks of exclusion, Paley made up and told them stories of a magpie who rescues lonely children and takes them to a world where everyone is accepted for who they are. Paley used these stories to invite her students to recall and discuss the pain that rejection causes and to imagine life in a world ruled by acceptance. Paley also opened up a schoolwide dialogue by meeting with students from grades 1–6. As the older students described the lasting pain of past incidents of exclusion, they offered rich insights into its causes and effects. After one fifth grade student noted that most children become "meaner" as they grow older, another responded by saying, "People can be trained to be nice or to fight" (1992, 100).

One student expressed the feeling of the class when she said, I rarely noticed injustice before. Now I see it everywhere. It's painful to behold and even harder to confront.

Paley agreed. This is why she posted a new rule on the wall that informed students that "You Can't Say You Can't Play." This new rule did not stop exclusionary practices from developing, nor did it magically eliminate the intense resistance that some students exhibited. Rather, it provided two key resources: first, a "useful perspective" to view painful interactions within the classroom; and second, an accessible framework for responding to and diminishing these hurtful practices.[19] Paley recalls that when she "came upon the biblical passage 'the stranger that sojourneth with you should be unto you as the homeborn among you,' I knew not that the first place a stranger sojourneth in is the classroom." This convinced Paley that educators must confront exclusionary classroom dynamics: "We have our work cut out for us, in every grade, if we are to prepare our children to live and work comfortably with the stranger that sojourneth among them" (1992, 111, 114, 129).[20] We as educators also have "our work cut out for us" if we are to prepare students to understand how discrimination and institutional powerlessness affect adults and children and to develop more constructive ways of responding.

Lenore Gordon presented the idea of discrimination to her fifth and sixth grade students as something that hurts people because of their race, sex, class, etc. (1985, 5). The students she taught in a New

York City public school were struck by the degree to which racism, sexism, and classism can prevent adults from fulfilling their dreams; the powerlessness and humiliation workers regularly experienced at work; and adults' struggles to take pride in their work and to take control of their lives. Gordon's class read interviews from Studs Terkel's *Working* (1972) and Langston Hughes's poem "A Dream Deferred," did oral interviews of parents and community members, and did a content analysis of magazine depictions of women and people of color. These learning activities encouraged students to explore how "anger generated on the job is displaced from the powerful to the powerless," why powerless and/or oppressed people often unleash their rage on each other, and more effective ways of dealing with powerlessness (Gordon 1985, 6).

Gordon also asked students to make lists of people who are often discriminated against; the groups they mentioned typically included blacks, Latinos, women, gay people, and people with disabilities. After students gave examples of discrimination for each group, they examined why people in these groups often vent their anger on other powerless groups, on one another, or on themselves. The class then read an interview with a farmworker named Roberto Acuna. This interview enabled students to discuss how activism can turn the rage caused by racial and class oppression into personal and social change. Students also learned more about the "arts of resistance" (Scott 1990) by role-playing a scene in which a black domestic worker confronted a white employer about her racism. Finally, after examining the similarities between the institutional disempowerment of workers and children, Gordon's students imagined alternatives to "dumping" on others when angered or hurt by the powers-that-be in their lives (Gordon 1985, 4–6). Since her students often experienced discrimination as children, girls, and/or people of color, they were open to exploring diverse forms of oppression as well as creating nonoppressive behaviors.[21] As Gordon observed in another article, it is fortunate that educators can tap into children's sense of justice, because one form of oppression pervades most schools: homophobia (1992, 4).

Gordon suggests that homophobic name-calling is as widespread as it is damaging: it exists in all grades, is devastating to the millions of young people experiencing homosexual feelings or having gay or lesbian parents,[22] and pressures *all* children to conform to rigid sex-role behaviors. Gordon notes that because the subject of homosexuality is emotionally charged and controversial, many teachers are understandably reluctant to confront students who engage in homophobic name-calling. But since this name-calling is a form of oppression that is no different than other bigotry, Gordon believes that educators must respond to homophobia as much as possible: "Teachers have the right, indeed the obligation, to alert their students to all forms of oppression" (1992, 4).[23]

Drawing on her experience in elementary schools, Gordon offers several ways of addressing homophobia. Students can compare the stereotypical behaviors demanded by sex-role expectations with the more complex realities found in their families and/or communities. They can imagine how it feels to be a member of a group that is called a "name" as well as a group member that does the name-calling. Finally, educators can help students develop the personal resources they need to function independently when pressured to conform to arbitrary group norms.[24] We need to create forms of liberatory education that connect the will to know with the courage to resist and the confidence that change can occur.

"Children's hope," Bill Bigelow suggests, "is a fragile thing." This is why Bigelow tries to turn his history classes in an Oregon public high school into what he calls "communities of resistance and courage, hope and possibilities" (1991, 38, 43).[25] Like many educators, Bigelow wants every aspect of his classroom to enhance the learning and affirm the lives of *all* his students.[26] As a result, Bigelow is concerned that the traditional curriculum's focus on males and powerful elites gives young people a message that is as exclusionary as it is destructive: "Some of you are better than others, some of you are destined for bigger things" (1993, 19–20). Bigelow insists that it is imperative that educators work to counter — and transform — this alienating and divisive message. Bigelow's teaching addresses this issue in a number of ways. First, he works to enhance students' abilities to empathize with other people. In their article "Promoting Social Imagination Through Interior Monologues," Bigelow and Christensen describe how they invite students to try to imagine the feelings and thoughts of a character in history, literature, or life. As the conclusion of their article suggests, if "we want kids to think deeply about other people — why they do what they do, why they think what they think" — and "want students to care about each

other and the world," then inviting them to develop their "social imagination" is a good place to begin (1994, 110–11).[27]

Bigelow also teaches his students to "talk back" to history books, the media, and those aspects of our culture that misrepresent and/or ignore their lives: "For students, learning to recognize that those in power privilege the voices of the powerful over the powerless is a basic skill.... Working class children, children of color, young women — all students not born with silver spoons in their mouths — can begin to reclaim their own histories once they begin to look for what is missing as well as for what is there" (1991, 43).[28] Besides trying to nurture students' empathy and ability to "talk back" to history, Bigelow has a more analytical goal: to teach students to analyze the wealth and power inequities of our society, the complex ways that our society structures domination, and the historical roots of these developments.

Bigelow wants to present history in ways that make students feel more hopeful and powerful. By studying the rich legacy of movements for social justice, students learn a crucial lesson: that people can resist injustice, transform society, and influence history. Rather than glorifying violence, Bigelow's aim is to reveal the human capacity to fight for our rights against great odds. Bigelow not only *teaches* about past and present struggles for justice; he also brings people into the classroom whose words and deeds offer hope. However, Bigelow believes it is not enough to *study* resistance. Nor is it enough for students to *meet* people whose lives proclaim that "we can make a difference." Although it is important to study and meet people who have pushed against the grain of history, it is equally important that students "look at their own lives, so as to locate a personal 'legacy of defiance' from which to draw hope — and wisdom" (Bigelow 1991, 40–42).

This is why Bigelow asks students to recall, write about, and then share an incident in which *they* "stood up for what they felt was right." It could be a time when they confronted an individual who was committing an injustice or a time when they challenged an abusive authority. One aim of this group activity is to nurture a community of justice and courage by reminding students of their "legacy of defiance."

Besides celebrating resistance, Bigelow encourages students to evaluate it by taking notes on each other's stories during their group "read-arounds." Bigelow asks his students to focus on "1) What conditions allowed us to stand up for ourselves or others? 2) Was the resistance effective in rooting out the *causes* of injustice? and 3) How were we changed by our acts of defiance?" (1991, 43).

While most students grapple with the limitations of their actions, many leave class with an enhanced sense that they can make a difference. One student noted that most people fought alone, although it was more satisfying and effective when they resisted together. Another student learned that "you have to be the one who stops the pain." A third student expressed the feelings of the class when she said that students' resistance showed that they have "a power over their lives and [a] power to protect themselves" (Bigelow 1991, 43).

Bigelow's foremost concern is to involve students in activities that enhance their ability to build a more equitable and just society. This, he reminds us, means that students must do more than uncover injustice; they must also act on their insights. In this spirit, Bigelow asks students to develop a final project that "educates" people in the school or larger community (1991, 43). By creating rock videos, videotapes of local struggles, children's books, etc., and then presenting them *outside* the classroom, students not only "teach" others, they also learn "that the best way to address injustice is to work for change." By studying the social contexts that nourish hurtful behaviors, imagining more humane alternatives, and taking actions against injustice, many students learn an invaluable lesson: that discussion, cooperation, and resistance can enable us to change the world for the better.

There are many ways to create empowering, life-affirming forms of education that help students (and educators) resist injustice and imagine more humane social arrangements.

Paley, Gordon, and Bigelow do not explicitly use the partnership and dominator models in their work with students. However, despite the considerable differences between the age of their students and the issues they address, all of these educators focus on

six topics that Eisler and Loye (1990, 55) consider to be vital to a partnership education:

1. The degree to which we are constrained and conditioned by social forces shaped by the dominator model.

2. What these forces are and how they work on and within us.

3. Why we might want to develop more partnership in our lives, our society, and the world.

4. What this would look like and feel like.

5. What personal, relational, and institutional resistance we can anticipate.

6. How we might create new visions, pathways, and social supports to enhance the degree of partnership in our lives and in our society.

Conclusion

Nearly 20 years ago, Jean Baker Miller (1976) posed the following questions about human difference:

> What do people do to people who are different from them and why?... When does the engagement of difference stimulate the development and the enhancement of both parties to the engagement? And, conversely, when does such a confrontation with difference have negative effects: when does it lead to great difficulty, deterioration, and distortion, and to some of the worst forms of degradation, terror, and violence — both for individuals and groups — that human beings can experience? (p. 3)

To the extent that America does not have "a very glorious record in this regard" (Miller 1976, 3), educators need to understand oppressive social forces and foster more *humane* alternatives. My teaching experience in education departments suggests, however, that the training of educators rarely focuses on how America privileges some groups, devalues others, and represses diversity. Similarly, the growing literature on multicultural education typically examines the surface manifestations of culture but ignores problematic power relations (Sleeter and Grant 1988). In this sense, our training has not prepared most educators to address the intimate relationship between social difference and social dominance. Nor do most schools encourage us to explore how the lives of many students are shaped by relations and social structures that are more oriented toward domination than toward partnership. This is why the creation of new roles for educators requires *social* as well as *personal* change; we need to change not only our consciousness but our schools and society (Koegel 1993). Such changes are possible.

The recognition of our society's tendency to convert difference into relations of domination and subordination has led many educators to focus on what I call the problems of domination and the possibilities of partnership. I have found that the dominator and partnership models provide a rich lens that enables educators and students to address the interplay of partnership and domination in our lives, relations, and society. However, there are many ways to create empowering, life-affirming forms of education that help students (and educators) resist injustice and imagine more humane social arrangements. In fact, a vast literature offers several ways that educators can promote partnership ways of relating while encouraging students to resist dominator modes of social organization that hinder their highest potentials.[29] Those of us who want to can enhance our ability to educate for what bell hooks calls "the practice of freedom" by looking at what is being done and by innovating as we see fit (1994, 13). It may be difficult, but it is possible — and rewarding. As we engage in "rethinking our classrooms" and "rethinking our schools," we not only discover that "we make the road by walking" (Horton and Freire 1990), we also find that a pedagogy of liberation can and must be a pedagogy of hope. There is hope.

Notes

1. See Seth Kreisberg's *Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education* for a comprehensive review of different analyses of what he calls "power-over" and "power-with" modes of organization (1992, chaps. 2 and 3).

2. Riane Eisler published *The Chalice and the Blade* in 1987. This pioneering work challenges conventional understandings of what has been, is, and can be. *The Chalice and the Blade* and *The Partnership Way* (which Eisler wrote with David Loye, her partner in life and work) have nourished and stimulated me more than any other books that I have read. See also her *Sacred Pleasure: Sex, Myth, and the Politics of the Body.*

3. Educators who wonder how schools fit into this dynamic might wish to read David Purpel's *The Moral and Spiritual Crisis in Education: A Curriculum for Justice and Compassion.* Like other holistic educators, Purpel wants the form, the content, and the organization of education to nourish a vision of justice, community, love, and joy. However, like many "revisionist" scholars, Purpel believes that most "schools represent a powerful force of social, intellectual, and personal oppression" (1989, 19). Purpel's work not only offers an important critique of schooling, it also elaborates more humane alternatives. For a fascinating discussion of these issues, see Seth Kreisberg's *Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education* (1992).

4. Roughly 15% of our population lives under the poverty line (defined as less than $15,000 for a family of four in 1992), and nearly one-third of all Americans subsist on less than what our government calls "lower income" (defined as less than $23,000 for a family of four in 1992). For an illuminating discussion of how our class structure shapes the quality of life in the United States and why most Americans "don't like to talk about class" or to "speak about class privileges or class oppression, or the class nature of society," see Gregory Mantsios' "Class in America: Myths and Realities" (1995, 131).

5. It is important to note that this "superior–inferior pecking order" is not always dependent on *physical* strength. Rather, this "pecking order" is often sustained by what we might call social power. The power that a teacher or boss wields, as most students and workers are well aware, is not dependent on their physical strength.

6. Although Kivel's chart lists each group separately, people have multiple group memberships that they experience simultaneously. This means that gender, for example, is not a separate category of social experience. Rather, it is part of an intersecting system of relationships that includes race, class, sexual orientation, etc.

7. By their very nature, unequal power relations not only enforce compliance, they also generate different forms of resistance. Thus, although domination may be pervasive in a society, it is never complete or stable. Space limitations prevent me from developing this crucial point. For a suggestive discussion of the ever-present forms and "arts of resistance," see Scott (1990).

8. For a brilliant exploration of the "correspondences" between white, male, and heterosexual privilege, see Peggy McIntosh's "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies." (To obtain a copy, call 617–283–2838).

9. Eisler and Loye's *The Partnership Way* discusses the importance of being able to imagine and experience partnership alternatives and offers rich suggestions about how to "create key building blocks for the partnership future (1990, 181). See also Nancy Schniedewind and Ellen Davidson's *Open Minds to Learning: A Sourcebook of Learning Activities to Promote Race, Sex, Class, and Age Equity* (1983) and *Cooperative Learning, Cooperative Lives: A Sourcebook of Learning Activities for Building a Peaceful World* as well as bell hooks's *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1994).

10. Having to deal with the consequences of a "virus" that infected my computer shortly before I finished this article deepened my appreciation of this unsettling dynamic: someone created a "virus" because he or she wanted to damage equipment and to hurt people.

11. My brief exchange with a woman who cleaned college buildings illustrates this dichotomous worldview. As I was preparing to leave class one day, she asked me, "Are you finished yet, boss?" Taken aback, I replied that "I was finished, but that I was not a boss." She responded by insisting that "If you're not the boss, then you must be the slave." Life, as she perceived and experienced it, offered few choices. She is not alone. Nor is her perception completely unfounded.

12. As the work of Alice Miller (1988) demonstrates, the use of authoritarian power and intimidation in parent-child relations is as pervasive as it is denied. Intense but often unspoken parental injunctions make many (some say most) children fear they will not be loved, and may not survive, unless they become who their parents wish them to be.

13. For a general overview of this issue, see Chancer (1992, chap. 4). For a provocative analysis of the "totalitarian" tendencies of other institutions (such as the military, the police, law, medicine, the helping professions, and religion), see Marilyn French's *Beyond Power* (1985, 356–430). It is crucial to remember that workers develop many ways of contesting and subverting managerial control. In fact, like French workers of the past who damaged expensive equipment by strategically placing their wooden shoes within delicate machinery, American workers frequently resist by committing industrial "sabotage" (the etymology of which comes from the French word for shoe, "sabot"). For a fascinating account of the creative ways that workers resist degrading work and abusive authority, see Barbara Garson's *All the Livelong Day: The Meaning and Demeaning of Routine Work* (1972).

14. This crucial issue deserves fuller exposition than I can provide here. Janet Miller's *Creating Spaces and Finding Voices: Teachers Collaborating for Empowerment, (1992) and Seth Kreisberg Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education* (1992) offer two rich resources for the interested reader.

15. Space limitations prevent me from giving this crucial topic the attention it deserves. In the past 15 years, Ira Shor has developed a number of insightful analyses of the complex sociocultural roots of student resistance. See his *Critical Teaching and Everyday Life* (1980, reprinted 1987), *Culture Wars: Schools and Society in the Conservative Restoration: 1969-1984* (1986), *A Pedagogy for Liberation* (co-authored with Freire 1987), and *Empowering Education* (1992).

16. For nearly 30 years, Herb Kohl has offered invaluable theoretical insights and practical suggestions in numerous books and articles. For an inspiring discussion of a new teacher's ability to grow and to support his students' growth amid great hardship and discrimination, see *36 Children* (1967, reprinted 1988). For a fascinating discussion of how to deal with the pain, vulnerability, and conflict that educators who teach against the grain experience, see *Half the House* (1974). Recently, Kohl has published *I Won't Learn From You And Other Thoughts on Creative Maladjustment* (1994). This outstanding book provides an eloquent reminder of the possibilities of empowering students and ourselves amid oppressive forces. Kohl elaborates three concepts that represent the "guiding principles" of his teaching: first, "not-learning," which he defines as the conscious decision not to learn something that you find "morally offensive or personally noxious." Second, "hopemongering," which he describes as the "affirmation of hope and the dream of a just and equitable future despite all the contrary evidence provided by experience" (p. xiii). Finally, "creative maladjustment," the definition of which is worth quoting at length. Kohl suggests that:

> Creative maladjustment consists of breaking social patterns that are morally reprehensible, taking conscious control of one's place in the environment, and readjusting the world one lives in based on personal integrity and honesty – that is, it consists of learning to survive with minimal moral and personal compromise in a thoroughly compromised world and of not being afraid of planned and willed conflict, if necessary.... It means small everyday acts of maladjustment as well as occasional major reconstruction.... (p. 130)

17. I called this undergraduate course "Healing the Wounds of Injustice" and offered it at Empire State College (which is part of the State University of New York) in 1994.

18. It is important to stress two related points: first, that a one-semester course rarely provides the time and space necessary for lasting student transformation to occur; and second, that educators who engage in this work can expect that their efforts will have dramatically uneven results. Although some classes come together in ways that are enormously exciting, many classes do not. As Bill Bigelow noted, "those of us who write about classroom practice need to get much better at not merely describing our goals and successes, but also the specific forms of student resistance we encounter, and how we deal with those resistances." Otherwise, the descriptions of "ideal classrooms that we sometimes create in our writing can become very disempowering when encountered by others" (personal communication).

19. There are many ways that educators can create such "perspectives" and "frameworks" in their classrooms. See, for example, Nancy Schniedewind and Ellen Davidson's *Open Minds to Equality: A Sourcebook of Learning Activities to Promote Race, Sex, Class, and Age Equity* (1983); Nancy Schniedewind and Ellen Davidson's Cooperative Learning, Cooperative Lives (1987); Louise Derman-Sparks's *Anti-bias Curriculum: Tools for Empowering Young Children* (1989); Carl Grant and Christine Sleeter's *Turning on Learning: Five Approaches for Multicultural Teaching Plans for Race, Class, Gender, and Disability* (1989); Enid Lee's *Letters to Marcia: A Teacher's Guide to Anti-Racist Education* (1985); Riane Eisler and David Loye's *The Partnership Way: New Tools for Living and Learning* (1990); Sonia Nieto's *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education* (1992); a recent issue of *Cooperative Learning* called *Cooperative Learning and the Challenge of the 90s* (1994); and the articles as well as the teaching resources in the special issue of *Rethinking Schools* called *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching of Equity and Justice* (1994).

20. For compelling analyses of "anti-racist" and multicultural education that show why we need "to prepare our children to live and

work comfortably with the stranger that sojourneth among them," see Lee (1985), Nieto (1992), and Tenorio (1994). Paley has also written three other books that shed light on the impact of racial and gender relations in the classroom. See her *White Teacher* (1979, reprinted 1989), *Boys and Girls Together* (1984), and *Kwanzaa and Me* (1994).

21. For two excellent articles on this and related issues, see Bob Peterson's (1994) "Teaching for Social Justice: One Teacher's Journey" and Rita Tenorio's (1994) "Race and Respect Among Young Children."

22. Estimates suggest that roughly one-tenth of students have homosexual leanings and that approximately 8 to 10 million students live in 3 million gay and lesbian families (Wickens 1993).

23. Many students, teachers, parents, and administrators believe that educators do *not* have the right to address moral issues, let alone a controversial issue such as homosexuality. Unfortunately, Gordon did not address the pressures, hostility, and resistance that many educators encounter when they "try to alert their students to all forms of oppression."

24. Although Gordon wrote this article in 1985, her concerns are not dated. Males still pressure one another to stay within the "act like a man box" (Kivel 1992). Deeply invested in a certain conception of masculinity, many males put down other males who do not conform to it. Some males are not accepted as "real men" by many males and females because of who they are and how they act (Koegel 1994). For example, any male who is gay, thought to be gay, or has stereotyped feminine traits and interests is often viewed as less of a man. The predominant form of masculinity in this society encourages males to be intolerant of alternative ways of being masculine. This dynamic has profound implications for the engagement of difference: if a male's identity is built on the rejection of different forms of masculinity, how can he accept, let alone affirm, differences of race, ethnicity, or class? For insightful discussions of how females learn similar lessons about the "act like a woman box," see Miller (1976) and Orenstein (1994).

25. Bigelow stresses that many of the teaching strategies were developed with Linda Christensen, his teaching partner in a joint literature and history class. In several superb articles, Christensen describes ways of "revising the classroom" that empower students to "unlearn the myths that bind us" as well as "to read, write, and fight injustice." For insights into teaching that can be adapted by teachers of most subjects, see Christensen (1989/1990, January/February 1991, May/June 1991) and her articles in the excellent special issue of *Rethinking Schools* called *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (1994). *Rethinking Schools* consistently publishes articles that are both accessible and insightful. For information, call (414) 964–9646.

26. Unlike many critical educators who write about their teaching, Bigelow repeatedly emphasizes that his classes are rarely as smooth as he hopes or as effective as they may sound. For an insightful discussion of the internal and external blocks to liberatory education, see Ira Shor's *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change* (1992).

27. For two suggestive articles that discuss the importance of "celebrating" the lives and voices of students, see Christensen's "Celebrating the Joy in Daily Events" (1994) and "Celebrating the Student's Voice" (1994).

28. Bigelow has done extraordinary work in this respect by focusing on a historical figure that all students are familiar with: Christopher Columbus. For powerful examples of how students can be encouraged to "talk back" to history, see any of Bigelow's articles in the special issue of *Rethinking Schools* called *Rethinking Columbus*. This issue contains invaluable resources for any educator wishing to focus on the "discovery of America" and the rich legacy of resistance to the injustices it created.

29. For a few outstanding examples, see *Rethinking Schools, Democracy and Education, Holistic Education Review, Cooperative Learning Magazine, Radical Teacher, Journal of Negro Education, Transformations,* and *Feminist Teacher.*

References

Bigelow, B. September 1991. Talking back to Columbus. *Rethinking Schools* (special issue): 38–43.

Bigelow, B. Summer 1993. Getting off the track. *Rethinking Schools,* 7(4): 1, 18–20.

Bigelow, B., and L. Christensen. 1994. Promoting Social Imagination. In *Rethinking our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (special issue of *Rethinking Schools*): 110–111.

Boston Women's Teachers' Group. Spring 1983. The other end of the corridor: The effects of teaching on teachers. *Radical Teacher* 23: 2–23.

Buber, M. 1966. *The knowledge of man: A philosophy of the interhuman.* New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Chancer, L. 1992. *Sadomasochism in everyday life: The dynamics of power and powerlessness.* Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Christensen, L. December 1989/January 1990. Whose standard? Teaching standard English in schools. *Rethinking Schools* 4(2): 1, 12–13.

Christensen, L. January/February 1991. Revising the classroom: Teaching to read, write, and fight injustice. *Rethinking Schools* 5(4): 1, 19–21.

Christensen, L. May/June 1991. Unlearning the myths that bind us. *Rethinking Schools* 5(4): 1, 15–17.

Christensen, L. 1994. Celebrating the joy in daily events. *Rethinking our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (special issue of *Rethinking Schools*): 16.

Christensen, L. 1994. Celebrating the student's voice. *Rethinking our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (special issue of *Rethinking Schools*): 109.

Cummins, J. 1989. *Empowering minority students.* California: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Derman-Sparks, L. 1989. *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Eisler, R. 1987. *The chalice and the blade: Our history, our future.* San Francisco: Harper & Row

Eisler, R. 1995. *Sacred pleasure: Sexuality, myth, and the politics of the body.* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco

Eisler, R., and D. Loye. 1990. *The partnership way: New tools for living and learning.* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Freire, P. 1994. *Pedagogy of hope.* New York: Continuum.

French, M. *Beyond power.* New York: Ballantine.

Garson, B. 1972. *All the livelong day: The meaning and demeaning of work.* New York: Penguin.

Goleman, D. 1985. *Vital lies, simple truths: The psychology of self-deception.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Gordon, L. 1985. "Working people" curriculum examines the world of work. *Interracial books for children bulletin* 16(4): 4–8.

Gordon, L. 1992. What do we do when we hear "faggot"? *Rethinking Schools* 6(4): 4.

Grant, C., and C. Sleeter. 1989. *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability.* New York: Macmillan.

hooks, b. 1993. *Sisters of the yam: African-American women and self-recovery.* Cambridge, MA.: South End Press.

hooks, b. 1994. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Horton, M., and P. Freire. 1990. *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kirkpatrick, D. 1993. Edgework for educators. In *Holistic education: Principles, perspectives, and practices*, edited by C. Flake. Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.

Kivel, P. 1992. *Men's work: How to stop the violence that tears our lives apart*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Koegel, R. 1993. Living the vision amid suffering and oppression: A crucial challenge for educators. In *Holistic education: Principles, perspectives, and practices*, edited by C. Flake. Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.

Koegel, R. March 1994. Healing the wounds of masculinity: A crucial role for educators. *Holistic Education Review* 7(1): 42–49.

Kohl, H. 1967, reprinted 1988. *36 children*. New York: New American Library.

Kohl, H. 1974. *Half the house*. New York: Dutton.

Kohl, H. 1994. *I won't learn from you and other thoughts on creative maladjustment*. New York: New Press.

Kohn, A. 1986. *No contest: The case against competition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kohn, A. 1990. The Case Against Competition. In *Noetics Sciences Collections: 1980 to 1990*, edited by B. McNeill and C. Guion. Sausalito, CA: Institute of Noetic Sciences.

Korda, M. 1975. *Power: How to get it, How to use it*. New York: Random House.

Kozol, J. 1991. *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown Publishers

Kreisberg, S. 1992. *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lee, E. 1985. *Letters to Marcia: A teacher's guide to anti-racist education*. Toronto: Cross Cultural Communication Centre.

Lerner, M. 1986. *Surplus powerlessness*. Oakland: The Institute for Labor and Mental Health.

Liston, C., and K. Zeichner. 1991. *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Mantsios, G. 1995. Class in America: Myths and realities. In *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States*, edited by P. Rothenberg. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Maslow, A. 1968. *Toward a psychology of being*. 2d ed. New York: Van Nostrand.

McIntosh, P. 1988. White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Working Paper No. 189, Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.

McNeil, L. 1986. *Contradictions of control*. New York: Routledge.

Miller, A. 1988. *Banished knowledge: Facing childhood injuries*. New York: Anchor Books.

Miller, J. 1990. *Creating spaces and finding voices: Teachers collaborating for empowerment*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Miller, J. B. 1976. *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Nieto, S. 1992. *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Orenstein, P. 1994. *Schoolgirls: Young women, self-esteem, and the confidence gap*. New York: Doubleday.

Paley, V. 1984. *Boys and girls together*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Paley, V. 1989. *White teacher*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paley, V. 1992. *You can't say you can't play*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paley, V. 1994. *Kwanzaa and me*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Peterson, B. 1994. Teaching for social justice: One teacher's journey. *Rethinking our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (special issue of *Rethinking Schools*): 30–37.

Prothrow-Stith, D. 1991. *Deadly consequences: How violence is destroying our teenage population and a plan to begin solving the problem*. New York: HarperCollins.

Purpel, D. 1989. *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion*. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Ryan, W. 1981. *Equality*. New York: Random House.

Schniedewind, N., and E. Davidson. 1983. *Open minds to equality: A sourcebook of learning activities to promote race, sex, class, and age equity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schniedewind, N., and E. Davidson. 1987. *Cooperative lives: A sourcebook for learning activities for building a peaceful world*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Scott, J. 1990. *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sennett, R., and J. Cobb. 1973. *The hidden injuries of class*. New York: Knopf.

Shor, I. 1986. *Culture wars: School and society in the conservative restoration, 1969–1984*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Shor, I. 1980/1987. *Critical teaching and everyday life*.. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I. 1992. *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shor, I., and P. Freire. 1987. *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Sklar, H. 1995. Imagine a country. In *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States*, edited by P. Rothenberg. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sleeter, C., and C. Grant. 1988. *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. New York: Merrill.

Tenorio, R. 1994. Race and respect among young children. *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice* (special issue of *Rethinking Schools*): 24–28.

Terkel, S. 1972. *Working*. New York: Avon.

Welch, S. 1985. *Communities of resistance and solidarity: A feminist theology of liberation*. New York: Orbis.

Wickens, E. March 1993. Penny's question: "I will have a child in my class with two moms: What do you know about this?" *Young Children* 25–28.

Yen, W. 1989. Welcome to conditioning. Unpublished poem.

Diversity Can Silence Difference

Georgia Johnson

Multicultural education involves more than curriculum and teaching materials; it needs to include the "messy details" of the rich cultural experience of non-mainstream societies.

> An Indian is an idea a man has of himself. And it is a moral idea, for it accounts for the way in which he reacts to other men and the world in general. And that idea, in order to be realized completely, has to be expressed.
>
> — M. Scott Momaday
> *The Man Made of Words*

Much of the current debate surrounding multiculturalism in schools fails to account for the tension between practices that promote diversity and the complexity of identity and difference in cultural and social groups. Multiculturalism in elementary school settings that espouses diversity promotes inclusion of the requisite number of viewpoints in the curriculum, such as legends/myths from all groups and interpretations beyond the dominant one of historical events — the story of Columbus, the evils of slavery, building the transcontinental railroad, the Spanish conquest of Texas and California, etc. Instructional strategies in literacy learning for multicultural classrooms focus on the diverse student group's language and access to the dominant discursive practices and on an inclusive curriculum that will represent the group's contributions to the larger social fabric.

In the case of American-Indian students, a multicultural literacy curriculum usually addresses the fact that he/she may enter the classroom speaking a native language and includes an ESL component. Trade books and textbooks used in this approach to multiculturalism include myths and legends attributed to tribal people and take into account the contributions tribal groups have made to the social and political history of our country. Such an emphasis attempts to pair learning styles with cultural practices and values, or lifestyles, in a cognition and culture approach to instruction. This approach, informed by research in Indian Reservation schools (Phillips 1972; Cummins 1984), stresses the Indian learner's strengths in shared activities, a well-developed visual learning pattern, and a balanced view of their own place in the universe.

Note: The author would like to thank her co-authors, Martin and his schoolmates in the second grade at the Coeur d'Alene Tribal School, for telling her stories.

Dr. Georgia Johnson is an assistant professor in the college of education at the University of Idaho. She teaches literacy issues, foundations of education, and children's literature and is the academic advisor to the American Indian students.
Requests for reprints should be sent to Dr. Johnson at the College of Education, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843.

Traditional Indian communities teach children to approach learning with respect, patience, and silence. This learning is central to the lifestyles of Indian people, and it differs significantly from the individualism, competition, and active participation found in most mainstream classrooms. It is cultural differences such as these that are difficult to identify and include in multicultural literacy materials and teaching. As a result, we focus the discussion of culture on how students from diverse cultures learn and which curricular materials are free from stereotypes. Issues of difference are contained to a harmonizing discourse that invites teachers to use "culturally responsive instruction" aimed at helping ... students to be academically successful while still taking pride in their own cultural identity (Au 1993, 31).

In this article, I position the culture and cognition approach to multiculturalism as one that polarizes minority and mainstream cultures and can decontextualize the culturally different student by reducing cultural difference — lifestyles — to ethnic group behaviors and social contributions in a framework of cultural relativism. Drawing from the radical literacy theories of Paulo Freire, the cultural criticism of Edward Said, the literary criticism of Paula Gunn Allen (Laguna Pueblo), and the pedagogy of difference arguments of Henry Giroux, I examine the tensions in multiculturalism that surface when the "messy relations of race, ethnicity, power, and identity" (Giroux 1993, 60) are inscribed in a young Indian boy's story.

In her foreword to *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World* (Freire and Macedo 1987, xiii), Ann Berthoff points out the power of Burke's "representative anecdotes" or stories to extend meaning beyond themselves in much the same way that metaphors work to expand meaning from the literal to the figurative in language. My representative anecdote of a young Indian boy's story is both an analysis of how his story represents his literacy learning and his cultural context as well as a demonstration of how the "messy relations" of difference can and must be included in multiculturalism. I use a representative anecdote in order to discuss the following issues in multicultural literacy instruction: cultural currency, the importance of naming and transforming social conditions, and the power of images in children's books about ethnic groups, specifically American Indians.

Martin's story

I have a series of audio tapes of children (8 to 10 years old) telling stories or sharing an event that I use with university students and classroom teachers to demonstrate generative assessment beginning with a child's grasp of narrative structures.[1] One of the stories told by Martin (Coeur d'Alene, Cree), age 8, was in response to my telling him that I had missed him the previous week. He told about where he had been with his arm on my shoulder and his face close to mine so that he was able to look at the three other children, his audience, gathered around the tape as he described a trip he took with his family.

> I was at Rocky Boy cuz my uncle died. We drove in the car and ate at Burger King. We was in Montana when I woke up and my brother was still sleepin.
> On the road you gotta take to go to Rocky Boy, my Mom put the flowers in the ditch. We got the flowers in the town, for my uncle. My Mom said we gotta put the flowers where he died, for his spirit.
> At the funeral, the priest did some prayers, but not for his spirit. We put the flowers by the ditch and that was where he died cuz he was drunk and fell down. There was water, so he drowned.
> At my aunt's house we had lots of food and the Giveaway.
> I played with my cousins and we got in the car and came back here. And now I'm back.

I include Martin's story along with five or six other students' stories in the assessment class because it is a good example of purpose and order in narrative. He tells his story to explain his absence from class and to share an event. Although the story has details unique to Martin's tribal culture, it is not a legend or myth, but the telling of a personal event that matters to him. He displays competence with narrative form: his story has a beginning, a middle and an end, he provides details, he organizes sequentially as well as rationally — cause and effect details. Syntactically, he uses a range of verb tenses to convey passage of time and he forms complete thoughts. His use of pronouns "I, We, You" are a bit confusing in a written format, but in an oral format the overt use of "you" serves to include his audience and is a common technique in story telling.

In the categories outlined in a social constructivist approach (Edelsky 1978, 1983; Goodman 1980; Vygotsky 1978) to literacy learning, Martin has a good grasp of both narrative form and content and is well prepared to continue to construct and interpret text — to write and read in school. And on a literary level, his story exhibits a strong sense of tone. Lopez (1989) defines the tone of an interactive or told story

as "a feeling that derives from the listener's trust and a storyteller's certain knowledge of his subject and regard for his audience" (pp. 63–64).

The act of sharing what he knows and naming his world strengthens Martin's sense of self and his identity as a Coeur d'Alene Indian and as a learner in school (Freire and Macedo 1987). As I will elaborate upon later in this essay, he is an active participant in the discursive practices of school and of his culture; the ideal both/and position[2] prescribed in inclusive multicultural instruction (Au 1993; Banks and McGee 1993; Crawford 1993; Reyhner 1988).

Although Martin's story displays a wide range of literacy/literary strengths and positive examples of a diverse learner balancing several identities, the response from my students (undergraduate and practicing teachers) was focused on one detail in the story's content: "cuz he was drunk and fell down." The undergraduate students wanted to know, "What about the other kids? Wouldn't his story upset them?" and, "How am I supposed to talk about that (alcoholism and death) with second graders?" While the practicing teachers took a more normative position about what they heard — "We are trying to teach those (Indian) kids not to drink and do drugs and glorifying that stuff just makes it worse" — the student teachers preferred "story" stories instead of events from student's lives — "I think those (Indian) kids should tell their stories, you know 'Coyote Tales,' and how they named the rivers and stuff like that, but the classroom is no place for talk about drunkenness."

These responses illustrate my discussion of difference in two ways. First, the responses exposed a significant gap in much of multicultural literacy instruction — *what* the child from outside the dominant culture writes or tells in school is ignored. Instead, there is an emphasis on form — *how* the child tells or writes is described and prescribed from within normative cognitive, developmental, and instructional criteria. Although future teachers are encouraged "to broaden the rules of what is acceptable in the classroom in terms of how students speak and write about their lives and how they answer questions..." (Au 1993, 103), the experiences, lifestyles, or identities of the students are left out of the discussion by limiting the criteria of acceptability to form and ignoring content.

This gap is especially significant to minority children because, as Lisa Delpit (1988) reminds us, the promise of multicultural education is to teach learners with different speaking and writing patterns how to participate in the dominant culture without giving up their own culture. Yet when Martin used the dominant discursive codes to talk about an event and included a detail that is talked about openly in his ethnic and social group, he was *not* assessed for his form but for his content.

Second, my students' responses exposed an assumption of the self-evident nature of the pedagogical and ideological correctness of their positions (Giroux 1993). Such unexamined assumptions are part of the paradox of diversity and cultural relativism in claiming that cultures are different but not necessarily inferior or superior. The problem with this view of culture, as I see it, is that cultures can be abstracted and ahistoricized through a focus on customs and values, but when a student's customs or values are contrary to the values of school discursive practices, relativism vanishes. This is one of the most obvious tensions that remains unexplored in cultural diversity concepts espoused in current instructional practices.

My students' consensus was that Martin's story is not acceptable as a story to be shared in "Circle" or in "writer's workshop" because he talks about "inappropriate" topics. The notion of appropriate/inappropriate topics was defended by the undergraduate students when they said "there are just some things we don't talk about in school...." Giroux defines this unstated social grammar of classrooms as a "school voice that seeks to regulate the specific ways in which students learn, speak, act, and present themselves" (1987, 14). The term "unstated" is of particular importance in my analysis of Martin telling his story. The "stated" criteria of the exercise — children's use of narrative structures — were no problem for Martin. What (could have) prevented him from developing his oral tale into a written, illustrated text and gaining access to the transformative possibilities of "critical literacy" (Freire 1985) are the "unstated" criteria that are seldom explained to students such as Martin. In the three years Martin has been in a formal school setting, he has learned to read, write, follow directions in the classroom, and speak in a group — in other words, he is playing by the "stated" rules. But, when he speaks/writes about the specificity and particularity of his everyday life (content) and if this specificity offends or challenges assumptions embedded, but never stated, in school discourse and assessment, then he speaks difference not diversity.

Language, community, identity, and the power of image

As educators, we need to look closely at who speaks within or outside a "privileged space" and, more to the point, we need to look at our own roles in providing "space" where we can hear different voices (Giroux 1993). To this end, I would like to contextualize Martin as a member of multiple-discourse communities in an attempt to [re]view unified notions of difference and identity. Martin is a participant in intersecting, not separate cultures: he identifies with popular culture — *Kung Fu* movies and karate are talked about daily on the playground; he is an active member of the Catholic community on the reservation. Along with practicing his "karate-chops" and attending Sunday Mass, he takes part in traditional Coeur d'Alene rituals and ceremonies and lives in a very isolated, rural reservation community. His identity cannot be captured in unified, reductive categories such as "The Indian Child" or "Native Americans" or "Indian."

Children in tribes such as the Coeur d'Alene speak English, but the tribal concepts of purpose and value of language are different from the roles of language in the dominant culture. The Couer d'Alene tribe, along with many other tribal groups, is an oral culture. Their story structures and much of their knowledge system are constructed and expressed in spoken rather than written texts (Frey 1993).

Literary critics/teachers such as Bonnie TuSmith (1993) carefully analyze the work of published Native storytellers who straddle the worlds of spoken and written narratives and conclude that "Oral cultures place primary importance on the (speaker's) ability to articulate experiences" (p. 110). And in describing one of the primary differences between orality and written literacy, they claim that oral cultures emphasize the social rather than individual nature of meaning. For Paula Gunn Allen (Laguna Pueblo), the sacredness of language in oral traditions allows both the speaker and the listener(s) to "share one's singular being with that of the community and know oneself within the communal knowledge of the tribe" (1987, 55). In her description of the importance of telling an event in traditional cultures, Allen informs us that, "Those reared in traditional American Indian societies are inclined to relate events and experiences to one another" (p. 59) and that "no one's experience is idiosyncratic" (p. 71).

These theorists can contribute to our understanding of Martin as a storyteller, his purpose in telling his story, the content of his story, and his identities in intersecting and multiple contexts. The story of attending his uncle's funeral contains details that convey the complexity of living in several worlds. But his story also conveys how well he understands the differences between his multiple identities. For instance, he knows that his mother performed a Coeur d'Alene burial ritual for his uncle while the priest performed a Catholic ritual and that his uncle's spirit was attended to in the tribal ritual. Simply acknowledging how well Martin negotiates his many worlds is not enough, we must also value his Coeur d'Alene culture so as not to violate his difference under the guise of emancipatory agendas. I do not want to claim that as outsiders we can fully understand Martin's identity as a traditional Coeur d'Alene but to emphasize that, as his teachers, we must accept and work with his difference.

The issue of alcohol abuse is still a troubling one because it focuses our (outsider's) attention on "problems we have in understanding the life choices of individuals and groups who do not share our fundamental commitments" (Kane 1994). And the issue is equally troubling because discussions of alcoholism can contribute to stereotypes of Indian groups. My experiences with Indian students, Indian communities, and American-Indian literature make me very aware of the problems many Indian people have with alcohol. But as a result of living and teaching in Indian communities, I am also aware of a significant cultural difference in the open discussion of this problem among Indian people of all ages and the reference to drinking and drunkenness in current Indian literature. This openness does not mean drunkenness is accepted in tribal groups; it means it is talked about in a manner that is different from the dominant culture's.

If the purpose of multiculturalism *is* to focus on culture as a lived and spoken experience and how difference often manifests itself in both how and what groups speak, write, and tell stories about, then the "messy" details as well as the contributions of groups can be included. One of the problems with stereotypes is that they arise from a limited or reductive approach to difference. Alcoholism is a problem in many cultures; it can become a stereotype of a group's behavior if it is the only image outsiders have of a group. When an insider, such as Martin, tells a story about himself or herself, he or she presents a complex — not a reduced — image of who they are. Complex images of difference, like those in

Martin's story, can challenge both negative and romantic stereotypes.

When Martin spoke about a subject that is not talked about in public in mainstream culture, he stepped out of my students' static unified representation of "Indianness." In the average elementary classroom, "Indianness" is most often limited to picture book [re]presentations of mythical figures living in the past or of young Indian girls and boys who are dressed in traditional costumes or books that retell traditional tales featuring animals who teach a "lesson" through humor. Discussions of these books in texts that promote diversity and cultural relativism point out the themes of Native American literature: the passing on of traditional knowledge and history; the mistreatment and injustice suffered by Indian people; the value of relationships with family and friends; and "a reverence for nature and all living things" (Harris 1992). Such an abstracted, decontextualized, ahistorical representation does much harm to students like Martin because this image simply will not acknowledge the particulars of his everyday life — he disappears. Within the category "Indian," partially constructed by imagemakers outside of the particular and local, Martin and other students from tribal groups are compelled to accept [a] mythic, miniature version of themselves (Said 1993).

This static categorization of difference allows outsiders, such as the students and teachers in my classes, to reject any image of "Indianness" that contradicts a romantic, mythic, abstract Indian identity — the essential Indian of cultural relativism. Such a position also validates assumptions of a unified (Euro-American) identity on the part of my students and the unquestioned rightness of developing such an identity through literacy.

One danger in assuming that embracing multiculturalism as a concept will lead to understanding difference is the seductive tendency to use our awareness of, in this instance, Martin's strengths as a storyteller as a vehicle for assimilation. Simply stated, I am not proposing to assimilate Martin's identity as a traditional Coeur d'Alene. Rather, I want to position multiculturalism as difference in order to respect and not disrupt Martin's identity as a traditional participant in a tribal culture. Within this view of multiculturalism, school could be a place for Martin to develop his emerging identities as a learner who makes meaning in a particular context.

If theories and practices of multiculturalism act to contextualize Martin, not to privilege or categorize one of his identities over the others, but to provide a place — school — for intersectionality where his multiple identities meet and cross, we can teach to the possibility of "construct[ing] social realities that celebrate, acknowledge, and affirm differences...." (Hooks 1989, 11–12).

Conclusions

No one is simply Irish, or Chinese, or a woman, or a Native American. Diversity discourses of instruction essentialize and polarize cultural difference when they position "Others" as unified, abstract, and knowable. When we talk about the *how* of specific language/learning practices without the *why* and the *what* of particular and multiple ways of being and making meaning in the world, we are limiting students like Martin to a static, contained role inside and outside his particular culture. If we begin to conceptualize all traditions and language as *both* persistent *and* dynamic, if we can shift our emphasis from the knower/speaker to explorations of knowing/speaking so that narratives of difference are heard in the classroom, perhaps Martin will experience school as a place to successfully negotiate the intersectionality of his identities.

Notes

1. Generative assessment is a method of looking at a student's work in order to determine how best to guide the student's next activity. Generative assessment differs from summative assessment in that it does not view learning as completed or mastered, but as ongoing, developing, and always in process.

2. The both/and position for Martin means that he would be in a learning environment that supports his continued learning as a Coeur d'Alene *and* as a participant in mainstream literacy practices. Ideally, Martin will not have to choose to be *either* a successful Coeur d'Alene *or* a successful learner.

References

Allen, P. G. 1987. *The Sacred Hoop*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Au, K. H. 1993. *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Banks, J. A., and C. McGee. 1993. *Multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Berthoff, A. 1987. Foreword. In *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*, edited by. P. Freire and D. Macedo. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Crawford, L. W. 1993. *Language and literacy learning in multicultural classrooms*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Cummins, J. 1984. *Bilingualism and special education*. San Diego, CA: College-Hill.

Delpit, L. 1988. The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review* 58: 280–298.

Edelsky, C. 1978. Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly* 16: 211–229.

Freire, P., and D. Macedo. 1987. *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Frey, R. 1993. *Stories that make the world: An introduction to the oral literature and storytelling of the Indian peoples of the inland northwest*. Boise, ID: Idaho Humanities Council.

Goodman, Y. M. 1980. The roots of literacy. In *Claremont reading conference — Forty fourth yearbook*, edited by M. P. Douglas. Claremont, CA: Claremont Graduate School.

Giroux, H. 1987. Introduction. In *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*, edited by P. Freire and D. Macedo. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. 1992. *Border crossings*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.

Giroux, H. 1993. *Living dangerously*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Harris, V. J. 1992. Multiethnic children's literature. In *Exploring literature in the classroom: Content and methods*, edited by K. D. Wood and A. Moss. Norwood, MA: Christopher–Gordon.

Hooks, B. 1989. *Talking back: Thinking feminist, Thinking black*. Boston: South End Press.

Kane, J. 1994. Personal correspondence.

Lopez, B. 1989. *Crossing open ground*. New York: Vintage.

Phillips, S. U. 1972. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In *Functions of language in the classroom*, edited by C. B. Cazden, V. John, and D. Hymes. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reyhner, J. 1988. *Teaching the Indian child: A bilingual/ multicultural approach*. Billings, MT: Bilingual Education Program, Eastern Montana College.

Said, E. 1993. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

TuSmith, B. 1993. *All my relatives: Community in contemporary ethnic American literatures*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Vygotsky, L. 1973. *Mind and society*, edited by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Sonberman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

A Conversation on Multiculturalism with Paul Byers and Mary Catherine Bateson

Asked to talk about multiculturalism and why we have such difficulty with those we perceive as different, Paul Byers and Mary Catherine Bateson met in New York City on February 6, 1995, and immersed themselves in an intense, spontaneous two-hour conversation.

The conversation was taped and then transcribed. As I read and reread its transcription, it became clear that it would be impossible to publish the conversation in its entirety. Spoken conversation is a dance that has its own choreography, and in that choreography finds its meaning, which is difficult to capture in the written, printed form. Somehow in the translation from spoken conversation to written communication much is lost; the choreography is dulled, the gestures muddled.

That occurred with this transcription and I, subsequently, selected highlights — gestures, so to speak, in the spoken dance — which testify to the themes and thinking processes that emerged as Paul and Catherine untangled the proposed topics. The threads woven together here are offered as a contribution to the ongoing thick, multileveled dialogue being uncovered as educators face the same concerns in their classrooms.

Perhaps the conversation, and even these selected highlights, in its skipping about, inability to reach definitive conclusions, mixing of levels and themes, serves as a metaphor for the complexity of the issues at hand. As educators grapple with how to define multiculturalism and decipher its pedagogical implications, they discover that the dialogue, as with Byers's and Bateson's, is at an exploratory stage, taking small and grand steps toward unraveling the (necessary) confusion. Byers and Bateson have done us the favor of helping us find a language to talk about the confusion. In their thinking together they also have mirrored the stumbling blocks and awkward gestures we may meet along the way.

Paul Byers, an anthropologist, is a retired adjunct Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. He is presently researching the out-of-awareness forms of information vital to all interaction.

Mary Catherine Bateson, also an anthropologist, is author of *Peripheral Visions: Learning Along the Way*, *Composing a Life*, *With a Daughter's Eye*, and is co-author with her father, Gregory Bateson, of *Angels Fear*. She is presently teaching at George Mason University.

—Diana Muxworthy Feige
Associate Editor

Paul: Can we begin by figuring out what multiculturalism means?

Catherine: I'm convinced that multiculturalism has acquired a set of essentially conflicting meanings. On the one hand, multiculturalism has meant the insistence that the culture of various minority groups be included and affirmed. Seems to me that's one meaning, and a second meaning is the argument that all of us need to deal with cultural differences, whatever our origins and that, therefore, a part of my education should not just be a grounding in my own tradition but an awareness of a variety of different traditions.

Now, I think these two ideas have gotten totally muddled with each other. In a campus multicultural center that offers programs about a variety of different cultural groups, it may turn out that the people

who come only come to hear about their own group, not to learn about other groups. And all this has gotten caught in the standard competition for time in curriculum. You know, who gets to make who read what, when.

I would like to talk about what we would like multiculturalism to mean. Here's a word that has gotten seriously bogged down in confusions and contention. When I first heard it a few years ago, I thought that it sounded wonderful. How could that be anything but a good thing?

Paul: My take on that initially was that Columbia [University] was trying to get some multiculturalism in its core curriculum and the kids asked why we need to know about anybody else's culture to succeed in ours? And the second take I took on that was: How many other cultures are you going to have to look at? All of the varieties that we have in this country or should we, instead, try to move back to the underlying problem, the acceptance of difference?

Catherine: I think you have to teach the acceptance of difference by using example. They don't have to be the obvious local examples, although there are some. You know, you take the old story about the British foreign office requiring that every candidate coming into training learn Burmese. That was not so that they could all be sent to Burma. For 90% of them the particular language they learned, Burmese, was irrelevant to their careers but learning how to learn a language, how to go to a strange place and to believe that you could master a totally unrelated language with an unrelated writing system was very important.

At one level, the acceptance of difference can be taught by teaching students through anthropology courses that everybody's names are changing at the moment. Let us say the San Bushmen or whatever. Simply to acknowledge another human community and see that it is comparably complex and elegant in its integration is vital. That's a little different from saying every American should know something about all of the important minority cultures in this country.

Paul: Yes, but isn't it possible then to have somebody who knows all about another culture but still doesn't like it or the people in it?

Catherine: Indeed. But I think one thing on which we agree is that preaching to people about how they *ought* to be tolerant doesn't work and is in fact producing a major backlash in schools at the moment. Because it's even worse when that preaching is done by a teacher who has had this mandated to him or her, who at base doesn't believe it. That's truly pernicious. Can you teach me to accept difference without an example?

Paul: Interesting. Let's go sideways just a moment and pick up this notion that it seems that people are arguing with their neighbors all over the world, whether it's Serbians and Albanians, whether it's Americans and Latinos. Let's look at the question, How come people apparently do this, universally, and where does it come from? Because if we can't understand that then we can't understand what steps to take. And in many parts of the world, in Africa for example, a lot of people know all sorts of languages.

Catherine: And they still kill each other.

Paul: And we still fight the next guy. And as your mother [Margaret Mead] used to point out, people very often know that those folks over there had different kinds of ceremonies and different beliefs, so they had an understanding of difference but they still would go to war with them.

Catherine: Yes.

Paul: That's why we're trying to understand what we mean by *multiculturalism*. Because, if we mean learning about another society, that still doesn't imply that we're going to like them or accept them. You just *know* about them.

Then there's the peculiar thing to me of how, during the war, we said the Japanese were so terrible and very quickly after the war decided they were very bright. I'm puzzled about this, what are we talking about? They used to call it xenophobia in Australia when they started their post-war immigration program.

Catherine: I think you have to say that a degree of xenophobia is a universal, that when you encounter someone who looks different from you, one way of reacting, perhaps the most natural way of reacting, is hostility.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Catherine: One of the facts that I've been thinking about is that, on one hand, we have this rejection of difference, this promotion of homogeneity as a basis for solidarity and picking our enemies and projecting negative traits on them as another way of promoting solidarity. But then on the other hand, we live within any human family with a great deal of difference and a great deal of unintelligibility. We do have the capacity to do that. Every human family is a mechanism for assimilating an immigrant who might as well be from Mars, which is what infants are. They're really different and people accept and like them.

People in small homogeneous communities actually deal with very wide differences and indeed deal with them better than larger communities. The retarded do better in small towns than in big cosmopolitan cities. So I think you have to include that in the formula, that at the same time as people are rejecting differences of certain kinds they're intelligently living with and managing other kinds of differences. My favorite example of that of course is gender, because I think there are real differences between men and women, and society has learned to cope with them.

Paul: Not in an entirely satisfactory way.

Catherine: Not in an entirely satisfactory way, and of course one of the ways of dealing with difference is with hierarchy and exploitation.

Paul: Which seems to me to get us down to the place where multiculturalism is confused, complicated, and many things piled on top and mixed up. So that if we want to plan a "multicultural program" to deal with it, where are we going to start? We can start with foreign languages; we can start with teaching people about foreign cultures. Does either of these help?

Catherine: Before we started I was thinking about an aspect of Gregory's [Bateson] work that I think is perhaps helpful here. I'm going to cut into it from a different angle. There was a definition that he gave of love that I've played with in various contexts.

Paul: As I remember, the definition is very complicated.

Catherine: It's not all that complex. It's got three pieces to it and maybe if we can get those three pieces into the conversation we can deal with multiculturalism. I'm not going to quote this verbatim at this point but I can come pretty close. He said that the statement "I love you" is an assertion that (a) I acknowledge that I am a system or a mind. (This is Gregory so we know what he means by "mind.") And (b) that I acknowledge that you are a system with certain similarities and dissimilarities and (c) I acknowledge that you and I together constitute a larger system with a certain conformity within it.

Now, let's move away from human beings and talk of the shark in the water. The shark is not conscious, doesn't have an idea about itself as a system in any way that we can determine but it does have a set of behaviors that allow it to function in its entirety in the larger system without knowing the properties of the larger system. It only has the behaviors that provide for the interface.

It seems to me if I've got a neighbor from a different ethnic background, in order for us to get along in the human way of doing things, I do have to have some understanding of who I am, of identity in relation to a tradition that I come from and I do have to have some knowledge of the other person and the tradition that they come from. My understanding doesn't have to be exhaustive but it has to allow me to recognize both similarity and dissimilarity in order to empathize with the other person.

That gets you to the Golden Rule, in a sense. That's about as far as it gets you. The thing that is different about Gregory's take on it is the valuation of the system and having some mental map that includes us both.

Paul: Oscar Ischazzo [founder of the Arica Institute] defined love as the recognition of the same consciousness in others as in oneself. It's the larger system.

Catherine: Of the same single consciousness.

Paul: The recognition that we all belong to a larger system.

Catherine: Okay. But it can take very, very different forms.

Paul: I suppose if you could go up to a high enough level, the particular form is not the point. Regardless of form, we're all a part of life on the planet.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Paul: To what extent do you think intolerance, discrimination, racism have their roots, as far as the individual is concerned, in our own failure to accept ourselves? Are we talking about other people or are we talking about ourselves? We talk as though it is the other people.

Catherine: It seems to me you need to take two steps. The first step says you are different from me and that makes me uncomfortable. The second step projects onto you everything I don't like about myself. Don't forget that that happens. In other words, you're different from me and that makes me uncomfortable and I have an ideal picture of myself but I know that I am sometimes irrational, lazy, violent, that I sweat, or whatever, and I am just going to take that whole package of things that I don't like about myself and fill up my ignorance about you with those projections. Some of that can be dissipated with information.

Paul: But you can also turn the information thing upside down. Remember back in the McCarthy days, we tended to hate the Communists, as if anybody knew what a Communist was, but we had the label attached to it. We didn't really know what it was we were disliking. I wonder sometimes to what extent we label people and don't like the label, or attach people to the label we don't like.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Catherine: It's also more interesting that two words whose meanings have been reshaped, and everybody seems to have bought into that re-shaping, are *feminist* and *liberal.* I do think that in moments when human beings face change and uncertainty and have deep doubts about their ability to work with those who are closest to them, one of the things they do is create either demons or scapegoats — whether it is Communists, the infidels who were the external demon for Europe all through the Crusades, or the Jews during World War II. These are often ways of creating solidarity, and part of the technique of political rhetoric today is the rabid manipulation of language to demonize different groups.

Paul: Groups or ideas.

Catherine: Ideas, that's right. When they say liberalism is such a bad idea there is a list of people they are attacking by saying that. That's how it comes out. It is one thing to say welfare dependency is a bad thing but when push comes to shove, it is people on welfare that are going to get clobbered. I do think part of the xenophobia of the present has to do with uncertainty. I think there has to be two things going on. I think there has to be two things going on. One is the ordinary human habit of disliking people who are different. When that explodes into warfare, our relationship with them has been destabilized. But that is no good because if we have traditional enemies then we should learn to cope with our traditional enemies.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Paul: To anchor this for practical purposes, what can we say about multiculturalism, diversity, and xenophobia in a journal related to education? That's where I get stopped because the usual process it seems to me is, Go *learn* about other people. That response alone doesn't seem very satisfactory. I am more and more aware that as we become uncertain in these changing times, the problems of racism, disliking our neighbor, intolerance, all that stuff, seem to increase. That is, when there is uncertainty, there is threat. We even go looking for enemies, it seems to me.

Catherine: Practically speaking, it might be useful if I say what I do in my own teaching — and I, mind you, am not responsible for a curriculum. I meet with my students one day a week and do what I think is right. I put one big push of effort into trying to give students some understanding of complex systems. I put another big push of effort, not necessarily for the same students or the same classes, into teaching people to listen to individuals who are different from themselves. Is this just an accidental choice of two kinds of emphases, or are these two necessary sides of the same coin? Is the emphasis on "walking a mile in your neighbor's shoes," important — as opposed to talking about your neighbor as a member of a group or a culture or a system? On the other hand, I push for them to be able to think of our society as a complex of many different voices benefiting from that diversity. These are very different levels.

Paul: In my teaching I tried to make this point: for example, when you walked down Broadway there was almost everywhere someone with a paper cup asking for money. For a long time I was tangled up with whether I should give them money or how

much money or does it really do any good. Is it significant — for only one person? Then I came to realize that if I forgot the money business and made a point of looking at each person in the eye and smiling at him, that was a more significant response than the quarter I might give. I suggested that people try that. In other words, instead of worrying about giving individuals a quarter and what they are going to spend it on, confront each person with a smile and eye contact. That makes an acknowledgment. It is far more important of course, because it comes down to you and me and goes past the business of what you are going to spend the money on. It does something for the other person and me. That is the best I could come up with when people asked me what we could do about homelessness.

Catherine: So what you're saying is that we have been perhaps told too often to think of it systemically rather than person-to-person.

Paul: Systemically is rather a distant point of view. It is theoretical. One can talk about it, but what does it have to do with acknowledging the guy on the street?

Catherine: If I developed a habit of looking him in the eye and smiling, there is an immediate effect on me and him, but there are a couple of other things going on. I notice I have been averting my eyes and refusing to look at him. I notice that I am dealing with complicated guilts and sets of inhibitions in myself that I can begin to think about. And the old questions that inhibited me the first time around may definitely replay themselves, but in the context of my acknowledging another as a human being.

Paul: What do you mean by "replay themselves?"

Catherine: I walk down the street and am addressed by a homeless person and I feel uncomfortable and conflicted and a little bit scared. I try not to meet this person's eye and get past as quickly as I can. But my conflicted feeling has got anger, it has got guilt, it has got disgust.

Now I change my behavior. I look him in the eye and I smile and I say, "Good luck to you" or "God bless you" or "How are you doing, man?" or whatever it is that I say. I have reframed the whole interaction, but the systemic issues, it seems to me, then replay themselves — maybe not the first morning or the second morning but as time goes on I've gotten to the point of recognizing this homeless person as a human being and having an interaction with him. Then the question comes back, isn't there anything I can or should be doing to change the system that has him out on the street?

Paul: My sense is that it starts with one person reacting with another and making a discovery about himself and about relationships and passing this along to other people. Then more and more people begin to smile. Maybe it is something that will grow and become a custom. It works. Rather than dealing with it systemically, these patterns develop because people have done things in a way that organize them into a way of thinking and behaving.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Catherine: I think it is useful to make a distinction between two different forms of multiculturalism. Although in practice, they may combine and overlap, there is one thrust that has to do with identity multiculturalism and there is a second thrust that has to with the capacity to recognize and acknowledge people from other groups which I call adaptive multiculturalism.

Paul: Don't you have to have the second before you have the first?

Catherine: No. You have to have the second in order as a society for the first to happen. That's what you mean. But what is called the Western canon is identity multiculturalism for me.

Paul: I wanted to write articles about this. Over and again, our society takes the particular and ignores the large and general. People who want to study teen pregnancy talk about contraceptives without understanding the place of sexuality in the teen community. So you're never going to succeed here unless you can get to the higher order understanding. If you think it's only about accepting my group, it is endless. That can't solve it. The real underlying problem lies in accepting difference. That is why I was saying that those two definitions are at two different levels of thinking. One is consciousness and the other is today's conflict. You can't solve the conflict until you accept differences. Passing laws and mandating courses are not what it is all about. That is where I had to stop. I couldn't get beyond that because I don't know how you persuade the world to accept difference.

Catherine: At the moment what is happening is people are saying, I am Hispanic. It is important for my self-esteem and my children's self-esteem to affirm that, not to be second-class citizens. Therefore, I demand to be educated in Spanish. The necessary response to that needs to be: You are shortchanging your children if you teach them only Spanish, but we have been shortchanging our children for quite a while by teaching them only English. We have to make sure that at some basic level, they feel good in their home language and that's affirmed and then we have to give them the skills to function in the society. They can have those skills without loving and respecting and without affirming difference itself. The very use of the term *adaptive* rather than, say, *philosophical* multiculturalism is significant. Your upper level is philosophical multiculturalism and I am proposing a level in between which is adaptive multiculturalism. It says, You are going to do better if you know some languages.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Catherine: One of the things that I am worried about is the risk of preaching to people. If you approach it from the philosophical end, then the value element becomes so strong. It implies that you ought to feel a particular way. I think we have got a big backlash against that.

Paul: My preferred mode, and I think it would be yours too, would be to provide a way in which people will learn it indirectly. You can't teach people directly to accept difference but I think you can teach people about another culture.

Take the Board of Education. It is going to say, "You are going to teach this and give this much time to it." I don't think that works in the end. But the larger, higher, consciousness level is to build in a way of thinking about self and other without saying directly, 'This is what I am teaching you.'

Which is what I was suggesting before. A way of getting people to grasp this is to have them go out smiling at homeless people who are asking them for a quarter. That has lots, as you pointed out, built into it. We become aware of how we have been avoiding it. We become aware of that relationship. We also, in my experience, become aware that smiling at somebody is more important than the quarter we might have given because acceptance is part of the world. It is more important than the quarter.

Why Aren't We Getting Along?

Geneva Gay, Bernadette Cole Slaughter, and Ceola Ross Baber

Successful interracial, interethnic, and intercultural relationships depend on how well the parameters, problems, and challenges associated with cross-cultural interactions are identified, understood, and dealt with.

Geneva Gay is Professor of Education and Associate of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington in Seattle, Washington.
Bernadette Cole Slaughter is an Associate Professor in the Department of Professional Studies in Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania in Indiana, Pennsylvania.
Ceola Ross Baber is Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in Greensboro, North Carolina. All three are actively engaged in preparing teachers and other educational leaders for working with culturally diverse students and being advocates of multicultural education.
Reprint requests should be sent to the first author at the University of Washington, Seattle, 122 Miller, Box 353600, Seattle, WA 98195-3600.

Several key ideas embedded in the question, "Why aren't we getting along better than we are?" provide the general guidelines for this discussion. First is the idea that we *can* get along. Second, if we can get along but aren't, there must be reasons for this. These should be identified and resolved. A third implicit idea is identifying who "we" are, which would help determine how relationships can be improved. The exploration of these ideas and questions begins with the basic assumptions that: (1) "we" (whomever we are) must believe that getting along is possible and desirable; (2) we must be willing to act upon these convictions; and (3) effective human relationships require skills that must be taught and learned.

Getting along interpersonally and interculturally is imperative for the well-being and betterment of both individuals and society. It should not be left to chance, but developed deliberately and systematically. Teaching students a variety of cross-cultural relational skills should be as important as teaching them basic literacy and academic skills. Without forthright and forceful intervention, we leave children unprepared to deal with the array of cultural factors that underlie the central questions of this discussion. The prevailing theme throughout is that success in dealing with problems associated with getting along is contingent upon how well they are identified and understood. To facilitate this process, the discussion identifies some key dimensions of the problem by explaining who "we" are and some foundations of and obstacles to getting along. It concludes with educational implications for teaching skills in intercultural relations.

Who Are "We"?

The "we" of concern to us in improving relationships in the multicultural society of the United States has several different configurations. One of them is males and females. Both the macroculture and various ethnic microcultures place certain constraints on female–male relationships. Many of these derive from traditional sex role ascriptions and gender socializations in which males are taught to be aggres-

sive, doers, rational thinkers, decision makers, and forceful leaders. By comparison, females are groomed to be passive, dependent, emotional, followers, and caregivers (Grossman and Grossman 1994). While these patterns of expectations prevail across ethnic groups, they do vary in degree and extent. For example, Lewis (1975, 228) observed that "Many of the behaviors which whites see as appropriate to one sex or the other, blacks view as equally appropriate ... or inappropriate to both sexes; and the sex differences that do exist are more in the nature of contrasts than mutually exclusive traits." The degree of traditionality in families and ethnic groups is also a significant factor in the discreteness of sex-role socializations. Gender-specific behaviors tend to be far more discrete in traditional and non-Western than modern and Western societies. Therefore, within the United States gender-specific roles and behaviors are less extreme among European-Americans than Asian-, Latino-, and Middle-Eastern-Americans.

For many individuals, trying to function outside of gender-specific expectations is problematic and traumatizing. They may feel their gender identity is compromised and that they will be perceived as social deviants, nonconformists, or sell-outs. Others are not deterred by these possibilities but may still become somewhat isolated when they think and behave in ways typically associated with the opposite sex, because some people feel uncomfortable in their presence. Males and females should be natural extensions of each other, but too often in schools and society they aren't given a fair chance for this to happen. They are not taught or allowed to relate to each other in a variety of nontraditional and nonstereotypical ways. Consequently, their personal and social development — the total range of their humanness — is not as complete as it could and should be.

Another "we" that should be understood and dealt with in improving human relations is *intragroup members*. Too often when ethnic and cultural groups are evoked in discussions about diversity, they are treated as if they were monolithic. Thus, we hear about the African-American perspective, the Latino position, the Asian-American reaction, the European-American attitude.

This approach overlooks the fact that an ethnic group is a "category" that is composed of many different individuals and sub-groups. While they have some things in common, they are by no means identical. Different customs, beliefs, values, and ways of interacting exist among groups and individuals *within* ethnic categories that need to be understood and resolved in order to improve human and race relations. Members of ethnic groups who are educated, upper class, older, and suburban residents are not likely to think, believe, and behave identically to those who are poor, uneducated, young, and urban dwellers. The categorization of Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and Cuban Americans as Latinos does not mean that their cultures, issues, and perspectives are totally harmonious.

An ethnic group is a "category" that is composed of many different individuals and sub-groups. While they may have some things in common, they are by no means identical.

Understanding this *within-groups-within-ethnic categories variability* is essential to improving relationships among ethnically, racially, socially, and culturally different people. It is fallacious to assume that simply because individuals are members of the same ethnic group they know how to or will get along well with each other. Some of the same obstacles that interfere with getting along across ethnic and cultural groups operate within groups as well. Among these are socioeconomic class, education level, degree of ethnic affiliation, gender, and generation. Neisi (first generation U.S. born) Japanese-Americans may find it difficult to accept some of the behaviors and beliefs of their Yonsai grandchildren. African-Americans who have a strong ethnic and cultural consciousness may be intolerant of others who do not overtly embrace their blackness. Educated and middle class members of ethnic groups may not know how to communicate and empathize with those who are poor and uneducated.

Interethnic group diversity generates a third conception of "we" that is important to understanding and improving ethnic and racial relations in the United States. Ethnic demographics are radically changing what, "We, the people of the United States" means. The numbers and trends are so frequently discussed that they do not need to be detailed here. Suffice it to say that increasingly the image they evoke is a virtual

human and cultural rainbow. This means that the tendency of thinking of race relations as being a black-and-white issue is less appropriate now than ever before. More and more peoples of the United States reflect ethnic groups, national origins, and cultural and linguistic backgrounds very different from those that we were accustomed to in the past. Now the attention must be on why African, Asian, Latino, European, and Native Americans aren't getting along better among themselves and with each other. A closely related question is, "Why aren't indigenous individuals getting along with immigrant members of the same ethnic groups?" All of these add to the complexity and the potential enrichment of what "getting along" means in a culturally pluralistic society.

Yet another perspective on "we" that has serious implications for improving human relations is, "Who are *we as individuals*?" Essential to answering this question is understanding the sociality and comprehensiveness of our personhood. Randour (1987, 225) contends that the "process of being a person can occur only in relationships." The self is constructed by and constituted in relationships with "others" as well as with ourselves. Some of these "others" are actual beings and some are mental constructions; some provide positive influences and some offer negative ones; some are male and some are female; some are of our own ethnic groups but many are not.

The influences of significant others give form and substance to our ego identity and to our psychological well-being (Combs 1962). Therefore, " since the self is achieved through social contact, it has to be understood in terms of others" (Kelly 1962, 9). Educational programs should teach students about the natural reciprocity between self and other, how to develop relationships with a variety of "others," and how to treat these interactions with honor and care.

As individuals "we" also have relationships with ourselves. Randour (1987) points out that, "We think about our thinking, review our performance, evaluate how we responded in a certain situation. At times, we talk to ourselves" (p. 4). But even then, we are not alone because we carry all of our prior relationships with us intrapsychically. Therefore, an individual is a conglomerate and can never be independent of relationships with others (Kegan 1982; Ochs 1983). Given this reality, assessments of how we are getting along and efforts to improve it must attend to relationships with both self and others.

Too often we identify ourselves by narrowly defined roles and positions, and our relationships with each other are restricted to these boundaries. For example, the identity we acquire from our jobs becomes for many the only one worthy of developing and celebrating. In school, cognitive skills and mental abilities are developed to the virtual exclusion of everything else. Expression of our aesthetic selves is restricted to the occasions when we participate in "high" culture activities, such as attending concerts, operas, and ballets. When "the whole person" is not nurtured and enabled, individuals do not know how to engage with themselves and others on different levels and dimensions. They may develop their thinking skills but not their moral and ethical convictions; they may be able to share information with others but not to empathize with the social conditions of others; they may be able to understand facts but not to show compassion or caring. Understanding and accepting self facilitates the understanding and accepting of others.

Foundations for Getting Along

Of equal importance as knowing who "we" are by gender, individuality, and ethnicity is understanding some basic foundations for getting along cross-racially, ethnically, and culturally. Several different foundations come to mind. First is recognizing and honoring the *human right* of individuals and groups to be different and that there is nothing inherently wrong or derogatory about being different. In fact, it is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the human condition. We need to understand the limitations of our own conceptions of normalcy and accept the fact that different cultures offer a variety of values and expectations for regulating human behavior. Instead of these various standards being mutually exclusive or adversarial, they can be complementary and enrich each other.

A second condition for getting along cross-racially and cross-culturally is having a genuine respect for each other's human dignity. Regardless of how much individuals and groups may differ in physical and cultural identity, beliefs, values, experiences, and issues of concern, these should not be used as reasons to assault human dignity in the process of negotiating differences. Clear distinctions should be made between the circumstances of people's existence, their stations in life, and their worth as human beings. Thus, people who are able to relate across racial, ethnic, and social class lines can separate out

the factors and effects of poverty in the lives of poor Native Americans from their human worth and can see and celebrate their human dignity despite their economic status. Similarly, they understand that upper-class whites are not automatically better human beings simply because of their ethnic identity, social status, and educational level.

Getting along in an ethnically and culturally pluralistic society also means being mindful of the fact that our national and human heritages are composites of contributions from many diverse groups. Students must be taught to understand how we are indebted to each other and collectively responsible for what society is and can be. As Martin Luther King, Jr., explained, "We are all caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied into a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. We are made to live together because of the interrelated structure of reality" (Washington 1986, 254).

Another condition of getting along with culturally diverse individuals and groups is being open-minded and receptive to change. This involves questioning the accuracy and completeness of what we think we know about others and participating in interactions that extend beyond the boundaries of our present existence. For example, even after we think we have freed ourselves from overt racial prejudices, we should continue to monitor our language and behavior for subtle biases. The prospect of relating to people unlike ourselves should be welcomed as an opportunity for personal enrichment instead of an obstacle to be avoided or endured. For children, this might mean freely choosing learning partners who are ethnically diverse or learning some basic words in another language for social communication with their limited-English-speaking classmates. Adults may demonstrate this attribute by participating in leisure activities, such as going to movies, the theater, and fitness centers in locations where many different ethnic groups gather.

Getting along with culturally and socially different people also means valuing such relationships, being committed to their development, and acting upon these convictions. People who get along well with each other work at it. They understand that these relationships must be deliberately created and nurtured and that they require both sensitivity and skills in interpersonal interactions. They are aware of attitudes and behaviors others finding insulting, make conscious efforts to avoid these attitudes and behaviors, and learn how to interact in more facilitative and affiliative ways. These individuals are very ethical about their commitments to getting along. They do not allow them to be compromised by others who do not share them. For example, individuals who value interracial friendships do not stop pursuing them simply because others think they are unwise. Those who genuinely believe that racial and gender prejudices are intolerable under all circumstances do not sit passively and quietly while others engage in them, even if the perpetrators are dearly loved ones. Social and institutional actions that discriminate and oppress are opposed just as vehemently. Therefore, getting along cross-culturally incorporates elements of both *advocacy* and *agency*.

Applying principles of democracy to our personal and social interactions is another important condition for getting along. Of particular significance here are enfranchisement and empowerment as they relate to who participates and how they do so in culturally pluralistic relationships. All participants are treated with similar power, status, and prerogatives. Their right to tell their own stories in their own ways is respected, and the content of their life experiences is considered of equal worth. No one's "stories" are appropriated by someone else; nor does anyone attempt to interpret or "speak" for anyone other than themselves.

This feature of getting along is similar to what Molefi Asante (1991) describes as removing the dominance-subordinate order of the traditional relationship among different cultures and groups in the United States and having cultural and ethnic plurality without hierarchy. It also is consistent with Gordon Allport's (1954) contentions that interactions between diverse groups and individuals are more effective when they are of equal status and in pursuit of common goals.

Finally, getting along multiculturally means having the knowledge, will, and skills to engage in multiple, culturally diverse allegiances simultaneously without feeling that to do so is being fickle or superficial, or compromising one's integrity. Humans are complex, multidimensional beings. Achieving the full potential of their humanity requires a wide variety of knowledge, skills, relationships, and interactions. Those who understand this and act accordingly are able to relate well to individuals within and outside of their own racial, gender, ethnic, and cultural groups. They can cross these cultural borders with ease while remaining focused and centered in

their multiple and shifting identities and allegiances. They see these interactions as essential to their own betterment and to that of others, and they act assertively to make them available to self and others.

Therefore, getting along in a culturally pluralistic society means being at once self-asserting (actively pursuing one's unique identity and personal development) and self-abnegating (facilitating the development of others). It involves responding to what Patterson (1977, 13) calls the two great forces that underlie human culture and progress: "one pulls us toward the bosom of the group; the other pushes us toward the creation of ourselves as separate and distinct individual beings." It means penetrating the barriers and crossing the borders of race, ethnicity, class, and gender that traditionally have separated us. Gloria Anzaldua (1987) provides a poignant explanation of the challenges and benefits of living in and negotiating one's own cultural "borderlands" and those of others as avenues to new forms of human understanding. She explains that there is something very exhilarating about being an active participant in one's own creation, about seeing dormant areas of consciousness awaken, and witnessing the alien and unknown becoming the familiar.

By understanding, sorting out, and weaving together overlapping and complementary cultural strands from a variety of different sources, we become stronger and better human beings, individually and collectively (Rosaldo 1989). These contentions are substantiated by research findings reviewed by Bochner (1982). They reveal that "persons who are comfortably at home in more than one culture lead intellectually and emotionally more satisfying lives than monocultural individuals" (p. 37). Consequently, "from an adaptive point of view ... multicultural people are going to be more effective than monocultural individuals in dealing with the ever-growing number of cross-cultural encounters facing human beings in the future, as the world continues to shrink" (p. 36).

Obstacles to Getting Along

Unfortunately, not enough people in our society are getting along as well as they can and should. Several obstacles stand in their way. There are far too many for all to be discussed here. We have chosen to focus on three types that have direct implications for teaching and learning. These are social and informal interactions, differences among cultural systems, and educational tendencies in dealing with diversity.

Social and informal interactions

Despite the wide variety of ethnic and cultural diversity that exists in the United States, many of us have only minimal access to it. Most people live in ethnic and cultural enclaves with others like themselves. Cities are populated largely by ethnics of color who are poor and/or recent immigrants. The suburbs are inhabited predominately by middle- and upper-class European Americans. Places of work, worship, and recreation are often stratified along class, gender, and ethnic lines. Schools continue to be heavily segregated racially and economically despite more than four decades of integration efforts.

These situations do not provide many opportunities for socially, ethnically, and culturally diverse people to get to know each other on a significant level and to establish genuine bonds of kindredness. Instead, they breed stereotypes, prejudices, fears, suspicions, and hostilities toward diversity. If better intercultural relations are to occur, these need to be replaced with accurate knowledge about, substantive experiences with, and positive attitudes toward diverse groups and cultures. Bochner (1982) suggests that the best way to accomplish these is for individuals to acquire some experiential learning about each others' cultures and to create a critical mass of *multicultural* students and teachers who can mediate between diverse groups. Gentemann and Whitehead (1983) support this idea but refer to these mediators as "cultural brokers." These individuals can interpret cultural symbols from one frame of reference to another and can build "bridges of meaningfulness" between cultural systems.

How diversity is depicted in mass media creates another obstacle to effective interracial and intercultural interactions. Mass media are very powerful image and icon makers. In this capacity, they have a significant impact upon our perceptions and beliefs about ethnic groups and cultural differences. Newspapers, television, videos, and movies bombard us daily with subtle and overt images of ethnic, gender, and social discrimination and cultural distortions. What are individuals to think when they see people of color portrayed as violent menaces to society, when men are routinely presented as power brokers, and women and groups of color are seen as merely targets and consumers of decisions made by someone other than themselves? How can impressionable young females of color develop healthy self-concepts when they see few if any role models from their own ethnic groups profiled regularly in mass media?

These image voids or distortions make positive relations with self and others difficult to achieve. More often than not they play upon and aggravate the anxieties, fears, and gullibility of people.

The unrealistic positive expectations we have for intercultural interactions also can make them difficult to achieve. Many people assume that love, consensus, and the absence of conflict are the only bases upon which genuine interpersonal and interracial interactions can occur. Others think that once relationships are established, they will prevail across all circumstances and will flourish without being nourished. These expectations are naive and unattainable. More reasonable bases for establishing genuine and substantive interactions include the achievement of common goals and visions; respect for and desire to know each other; shared commitments to honoring the human dignity of everyone; opposition to oppression and exploitation; and shared memories, struggles, and hopes. We also need to understand the situational, contextual, task-specific, and need-gratification nature of relationships and interactions, instead of attaching an assumed universality and permanence to them.

Cultural differences

The existence of some significant *incompatibilities* between cultural systems creates another obstacle to diverse groups getting along with each other. Several researchers (Kochman 1982; Shade 1989; Spindler 1987; Trueba, Guthrie, and Au 1981) have suggested that these discontinuities involve the procedural and presentational styles more than the substantive or content components of cultures. In other words, *how* different ethnic and cultural groups code and deliver their values, beliefs, and ideas in expressive behaviors is more variant than what they believe, value, and think. For example, all groups value success, but what it means, how it is demonstrated, and how it is celebrated are culturally determined. Some cultures associate success with the accumulation of material wealth while others give priority to human services. All groups have some kind of work ethic. For some, this is translated into individual and competitive initiatives; others are more inclined toward group goals and cooperative efforts. Being unaware of these differences in "style" may lead us to incorrectly assume that people who do not behave as we do have no values and standards at all. Therefore, we may try to sever all contact with them or hasten to "fix" these individuals by imposing our standards upon them.

Differences in cultural rules that govern interpersonal conduct and communication can be especially problematic with respect to diverse groups sharing ideas and information and to genuinely caring about each other's well-being. This is because communication plays a pivotal role in conveying cultural and personal meanings. It involves an intricate matrix of verbal, nonverbal, and symbolic social acts that occur within specific contexts. Understanding both the content and context, the forms and functions of these is fundamental to improving intergroup relations (Hymes 1972; Porter and Samovar 1991). Kochman (1981) illustrates this point in his comparisons of African-Americans' and European-Americans' conceptions and styles of "argument." He says "blacks distinguish between argument used to debate a difference of opinion and argument used to ventilate anger and hostility.... Whites, on the other hand, fail to make these distinctions because argument for them functions only to ventilate anger and hostility" (pp. 18–19). These different presentation styles can cause Blacks and Whites to suspect the sincerity, integrity, and honesty of each other when they say they want to resolve conflicts and disagreements.

Porter and Samovar (1991) identify six specific aspects of communication that can be discordant and interfere with effective cross-cultural interactions. They are: (1) *perceptions*, or the social constructions of reality that we use to attribute meaning and value to social objects, events, and interactions; (2) *verbal components*, such as language usage, thinking patterns, information processing, problem solving, and the sequential structures of conversations; (3) *nonverbal processes*, which employ silent and symbolic forms of language, rhythms, and cadences of speech, concepts of time, and the use and organization of space; (4) *social relationships*, including rules and patterns of social etiquette, decorum, status, intimacy, authority, and managing hostility; (5) *motivation*, or the priority given to different goals, response dispositions to various systems of rewards and recognitions, and the underlying ideas, values, and beliefs that give meaning and direction to behavior; and (6) *self-disclosure and self-presentation*, or cultural styles and techniques that individuals use to convey their personality traits, individual values, and issues of priority. Each

of these offers different opportunities and challenges for building better culturally diverse relationships.

Educational tendencies

How issues of ethnic, racial, and social diversity are typically dealt with in schools constitutes another major obstacle to getting along interculturally. First, many educators continue to deny the existence and importance of cultural diversity. This is evident in statements like, "When I work with students, I see no differences. I treat them all the same," and, "The more important issue is that we are all human beings."

Second, too many teachers try to avoid, minimize, or anesthetize controversial issues like racism, sexism, powerlessness, and privilege. They teach that "through personal initiative anyone can transcend limitations of race, class, ethnicity, and gender, and achieve greatness." However, many students find it difficult to relate to the culturally "boundless and borderless" individuals presented to validate this point. To these students, "role models" like this do not seem genuine and authentic. As a result, the students may resent teachers for suggesting that they accept and emulate these unrealistic idols.

A third common strategy that educators use in dealing with diversity is to focus exclusively on factual information. It assumes that knowledge about different ethnic, racial, social, and cultural groups is sufficient for students to build friendships and establish positive relationships. This information tends to emphasize historical facts, institutions, and cultural artifacts, such as datelines, arts, music, literature, and crafts. Rarely does it extend to the dynamic dimensions of culture as applied in the daily lives of individuals and groups. These emphases are justified with explanations to the effect that, "We don't want to create and perpetuate new stereotypes by identifying cultural traits, values, beliefs, and behaviors of groups, since individual differences within groups are so great as to defy generalization."

Being cautious about perpetuating ethnic and racial stereotypes is wise indeed. However, individuals cannot learn how to relate to diverse people by avoiding the cultural attributes that make a real difference in how they give meaning to their lives. Nor can effective intercultural competencies be developed unless social practices and individual behaviors are critically analyzed, monitored, and modified to make them more sensitive to and inclusive of cultural diversity.

Multicultural education can help students improve their ability to get along with people from a wide variety of ethnic, cultural, and social backgrounds. It engages them in the deliberate study and celebration of cultural diversity with the intent of dispelling the notion that there is something inherently wrong, divisive, or destructive about cultural differences. Instead, it contends that diversity is a fundamental feature of our human birthright and our cultural legacy as citizens of the United States.

These initiatives, however, are being challenged by some very vocal critics. They contend that teaching about cultural diversity is a threat to the unity, common heritage, and continuous progress of the United States. A case in point is recent statements made by George Will (November 14, 1994), a columnist for *Newsweek*. He says, "multiculturalism is a campaign to lower America's moral status by defining the American experience in terms of myriad repressions and their victims" (p. 84). In a similar vein, Arthur Schlesinger (1992) makes references to "the cult of ethnicity," "the new ethnic gospel," and "multiethnic dogma" in claiming that cultural diversity places "the historical idea of a unifying American identity in peril.... It belittles *unum* and glorifies *pluribus*" (p. 17). The scare tactics of these arguments further aggravate the uncertainties some individuals have about cultural differences and thereby make the goal of diverse people getting along better more illusive.

Implications for Education

Educational interventions designed to improve racial and ethnic relations should deal directly with the dimensions and obstacles discussed above. Their substantive focus should always be on the *human*. This does not mean that cultural, ethnic, and social factors will be ignored or minimized, for they are central to understanding the essence of being human. People are by nature social, complex, and incredibly diverse beings. Their dignity, essence, and potential cannot be claimed, celebrated, nurtured, or shared without being sensitive to how expressions of humanity are culturally situated and determined. All of these have serious ramifications for designing curriculum and instruction to help students become more competent in interpersonal and cross-cultural relations. They include strategies grounded in valuing and respecting cultural diversity; becoming knowledgeable about the cultural characteristics, perspectives, and experiences of different racial, eth-

nic, and social groups; developing *functional* skills for multicultural settings and relationships; and having the moral conviction and will to live by standards that demand the acceptance of cultural diversity and human dignity.

Implied in what we have said thus far is that getting along is a comprehensive challenge. To accomplish it effectively requires comprehensive and interdisciplinary curriculum content, instructional strategies, and learning skills. It is not enough to simply know facts about other people's histories; we must know their cultures and our own, as well as techniques for how to respect, value, honor, and celebrate ourselves and others. Consequently, the mind, emotions, and behaviors must be affected. As Ford (1994) suggests, getting along is not some abstract or academic issue "out there" separated from us personally; it is within ourselves, our families, and our communities — it is a very personal and immediate thing! Instructional programs designed to help students develop intercultural relational skills should incorporate information, insights, and methodologies gleaned from anthropology, sociology, the arts, psychology, sociolinguistics, political science, and the humanities.

Furthermore, not only should students discover what it takes to get along cross-culturally, they should have regular opportunities to practice the necessary skills. The 50 steps suggested by Ford (1994) is a good place to start. They cover a wide range of possibilities for dealing with self, family, community, the nation, and the world. They extend from recognizing racism and sexism, to using unbiased language, to finding unity in spiritual diversity, to organizing political actions, to developing a national vision, to becoming a messenger of hope.

These general parameters for developing educational programs to improve the quality of human relations in multicultural contexts should be embellished by several other more specific components. They include goals and objectives such as:

- Knowing and accepting various forms of diversity as a social and personal reality, strength, and goal.
- Building multicultural communities of learners based on the various diversifying factors they bring to the classroom. A critical attribute of these communities is diverse students engaged in *equal status*, collaborative, and cooperative working relationships to achieve common personal, social, and intellectual goals.
- Developing a commitment to cultivating cross-racial, cross-cultural, and cross-gender relationships as a means of enhancing one's own humanity and the collective common good.
- Developing an intolerance of all kinds of human indignity, disrespect, oppression, and exploitation and a commitment to promote and participate in resistance actions to eliminate them.
- Learning how to monitor one's own values and behaviors for evidence of cultural bias, hegemony, adaptation, and pluralism.
- Analyzing various sources, expressions, and effects of cultural diversity for both individuals and groups.
- Exhibiting attitudes, values, and behaviors which embody the idea that having access to cultural diversity is both a privilege and a responsibility of citizenship in the United States and the global village.
- Creating an ethical code of conduct for intercultural interactions.

These goals are desirable and achievable but they are not automatically or easily attained. They require the use of systematic and sustained efforts. The review of research on different approaches to improving ethnic and cultural interactions conducted by Furnham and Bochner (1982) generated a specific training model, which should be the centerpiece of skills taught for improving intercultural relations. It includes the following:

- *Perceptive skills* for synchronizing verbal and nonverbal behaviors.
- *Expressive skills* for conveying appropriate emotional tones of voice for different cultural settings, purposes, and participants.
- *Conversation skills* that include appropriate vocabulary, timing, speaker exchanges, topics, self-disclosure, and presentation styles.
- *Assertiveness skills* for claiming one's own rights to cultural diversity without being arbitrary, overly intrusive, or insensitive.
- *Emotional skills* for expressing a wide range of feelings, beliefs, values, and opinions and determining their appropriateness for different situations.
- *Anxiety management skills* for coping with stress in culturally pluralistic settings, situations, and interactions.

- *Affiliative skills* for expressing feelings of caring, sharing, affinity, and compassion with culturally diverse individuals and groups.

This set of skills helps to dispel the notion that getting along can be accomplished by desire alone. While desire is necessary, it has to be complemented with knowledge and skills.

Teachers also need to create classroom climates in which getting along intra- and interculturally is the normative expectation. Commitment to this goal should radiate through everything that happens, including wall decorations, materials, and resources selected for use in the classroom, how students are organized for learning, the content of curriculum and instruction, and the assessment of student achievement and teacher effectiveness. In other words, the classroom should become a laboratory for *experiential learning* in how to relate to self and others. Students should be taught how to be self-reflective and critically conscious about their own and others' culturally diverse thoughts, values, and behaviors. Culturally diverse content should be incorporated in all dimensions of teaching and learning, including such fundamental areas as reading, writing, science, mathematics, and critical thinking. Teachers should use themselves as models and objects of critique in demonstrating desirable cross-cultural interaction skills. They should validate the necessity and benefits of struggle in embracing self and others on a more genuine level. The idea here is that getting along requires deliberate efforts and time. It also is *everyone's business at all times* rather than being the responsibility of a few individuals and restricted to selected circumstances.

Several other classroom climate factors should be cultivated that will facilitate skill development in intercultural relations. They include: (1) establishing equal status and power-sharing relationships among students and between students and teachers; (2) implementing intercultural protocols and rules of decorum for use in the classroom; (3) holding students accountable for abiding by the rules and expectations for how intercultural relationships will be developed, conducted, and honored; and (4) celebrating successful efforts of individual students and the entire class in getting along, as well as sanctioning violations of protocols and standards.

Having students role-play, dramatize, visually depict (in posterboard displays, collages, photo essays, and video logs), and write about examples and non-examples of getting along are good training devices for them to practice intercultural relational skills. Other techniques that work well are intergroup and culturally diverse peer teaching, partner learning, pen pals, and exchange programs. These can be conducted within the classroom, the school, and with other schools in the same district or neighboring communities. For example, students in suburban classrooms may become pen pals and participate in exchange programs with their urban counterparts. Another opportunity to practice getting along can be found in students in one grade "adopting" a lower grade in the same school (for instance, fourth graders working with first graders) to model and teach interactional skills. Students can also use characters and situations portrayed in ethnic literature to practice intercultural and interpersonal problem-solving skills.

If the composite of these goals and skills is taught conscientiously and systematically, the obstacles to getting along can be eliminated. Whether the target is getting along better with ourselves or with others within or outside of our own ethnic, racial, gender, class, and cultural groups, the results will be better when the intervention strategies outlined above are implemented. It is imperative to remember that getting along cross-culturally and interpersonally is not a skill that is acquired automatically by merely living in a pluralistic society; it must be learned. How well this is done is a direct reflection of the values attached to getting along and the clarity with which the various dimensions of the challenge are identified and understood. It is an issue of utmost importance as we envision future educational programs that are more closely aligned with personal, social, and global needs. Culturally different people simply must learn how to get along better with each other and with themselves. The future quality of our individual and collective lives depends upon our abilities to relate constructively with people from a variety of ethnic, social, national, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. The need is too crucial for anything less than no-holes-barred, comprehensive educational efforts.

References

Allport, G. W. 1954. *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Anzaldua, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La frontera: The new Mestiza.* San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Asante, M. K. 1991. The Afrocentric idea in education. *Journal of Negro Education* 60: 170–180.

Bochner, S. 1982. The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In *Cross-cultural interaction: Theory and definition of the field*, edited by S. Bochner. New York: Pergamon.

Combs, A. W., ed. 1962. *Perceiving behaving becoming: A new focus for education*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ford, C. W. 1994. *We can all get along: 50 steps you can take to help end racism*. New York: Dell.

Furnham, A., and S. Bochner. 1982. Social difficulty in a foreign culture: An empirical analysis of cultural shock. In *Cross-cultural interaction: Theory and definition of the field*, edited by S. Bochner. New York: Pergamon.

Gentemann, K. M., and T. L. Whitehead. 1983. The cultural broker concept in bicultural education. *Journal of Negro Education* 54: 118–129.

Grossman, H., and S. H. Grossman. 1994. *Gender issues in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hymes, D. 1972. Introduction. In *Functions of language in the classroom*, edited by C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, and D. Hymes. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Kegan, R. 1982. *The evolving self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kelly, E. C. 1962. The fully functioning self. In *Perceiving behaving becoming: A new focus for education*, edited by A. W. Combs. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kochman, T. 1982. *Black and white styles in conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, D. 1975. The black family: Socialization and sex roles. *Phylon* 36(3): 221–237.

Ochs, C. 1983. *Women and spirituality*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Patterson, O. 1977. *Ethnic chauvinism: The reactionary impulse*. New York: Stein and Day.

Porter, R. E., and L. A. Samovar. 1991. Basic principles of intercultural communication. In *Intercultural communication: A reader*, 6th ed., edited by L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Randour, M. L. 1987. *Women's psyche, women's spirit: The reality of relationships*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rosaldo, R. 1989. *Culture & truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Samovar, L. A., and R. E. Porter, eds. 1991. *Intercultural communication: A reader*, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schlesinger, Jr., A. M. 1992. *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York: Norton.

Shade, B. J., ed. 1989. *Culture, style, and the educative process*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Spindler, G. D., ed. 1987. *Education and cultural process: Anthropological perspectives*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Trueba, H. T., G. P. Guthrie, and K. H. P. Au, eds. 1981. *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Washington, J. M., ed. 1986. *A testament of hope: The essential writings and speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* San Francisco: Harper.

Will, G. F. November 14, 1994. A kind of compulsory chapel: Multiculturalism is a campaign to lower America's moral status. *Newsweek*. 124(21): 84.

What Is Stopping Us From Celebrating our Differences?

A Personal Reflection

Anne S. Watt

The author describes her increasing sensitivity and involvement with multicultural education that has culminated in her work with Primary Source, a nonprofit teacher center.

> [A] new spectre is haunting the world — the fear of ethnic conflict and the ethnic cleansing to which it seems to lead. Did we awake from the familiar nightmare of the cold war only to find ourselves confronting the terrors of our own basest instincts, the primordial urge to band together with those like ourselves and harass or kill those who are different? (Maybury-Lewis 1994)

> We know that the natural feelings of discomfort we experience around those whose appearance or practices or beliefs are different from ours can lead to distrust, hostility, and even hatred. When aggravated by perceived unfairness, these feelings often explode into physical violence, as they have periodically here in the United States and recently in the unspeakable horrors of Bosnia and Rwanda. The only available remedy is education (Brandt 1994)

Dealing with difference has been a major theme in my life since my teenage years. Because I am fascinated by people, customs, and cultures that are different from my own, I have found it very difficult to understand how differences can create so much fear and hatred among otherwise reasonable people. My own approach to difference has been to learn as much as I can, seeking both personal and professional insight into the roots of intolerance while becoming a teacher, first of children and then of teachers.

Actually the story is more complex than that, and one I am pleased to try to unravel in these pages. This article has two major parts. The first is autobiographical: I trace my own history of 43 years of fascination with difference. In the second, I describe my approach for helping teachers to become anti-racist multicultural educators, an approach refined over the past four years while I have served as co-director of a nonprofit teacher resource center.

Anne S. Watt, Ed.D., is Associate Director of Primary Source, a multicultural teacher education and resource center in Cambridge, Mass. She is also a prejudice reduction trainer for the World of Difference Institute of the Anti-Defamation League. Previously, Anne was a director of staff development in three Westchester, NY, school districts and an elementary principal in Tarrytown.

Reprint requests should be sent to the author at P.O. Box 381711, Cambridge, MA, 02238. E-mail primary@ace.com

Part One

I was born into a "liberal" WASP old Yankee family and grew up with all the protections and advantages such status confers, including first-rate schooling and interesting summer vacations. Most of my friends came from similar backgrounds; we thought of ourselves as quite ordinary.

Though aware of the presence of blacks (our long-term housekeeper), and Catholics (my great aunt's maids), it wasn't until I learned that Jews, including my seventh grade boyfriend, were not invited to the Boston "social dances" that I first recall becoming aware of prejudice. My response to this gross inequity — supported by my mother — was to refuse all invitations to these dances with a fiery note attacking the host organization for unfairness. From that moment, I began to wonder what it was about being Jewish that Boston society did not like? Why didn't Christians accept Jews if Jesus was a Jew? Meanwhile, my progressive education provided me with no knowledge of the Holocaust — even though it had occurred during my early childhood years.

As for people of African descent, though I went to school and university in the Boston area, I came into contact with only eight black students during all those years. I never spoke to any of them, though I secretly agreed with the "black is beautiful" theme that emerged in the late 1950s. I assumed it would seem "fake" just to strike up a conversation with a person of color. In truth, I felt too ashamed and guilty to approach these college classmates, because black people were descendants of slaves and my ancestors had enslaved them.

Instead, I threw myself into an attempt to expiate my guilt by "fixing the problem." I joined the campus chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) where I could safely march, distribute leaflets, and act like a true liberal. I brought a black male friend home to test my parents' liberal values. (They were not happy.) After sophomore year, I spent a summer as an intern at an interracial camp outside Philadelphia where a handsome African caught my fancy and where I found that sharing work, singing, and community living helped to bridge racial and cultural differences. I declared myself an anthropology major. After that, it was the International Student Association, with fascinating Indian, Israeli, and Arab acquaintances. By the time college was over in 1959, I had met people from many countries — yet I still knew no Americans of color as friends.

After marrying a Scot and living for two years in the United Kingdom, I returned to the United States in 1962. The Civil Rights Movement was heating up and (from a safe distance in New York) I was deeply troubled to hear George Wallace's racist diatribes and to read about the humiliation of courageous black children trying to desegregate Mississippi schools. But I stayed on the sidelines feeling powerless, giving away my inherited Georgia Power Company stock to the Southern Poverty Law Center, and discreetly picketing the White Tower restaurant chain in Brooklyn. Though I still felt ashamed of being white, I felt somewhat redeemed to be a "liberal" northerner. At least I was not a part of the problem.

In the late 1960s, my husband joined an adventurous group of liberal academics in the founding of an experimental college, and so we moved to Southern California. There, some students urged us to try a three-day "Urban Plunge" organized by the Sisters of the Sacred Heart in East Los Angeles. This was a great moment of change for me.

First we were sent out in pairs to visit poor black, gay, and Hispanic night spots in the city. This was followed by much intense group discussion around race, class, and gender differences, all the while with little food or sleep. By the end of the weekend, we realized that "liberals" were nice middle class people who gave money and paid lip service to equality, without ever risking our comfort or privilege. Liberals identified the victims of discrimination as the problem. Liberals got involved in fighting for civil rights at their dinner parties, on paper, and in theory. Liberals were US!

So we returned home to join the battle, to "walk the walk and not just talk the talk." The first thing was to get involved advocating desegregation of the public school system our oldest child was about to enter. Next, I started an interracial nursery school on the college campus, literally ringing doorbells in the barrio to persuade black and Hispanic parents to send their children to the preschool.

We sold our house on the hill and were helped by an African-American friend to rent a smaller one in a black and Hispanic neighborhood. Here, our three young children (aged 3, 5 and 9) had an advantage I had missed growing up in Boston: they played exclusively with black and Hispanic children in a lower middle class neighborhood, where we were one of just two white families. At the same time, our daughters were bussed back up the hill to attend the newly

desegregated school where there was still a white majority. We lived comfortably for three years in our small house and were well accepted in this neighborhood — although every summer we escaped back east to our New England farmhouse and Boston relatives.

I now considered myself a "radical." I was glad to let go of friendships with some whites who "couldn't understand" what we were doing in favor of the deepening friendships that developed with our black neighbors and their children. Our daughters spent nights in each other's homes, and we had many bicultural experiences with the parents: learning to cook chitterlings and cactus, spending whole nights carousing with their friends in the Watts section of East Los Angeles, sharing a Christmas tin drum backyard barbecue, accompanying gospel singing. We shared each others' lives and all felt greatly enriched.

Looking back on this period of the seventies, I realize that my entire "radical" horizon extended no further than the welfare of my own nuclear family. Occasionally I would get into heated arguments about race and inequity, but ghettoized white culture angered me and my flaring temper did not encourage a thoughtful exchange of ideas, useful debate, or change in others. I avoided (and was avoided by) many of our previous white acquaintances.

At that time, I had been carrying a four-fifths load as an adjunct faculty member in the education department of a local state college. When I applied for a full-time position, I found myself directly confronted with oppression. Despite strong recommendations and after months of stalling and painful disingenuity by the very colleagues who had recommended me, I was *not* hired, and the position was not filled. I later learned that the dean considered me "another of those radical feminists from a snobby eastern university" — just like the "trouble maker" he had had to deal with a year before I arrived.

Following some bitterness and cynicism, I entered a doctoral program in 1976. My teaching of teachers for the previous two years had been greatly influenced by Gerald Weinstein's *Toward Humanistic Education* (1970), so our family U-hauled back east and I joined Weinstein's program in humanistic education at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst.

These were heady times at UMass. Dwight Allen had opened the doors of the Ed School to many aspiring black New York City community school administrators, and our classes were all about racism, power, struggle, and oppression. I had thought I was well prepared to take part in the struggle for equity and social justice while still grounding my goals in the human potential movement and humanistic education. But in courses on racism, I was constantly confronted by colleagues of color about my inability to grasp the meaning of institutional oppression or to acknowledge my role in its perpetuation. I was finally forced to acknowledge the reasons for the paucity of black or other minority "voices" in the humanistic education courses. At that time, humanistic educators were not interested in looking at the centrality of racism and institutional oppression in our education system and in our lives.

But I could no longer avoid examining my own role as a white educator entrapped in a racist system that I was probably helping to maintain by blinkering myself inside the human potential movement. Although I continued to believe in programs that promoted individual self-esteem by teaching students to respect and appreciate one another and to celebrate cultural diversity, I became aware that, however noble an individual program might sound, it was doomed to fail if the school context itself was racist. I realized that my own program in humanistic education was based upon a dangerous and fallacious image — that of the great American melting pot: *e pluribus unum*. The program was only marginally interested in institutional oppression; questions of race, class, and gender inequity were rarely raised, except in an individual context. The world of humanistic education was a mostly white, middle class world — one in which I was increasingly uncomfortable as I came to see that I was part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

Yet how was I to shift from being part of the problem to helping with solutions? How was I to make a dent in the many kinds of institutional discrimination created and still maintained by my dominant white culture? Could one white person make a difference? Could the insidious patterns of racism ever be destroyed? I began to think about these heady questions as I read case histories of whites who had taken a real stand against oppression in their lives; people like Lillian Smith (1961), Judith Katz (1978), Lois Stalvey (1989), Robert Terry (1988), Robert Moore, founder of the *Council for Interracial Books for Children* in New York, and James Edler, a colleague at UMass whose unpublished doctoral work (1976) set forth a series of stages of White Racial

Identity Development. I began to wonder if there were any patterns in the lives of these white people who had worked to dismantle racism. Did they share any common experiences? What might they teach me?

As a student of developmental psychology, I found Edler's description of stages of white identity development intriguing. More recently, I have discovered that Rita Hardiman (1979) and Beverly Daniel Tatum (1992) also espouse somewhat similar theories of white racial identity development.[1] Drawing from these and other authors, I have observed in my own development the possibility of five distinguishable stages of racial identity development that white people may experience. They are:

Stage 1. There is no race problem. I am not aware that anyone is oppressed in our free, democratic society. We live in the best system in the world. Anyone can get ahead.

Stage 2. There may be racism in the parts of the United States (like cities) where minorities live. Racism is brought about when minorities, especially blacks who have problems, complain a lot, and don't seem to be able to use our system to get ahead. But *I* am not a racist and nobody in *my community* is prejudiced.

Stage 3. Racism exists; it is a poison that hurts black people and other minorities. It was caused by the history of slavery, and, knowing that history, I feel guilty about being white. To help rid the country of racism, I'll help those who suffer from it in any way I can. I'll tell my children that racism is unfair; I'll be "seen" with black people; I'll support the idea of hiring the school's first black teacher and try to get more minority children admitted; I'll send money to black organizations like Klanwatch, so they can continue working to fight this ongoing problem. While I feel ashamed that my people have caused so much pain for black people and uncomfortable that I carry the badge of whiteness, it helps me to support liberal causes like these.

Stage 4. I have now come to recognize that racism in the United States is not a black problem but a white problem. White people continue to support racism because we benefit from it. Racism can be viewed as *individual* acts of unfair treatment; as *cultural* acts, such as the omission from school curricula of the cultural contributions of non-whites; and as the pervasive *institutional* structures that provide middle class whites like me with unearned advantages over people of color. No matter what I do or don't do, I am a part of the ongoing problem of racism, even though I cannot personally be blamed for its history. It is therefore my responsibility as a white woman to work to undo racism in all of these contexts.

Stage 5. As a white American, I am part of a *system* that continues to confer many unearned privileges on white men and women in the United States because of our skin color alone.[2] Because racism damages all our lives, I, too, am a victim of it. Acting out of neither guilt nor superiority, I can form alliances with others of all backgrounds who commit their lives to helping to heal the wounds of racism. I recognize my white privilege but am committed to sharing its benefits.

As an educator, this means striving to oppose all forms of discrimination in schools and helping to transform our education system. This requires that I take a stand against racism and injustice toward children and teachers and parents, that I resist complicity in the systems of oppression while trying to be an ally to white people who still don't understand their complicity. I will work toward healing the wounds and scars of racism, through reaching out and embracing a diverse human community in my friendships, work relationships, and political life.

As an educator, multiculturalism means striving to oppose all forms of discrimination in schools and helping to transform our education system.

Toward the end of graduate school in the late 1970s, an African-American friend and I formed a small consulting business. We called ourselves *Biracial Associates*, consultants in racism awareness, conflict resolution, and prejudice reduction. We gave workshops for teachers and dormitory heads on the UMass campus and even did a presentation for the U.S. Navy at the University of Maryland. But with Reagan's election in 1980, racism became a left-wing rallying cry, implying violent clashes. Most organizations simply denied that racism festered in their ranks. Our consulting ran dry.

Meanwhile, I entered public school administration for ten years, first as a staff development and

curriculum director, and then as an elementary principal in a largely Hispanic school. Plagued by administrative demands, I found it frustrating trying to make an impact on the institutional oppression I witnessed and unintentionally participated in daily. I saw it in the way Hispanic preschoolers were tracked by developmental screening, in the way lunchroom and playground aides treated children who were non-white, in the way needy children were labeled and placed in special education, in the kind of textbooks that were purchased by the district, and, finally, in the way some teachers either unknowingly excluded black and Hispanic children from the classroom process or blatantly lowered their expectations for non-English-speaking, poor, and minority children.

After ten years of trying to make a difference as a school administrator, I decided in 1990 to spend my time and energy focusing directly on what I care most about: anti-racist, multicultural education. First, I joined the Anti-Defamation League's "A World of Difference Institute" and became a prejudice-reduction trainer in schools where discriminatory incidents had taken place. At the Anti-Defamation League, I also developed and taught a course called "Learning About Differences" for juvenile hate-crime offenders (as part of their probation requirement), and I wrote an ESL curriculum on how to deal with hate-crimes for newly arrived Vietnamese immigrants in Boston.

But most of my time has gone into helping a colleague create Primary Source, a nonprofit teacher center in Cambridge, Mass., whose mission is to face down racism and other forms of discrimination in classrooms, schools, and communities, while promoting a high standard of hands-on teaching of the humanities from multiple perspectives, using original source materials.

Part Two

At the teacher center, we assist teachers in gathering and using original source materials so that their students, from preschool through twelfth grade, will gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of their own and many other ethnic, racial, and cultural histories, "unlearn" prejudices in order to develop tolerance and respect for major differences among peoples and cultures, and become motivated to take action against the social injustices that they find in their lives. These three elements comprise a paradigm for transforming curriculum, schools, and communities. Most of our work is, of course, with teachers.

Expanding teachers' knowledge base

The first phase of our work is to research, gather, and provide teachers with primary source materials that represent the history and culture of those people whose "voices" and history have not been well represented in published texts. For many of us, our education was rich in the history of western European male heritage, and not much else. We learned of Chaucer and T. S. Eliot, of Columbus and Benjamin Franklin, of Thomas Edison and William Gates. We know far, far less about others who have made our nation what it is today. What about Americans of African heritage and Mexican heritage? The many Asian heritages or the Hispanic/Latino heritage? What about the history of the indigenous peoples who were here when Europeans arrived? And finally, what of women's roles in all of this history? Our students need to hear the "voices" of the many different peoples whose struggle and achievement have made our country what it is today. Such information will yield a more accurate view of U.S. history for all.

Adrienne Rich (1994) poignantly reminds us that "When those who have the power to name and to socially construct reality choose not to see you or hear you, whether you are dark-skinned, old, disabled, or female, or you speak with a different accent or dialect from theirs; when someone with the authority of a teacher, say, describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked in a mirror and saw nothing" (p. 1).

One by-product of adding to the Euro-American "canon" more information about both noteworthy and ordinary women and men from non-European backgrounds is that the heritages of more of our diverse student population are then recognized. Geography, history, literature, arts, and music featuring women and different ethnic groups affirm that the history and culture of students in that group are important. This information enables students to see themselves in the curriculum and thus to feel connected to the educational process. Often this builds academic self-esteem, provides the impetus to remain in school, and encourages motivation to overcome linguistic and cultural alienation and to succeed — despite many lingering institutional racist patterns.

An example of a program that adds relevance to history for African-American students is a classroom drama and discussion program in which white author Harriet Beecher Stowe seeks support for *Uncle Tom's Cabin* from an impressive (but little known) African-American Boston abolitionist, Lewis Hayden. Though the time is 1853, the stereotyping of black people — even by progressive whites like Stowe — raises issues still of relevance today.

Unlearning stereotypes

The second approach we use with teachers is inextricably related to the expansion of their knowledge base. It involves helping teachers examine and "unlearn" stereotypes they may have grown up with; an examination of these biases is, we believe, an essential element in empowering and preparing teachers to teach about heritages other than their own.

Gordon Allport (1979) reminds us, in his monumental study on the nature of prejudice, that no one is born with prejudice: it is learned from our earliest years, as one aspect of predictable cognitive development. All children learn prejudices about those people, cultures, and religions that are outside their experience. As long as no accurate information is provided about these differences — particularly differences in gender, ethnicity, culture, religion, race, language, or physical ability — biases and stereotypes are likely to be nourished.

For example, a two- to three-year-old may assume that there is a relationship between brown skin and dirt, based on the similarity of color. If the relationship is never explained and corrected, a stereotype is likely to be set in place that will become harder to replace with fact as the child grows older. The manner in which a parent or teacher helps the child replace such stereotypes with correct information will either deepen or reduce the prejudice. The white mother who blushes and apologizes when her three-year-old points to an African-American man in the supermarket and asks why he has brown skin is sending the child a clear message that it is not okay to talk about skin color.[3]

Like children, teachers, too, have acquired prejudices. They must also examine and "unlearn" many of these long-unexamined assumptions about people who are different from themselves in order to teach with efficacy. When teachers try to include in their lessons material about different cultural groups with whom they have unexamined stereotypes and little personal experience, not only will their biases be passed on, but students from those backgrounds will quickly sense that their own experience exists outside the norms of this classroom.

Thus, in addition to filling some very significant knowledge gaps, we provide opportunities for educators to examine prejudices that they have developed throughout their lives, in a safe, nonjudgmental setting. Here they can begin to dispel some of their, long-held, usually unexamined feelings of discomfort about people who are different, in significant ways, from themselves.

This approach draws on the work of Cherie Brown (1992), whose National Coalition Building Institute provides prejudice reduction and conflict resolution training for people in all walks of life. Brown claims that all of us unconsciously "record" and internalize "tapes" of information and misinformation about people who are different from us. Reeducation is necessary if we want to increase our tolerance for differences, not to mention learning to respect, appreciate, and even celebrate differences. This approach is also influenced by the Anti-Defamation League's A World of Difference Institute.

While we continue to refine the design of the "unlearning stereotypes" segment of our own particular professional development program for teachers, we have identified at least five significant components that are especially appropriate for white, American-born teachers. These include:

- *Taking pride in identity*: acknowledging pride of heritage by getting in touch with aspects of one's own ethnic, religious, cultural, and gender group memberships
- *Identifying learned prejudices*: discovering and acknowledging attitudes acquired since early childhood from parents, peers, teachers, the media, books, and life experiences
- *Recognizing examples of discrimination in our own lives*: identifying instances when we were treated as "outsiders," stereotyped, or discriminated against as we moved to a new school or neighborhood or when we traveled in a country where we didn't know the language, when we were teased for being clumsy, fat, or poorly dressed, when we were isolated in a job, etc.
- *Identifying instances of discrimination against people without power in U.S. schools*: recognizing school policies and practices that discriminate, by commission or by omission, against females and non-mainstream teachers and students.

These include methods of teaching, curriculum content, placement and tracking of students, programs for integrating bilingual students and those with special needs, policies about parent contacts, tests, grading, use of the public address system, opportunities for advancement for teachers, etc.

- *Learning techniques to interrupt and counter racism and other discriminatory practices*: finding ways to intervene with gentleness born of the understanding that people's attitudes and behavior are more likely to change if they are offered new information nonjudgmentally and treated with respect even as they are pressed to make necessary changes.

Taking action to support social change

The third step in this professional development paradigm is to help teachers integrate anti-bias attitudes, hands-on teaching skills, and information about the history and culture of underrepresented people. In our particular approach, we have developed a program called *Transforming Teaching: Transforming Learning*. We begin, as before, with the teachers. Our institutes for kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers combine a hands-on, interactive model of research and cooperative learning with activities involving oral history, map-making, developing timelines, using artifacts, and unlearning stereotypes. Guest speakers representing cultures under study offer the perspectives of primary sources.

As we develop materials and structure the syllabus, we draw heavily on James Banks's (1993) paradigm for transforming the curriculum, in which one shifts the "mainstream perspective" away from the central focus of a study and substitutes a more inclusive focus. For example, in an institute entitled *A New Look at the Old West: Multicultural Voices from the Frontier, 1840-1910*, we examine this defining era of American history from the points of view of Native Americans and Mexicans who were already living in the western parts of the country, as well as the African-American pioneers, cowboys, and Buffalo Soldiers and the Chinese and Japanese who immigrated eastward in search of work during this period. Providing new teaching methods and non-textbook, original source material, this approach lays the groundwork for teachers to transform their teaching goals, attitudes, and methods, making them multidimensional and inclusive. One participant wrote that "they give you tools to teach in exciting and effective ways ... jumping-off points that encourage you to think about things differently."

The second part of this approach — *transforming learning* — follows the classroom work and calls for provision of long-term, school-based support for teachers, their students, and their school communities. It is essential to build a bridge connecting the ideas of a stimulating course with the realities of the classroom, the school, and the slow pace of change. A truly multicultural program, we have found, "deliberately infuses history, beliefs, traditions, and values of diverse cultures ... into all aspects of school life ... and provides children and members of the school community with the critical thinking skills they need to challenge the racism, stereotypes, and biases that plague society."[4]

Tailored to each school's needs, our staff developers must assist in teachers' classrooms, helping them try out methods already modeled in the institute; hold curriculum revision meetings with grade level and school-wide teams of teachers and administrators; offer staff-development leadership training for core teachers; address faculty meetings; and conduct "unlearning stereotypes" workshops for faculty, staff, and parents. In these ways, we begin to confront the reluctance of the adults in our school communities to acknowledge and begin to redress systemic educational inequities, while continuing to help students understand and value different perspectives through their studies.

Obviously the *Transforming Teaching: Transforming Learning* program at Primary Source is not a prescription for a mere two-hour in-service workshop. Nor is it necessarily the perfect approach for every situation. Rather, it is a program of support for adult development, curriculum transformation, and social change aimed at decreasing intolerance for differences. It has proved most effective when conducted over many weeks, and many months. It challenges educators to recognize that the single dimensionality of traditional mainstream education is no longer appropriate for today's students because it leads white students to what Brandt (1994) describes at the beginning of this article as "discomfort around those whose appearance or practices or beliefs are different, [which] can lead to distrust, hostility, and even hatred" (p. 3).

James Banks (December 1991–January 1992) believes that a multicultural approach to education will help the next generation of students from all

backgrounds learn to tolerate, accept, and respect each others' differences. In fact, he rallies scholars and teachers to recognize that multicultural education itself "grew out of the struggle guided by Western ideals of human dignity, equality, and freedom" (p. 35). In another moving statement that continues to inspire and provide direction for me and for my colleagues, Banks (1992) claims that:

> Multicultural education is necessary to help all of the nation's future citizens acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to survive in the twenty-first century. Nothing less than the nation's survival is at stake. The rapid growth in the nation's population of people of color, the escalating importance of non-white nations such as China and Japan, and the widening gap between the rich and the poor make it essential for our future citizens to have multicultural literacy and cross-cultural skills. In the twenty-first century, a nation whose citizens cannot negotiate on the world's multicultural global stage will be tremendously disadvantaged, and its very survival will be imperiled. (p. 36)

Looking back over these pages, I see that what began as an interest in people and cultures, customs, and values that are different from my own, has, over the years, slowly developed into a way of life, a calling. Appreciating differences and working for equity has become my identity, both as a teacher and as a person. As for helping others learn to accept and respect differences, while the calling is deeply engrained, it is not an easy path, and its success is hard to measure. Nonetheless, I am moved and inspired to continue with this mission by Nelson Mandela (1994) who — after 27 years in South African prisons — was able to say, "I never lost hope.... I always knew that deep down in every human heart, there is mercy and generosity. No one is born hating another person because of the color of his skin, or his background, or his religion. People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite" (p. 542).

Notes

1. Beverly Daniel Tatum (1992) has spent years observing white and non-white students' racial identity development in her psychology classes on racism at Mount Holyoke College. I agree with her conclusion that, "given the dominant/subordinate relationship of whites and people of color in this society, it is not surprising that this developmental process will unfold in different ways" (p. 9).

2. This concept has been brilliantly elucidated by Dr. Peggy McIntosh, co-director of the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, in her working paper #189, *White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences Through Work in Women's Studies* (1988).

3. One of the most enduring and useful books to help early childhood educators understand prejudice in young children and develop anti-bias curricula to address it directly is Louise Derman Sparks's (1989) *Anti-Bias Curriculum: Tools for Empowering Young Learners*, published by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1834 Connecticut Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20009-5786.

4. This excerpt comes from a comprehensive definition of multicultural education prepared by a task force for the Massachusetts Department of Education (1992) for use in all schools.

References

Allport, G. W. 1979. *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Banks, J. December 1991–January 1992. Multicultural education: For freedom's sake. *Educational Leadership* 49(4): 35.

Banks, J. 1992. Effective teaching practices for multicultural classrooms. In *Multicultural education for the twenty-first century*. Washington, DC: National Education Association Professional Library.

Banks, J. 1993. *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brandt, R. May 1994. Differences that divide, Values that unite. *Educational Leadership* 51(8): 3.

Brown, C. 1992. Prejudice Reduction Workshop Model, Trainer's Notes. National Coalition Building Institute International, 1835 K St., NW, Suite 715, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Hardiman, R. 1979. Unpublished paper.

Katz, J. H. 1978. *White awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Mandela, N. 1994. *Long walk to freedom*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Maybury-Lewis, D. Summer/Fall 1994. Ethnic conflict: The new world order. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*.

Rich, A. 1994. Quoted in *The feminist classroom* by F. Maher and M. K. T. Tetreault. New York: Basic Books, 1.

Smith, L. 1961. *Killers of the dream*. New York: Norton.

Stalvey, L. 1989. *The education of a WASP*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Tatum, B. D. Spring 1992. Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review* 62(1): 9.

Terry, R. 1988. *For whites only*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Weinstein, G., and M. D. Fantini. 1970. *Toward humanistic education: A curriculum of affect*. New York: Praeger.

Thinking Locally and Acting Locally

The Discussion Continues

At the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in the Spring of 1994, Dr. Madhu Prakash of Penn State and Dr. Dale Snauwaert of Adelphi University engaged in an impassioned discussion on the notion of "thinking locally and acting locally." Their respective arguments were published in the Fall 1994 issue of this journal. The articles were then sent to a number of ecologically minded educators with an invitation to them to lend their voices to the dialogue. Their responses follow. The Editors invite readers to continue the discussion in the form of Letters to the Editor.

Response to Madhu Prakash and Dale Snauwaert

David W. Orr

As educators committed to fostering wholeness, our mission is to promote not global thinking or local thinking, but rather the ability to think well, which includes aspects of both. Among other things, the ability to think well includes the recognition that:

- All actions have effects on one locality or another.
- Knowledge, responsibility, and care are easily diluted by distance, both spatial and psychological.
- Limits of scale and complexity affect all human action.
- Ignorance is not an altogether solvable problem.

Since all actions have effects on one locality or another, good thinking means understanding the ways in which places are linked ecologically, economically, and morally. Economic development in one place often means ecological ruin, economic dependency, and human degradation in another.

The distance between the mines, wells, forests, farms, and dumps and consumers in the global economy conceals the true costs of consumption. For the most part, we do not know what a thing as commonplace as a loaf of bread costs the world in energy, soil loss, climate stability, biological diversity, or cultural information.

Everything from mosquitoes to cities have limits of scale and complexity, beyond which they don't work very well. A mosquito the size of an elephant could not get off the ground. Similarly, human systems like cities and the global economy have limits imposed by scale and complexity beyond which they lose resilience and adaptability.

Are these problems solvable by yet more knowledge? Here is the great divide in the modern mind. The heirs of Descartes believe that ignorance can be solved by more research. Human knowledge, they believe, both is benign and can grow infinitely. This assumes that: (1) we are not losing old and still valuable knowledge as fast as we gain new knowledge; (2) new knowledge is retrievable at the time needed and in a form that can be used appropriately; (3) we will want to use such knowledge to good ends; and (4) that new knowledge is not destructive. For perspective, the only knowledge we have ever had that consistently worked to good purposes is what might be termed "slow knowledge," which is culturally accumulated over long periods of time by communities that have calibrated their needs to the ecological realities of a particular location.

The issue is not whether we will live in an increasingly global civilization, but rather what kind of world that will be. If it is one that runs roughshod over place, locality, ecology, and diversity in the name of economic efficiency or some other abstraction, it will be both disastrous and short-lived. If, on the other hand, it is a world built from the bottom up on a solid foundation of good communities, there is considerable hope for the human prospect.

Finally, I do not know what the phrase "transcommunal, democratic social intelligence" (professor Snauwaert's words) means, but I do believe that John Dewey had it right when he said that "Democracy must begin at home, and its home is the neighborly community" (1927/1954, 213).

Reference

Dewey, J. 1927/1954. *The Public and Its Problems*. Chicago: Swallow Press.

Thinking Beyond Our Noses, But Not Beyond Our Limits

David A. Gabbard

Like all jingoism, the "Think Globally, Act Locally" slogan contains rich deposits of emotional potency. Its sentiments appeal to a certain segment of the population, many of whom choose not to advertise their moral convictions on the bumpers of their cars. I suppose that people who do put bumper stickers on their cars must gain some degree of identity from the act. But somehow I find it difficult to envision this sort of person sitting cross-legged on the concrete or blacktop behind their automobile, staring perplexedly at the bumper sticker in their hand and ruminating on the deep cultural and philosophical aspects of its message. It is not the intellectual content of the "Think Globally, Act Locally" message that accounts for the bumper sticker's popularity; rather, it is the

emotional appeal of a "progressive" political statement that rhymes. Intellectually speaking, we could improve on the content of the bumper sticker with something like: "Fight Globalism, Organize and Resist Locally." But that, of course, does not rhyme. If we were not so heavily socialized into the culture of the two-second sound bite and sloganeering, maybe the same people who now use bumper stickers and buttons to "express" themselves would be gluing treatises to their cars' door panels and embroidering their shirts with bibliographies.

Dr. Prakash offers us many lucid insights into the dangers of global thinking as both she defines it and as it is exemplified in Dr. Snauwaert's response to her. I do not take issue with Prakash's central arguments, but I do not believe that she was thinking past her nose when she made bumper sticker fans the implied target of her critique. I realize, of course, that she is more concerned with the hidden dimensions of the message than she is with the personalities of the messengers. But first impressions are often lasting impressions, and for all of her talk of "the concrete world," nowhere in the remainder of her article does she shift our attention toward "concrete" structures like the Trilateral Commission, the G-7, or the International Monetary Fund as the chief architects and engineers of globalism. She does mention the World Bank, but she does not discuss it substantively. In fact, it is only with rare exception that she refers to anything tangible, material, or "concrete," and, when she does, the reference is made only in passing. Perhaps this is because she assumes our awareness of the material dimensions of the theoretical issues that she stays focused on. This is dangerous.

Moreover, in reading her lucid account of the dangers inherent within global thinking, we may be led to believe that Dr. Prakash has learned to think past her nose. Unfortunately, she has not recognized the dangers of ethereal thinking, which is as disconnected from place as global thinking. Often enough, the two go hand-in-hand. With its only reference point residing in the realm of abstract ideas, ethereal thought can occur behind closed eyelids and, therefore, never carry us beyond the tip of our nose. Without looking at the world, without opening our eyes to the material dimensions of globalism, how could any of us be expected to think past our nose? While I readily acknowledge that certain aspects of the issues that Prakash addresses need to be discussed at a theoretical level, if Dr. Prakash truly wishes to bring us "back to earth," she needs to "ground" those theoretical issues by discussing the complex relations that they share with the concrete conditions of political economy.

Snauwaert, too, does little in the way of grounding his thought in the material world. He does, again like Prakash, make mention of tangible things. But, and here he parts company with her, Snauwaert's references to concrete elements in our political economy convey an attitude of acceptance toward them and the order into which they have been cast. For example, he begins unveiling his thesis with an acknowledgment of the complex interdependency of our world, a set of conditions that he accepts not only as a given, but also as legitimate. I'm not certain that Snauwaert would agree with me on this point. However, in combination with the global thinking he seeks to defend and augment, his own ethereal thinking carries his vision beyond the historical and present material dimensions of globalism's political economy.

Snauwaert's concern for a futuristic global order directed under the influence of transcommunalized democratic social intelligence causes him to ignore the material forces responsible for creating and maintaining the global system in which he finds so much interdependence. He simply accepts this current interdependence as a given and moves beyond it to formulate the manner in which a globalized "public" might go about developing their own regimes within it. While Prakash fails to carry her thought outside of her head to engage in a conversation with the world, Snauwaert takes his thought beyond the world as if it were not worth speaking to at all. He overlooks it. In doing so, he thinks beyond his limits, which are our limits as well. To explain these limits I need to introduce Snauwaert's transcommunal application of John Dewey's democratic social intelligence.

If we want to caringly sustain our local communities, Snauwaert argues, we need to attune our consciousness to the consequences of actions that transcend our locality. I assume that he means that certain actions bear certain consequences, and that we need to be aware of the extent to which those consequences are felt beyond the limits of our local community. He does not stipulate whether or not those consequences are felt within those limits as well. Neither is he clear as to whether the actions leading to those consequences are carried out by us or by others. Is he advising us to be conscious of the "transcommunal" consequences of our own action or is he telling us that we should be aware that the consequences of actions taken by persons outside of our community that we personally feel in our daily lives are also felt by people in Timbuktu? Or should we have our consciousness attuned to both scenarios? Which ever it is, Snauwaert informs us that this feat is to be achieved by the transcommunal application of Deweyan democratic social intelligence, which would represent a reformation in global thinking sufficient enough to deflect Prakash's critique.

He goes on to argue that persons for whom the intentional or unintentional consequences of actions taken by two or more people constitute a "public" insofar as those parties were not, themselves, active participants in those same actions. He implies that the members of this public need not be conscious of either the consequences or the source of the action that produced them. Once this consciousness emerges, however, those affected clamor for the control and regulation of those consequences. Snauwaert does not explain why the public would not wish for the actions producing those consequences to be controlled, regulated, or even halted. It appears that Snauwaert's/Dewey's public is not sophisticated enough to recognize the difference between cause and effect.

At any rate, once the awareness and consequent regulation have occurred, a regime comes into existence. We are not told from where, whether from the public or from the class of persons whose actions led to the consequences that produced the public in the first place. We are left to assume that, owing to their depravity of intellect and their poor organizing skills, the public must turn to the source of the consequences to have those consequences regulated. This leads to the formation of special regulatory agencies on behalf of the public, though the benevolence of these agencies is called to question when Snauwaert claims that they function to "organize and regulate the public." History teaches us that this is often the case, (the process has been referred to as ideological management

and manufacture of consent), but I am unsure as to whether or not Snauwaert intended this meaning.

Like most liberal theorists, Snauwaert places an unquestioning faith in a "self-conscious" public to move in "progressive directions" provided they recognize their common interest in stimulating regulation. Though, if I read Snauwaert correctly, he does make some acknowledgment that even actions committed out of public concern produce complex, indirect and, I assume, unintended consequences of their own. This problem is intensified, he argues, when both the public that unites in action and the arena in which that action transpires take on global proportions. This complexity, and here Dewey gets ushered in, generates the need for new political structures. These, Snauwaert contends, have already been established, though he never specifically identifies any such structures. Would Greenpeace and the Environmental Protection Agency be examples? Putting this issue aside, we can move on to his contention that the designs and efforts of these structures have not delivered on their promises.

What does this do to Snauwaert's faith in the public? Obviously, further deliberation is required to advance the level of self-consciousness requisite for "really" solving the problems, problems which, once again, are never clearly identified. For Snauwaert, the path to this next level of enlightenment must travel through that space identified by Habermas as an "ideal speech situation," wherein communication "approximates undistorted deliberation." As Snauwaert explains: "This process entails communication, free association, inquiry, debate, and participation, which taken together form the ideal of community life." Only under such conditions can a public develop what Dewey calls "social intelligence," which can be roughly defined as the desire and the ability to make decisions based on a shared vision of what would most benefit each community member's interests. This provides the basis of the variety of global thinking that Snauwaert seeks to advance and defend.

Snauwaert's vision of global thinking entails a "transcommunalization" of Deweyan social intelligence. To Dewey's requirement that individuals understand themselves as members of a local community, he adds the obligation that they view themselves as occupying a larger world of shared community. Where Dewey restricts the scope of his public's social intelligence to the consequences of actions that negatively impact one's own local community, the members of Snauwaert's global public possess a transcommunal social intelligence which also includes a concern for the consequences of actions that adversely affect local communities other than their own. Together this sense of shared community and universal concern justify the formation of whatever regulatory regimes one local community might deem necessary for the amelioration of problems in any other community. Nowhere does Snauwaert concern himself with the question of how people in the historical, cultural, and ecological context of their own community can possibly be knowledgeable enough of the historical, cultural, and ecological context of another community to understand how things ought to be regulated there. Along with his promotion of universal imperatives and his bald claim that transcommunal social intelligence enables persons to know "the range of consequences of conjoint activity," his failure to address the question of context relates to a more fundamental problem in Snauwaert's thinking.

It is one thing to argue that the participants in any open deliberation should concern themselves with the consequences of actions in locales other than their own. It is quite another to argue that further deliberation on those consequences should include the unrestricted involvement of the membership of those other locales. Snauwaert's failure to advance the second of these two arguments undermines the reformation of global thinking that he promises. In fact, the account that he provides of his transcommunalization of Dewey sounds much like the global thinking espoused by the dominant voices (those voices who received any significant level of attention) at the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit. Wolfgang Sachs (1993a, 1993b) provides a sound analysis of what this summit has meant in the evolution of the debates surrounding the ecological crisis. He contends that the Rio Summit reintroduced the traditional conflict between North and South and between those countries labeled since 1949 as developed and those stigmatized as "underdeveloped" into the diplomatic arena.

In the first place, representatives from the underdeveloped countries took the opportunity to demand more money from the North to stimulate more "development" within their own borders. It should also be noted that those representatives come, for the most part, from that tiny sector within those "underdeveloped" nations that reaped fairly significant rewards from earlier demonstrations of generosity from the North. They arrived in Rio in anticipation of using the environment as a bargaining tool with which to leverage economic concessions from their rich neighbors who had come with a different agenda.

Secondly, then, representatives from developed nations, such as the United States, came to Rio having finally realized the finitude of those resources requisite for further development. And they arrived with the full intention of discussing how those resources might be more effectively managed so as to promote what they termed "sustainable development." Nature is thus reduced to a variable in the equation of continued development. Sachs notes the myopic vision that haunts such activities. The cure for the "consequences," I'll use Snauwaert's term, of development (and there is no doubt that development produced the ecological crisis) is more development, albeit development in a different direction.

Just as Snauwaert recommends, the architects of sustainable development view themselves as responding to a public regime that calls for the regulation of the consequences in question (in this case — the eco-crisis is the consequence). Again, it is telling that Snauwaert does not mention the possibility that the actions (in this case — development) responsible for the consequences should be halted. The net result, and this would seem to conform to Snauwaert's recommendations as well, produces an imperative for state intervention. But this imperative possesses two dimensions. As Sachs (1993a) explains:

> On the one hand, the continuance of nature's capacity to render services, e.g., clean air and water or a reliable climate, has to be closely watched. On the other, society's innumerable actions have to be kept under sufficient control in order to direct the exploitation of nature into tolerable channels. To carry out these formidable objectives, the state has to install the necessary institutions like monitoring systems, regulatory mechanisms and executive agencies. A new class of professionals is required to perform these tasks, while ecoscience is supposed to provide the epistemology of intervention. In short, the

experts who used to look after economic growth now claim to be presiding over survival itself.

Again, these events appear to mirror Snauwaert's recommendations for the creation of institutions that would regulate the consequences that the public demands to have redressed. Like Snauwaert, too, the architects of these regulatory devices assume not only that the global economy of development will, indeed must, be sustained and expanded, but they also view that system as legitimate. If Snauwaert did not view the global system as legitimate, I cannot imagine that he would be so nonplussed in explaining how the system makes us all "economically, militarily, ecologically, cultural, and hence politically" interdependent.

In proclaiming the obsolescence of unilateral military action, Snauwaert overlooks, at least, some very significant events of the past 10 years. Namely, he completely ignores the U.S. invasion of Panama as a unilateral military action. He leaves unchallenged, then, not only the manner in which the current global economic system was created, a process steeped in blood spilled in the name of development, but also the overt forms of violence still used to maintain that order. Relatedly, he discusses the power of cultural penetration as if it transpired in a political and economic vacuum. The spread of development has demanded cultural penetration. The homogenization of world cultures has not evolved simply as the result of the "underdeveloped" having recognized their cultural inferiority and taking autonomous measures to ameliorate their condition. The culture of "development" has been imposed on them by external forces. The net result has not been so much cultural penetration as it has been cultural rape. The former implies a form of consent that the global masters have not required to achieve their ends.

Moreover, Snauwaert does nothing to significantly challenge Prakash's rejection of the jingoistic phrase: "Think Globally, Act Locally." While we might agree with her that this slogan leaves our imaginations impotent to fathom organizing ourselves to impede further global atrocities, historical evidence would suggest that we do, in fact, possess the ability to affect the global designs of the masters. Take, for example, the domestic resistance demonstrated to the Reagan and Bush administrations' Central American policy. The level of public dissent in the U.S. prevented an outright invasion of Nicaragua, compelling these administrations to turn to clandestine methods for achieving their ends. The situation in Panama was different, but the media did not accurately report the scale of either the invading forces' targeting of civilian sectors or public outrage expressed in the aftermath of that atrocity.

Nevertheless, Prakash's point remains valid. We can and should pay more attention to the manner in which external forces impact our community and then work within our community to insulate ourselves from the degrading effects that they have on our ability to create our own conditions of existence. In order to realize that ability, in order to control the conditions of our existence instead of being controlled by them, we need to understand those conditions. Such understanding would require as much literacy in our political-economy and history as it would ecological literacy of the immediately surrounding natural world that we would depend on to feed, clothe, and shelter ourselves. Moreover, local thinking and acting are not likely to be stimulated unless individuals develop some awareness of the scope of the problems we confront. But the broader form of awareness is, as Prakash suggests, empty unless accompanied by an awareness of how those global problems impact us in our localized commons.

This would require thinking past our noses — a mode of thought that simultaneously reflects upon the material conditions of our existence and then searches beneath their surface to reveal the deep cultural and historical patterns underlying them.

The former requires that we open our eyes to the world. I do not believe that thinking past our nose would permit us to be content with merely regulating the consequences of actions, particularly the consequences of globalism. This form of thinking requires that we consider stopping the actions that produce the unwanted consequences. And in order to identify those actions and actors responsible, we need to open our eyes.

The latter demands that we open our ears in order to penetrate through the "noise" of the material world. On the other side of this noise, there are quiet spaces, silent worlds where tacit assumptions lie hidden. As an example, Western culture has come to equate "change" with "progress." Hence, anything new must be better than anything old. This assumption underlies an economy that builds obsolescence into its own plans. Obsolescence is crucial for growth; it keeps consumers consuming by keeping them in a state of constant need. Just as I said that thinking past our nose does not permit us to be satisfied with regulating consequences, neither do I believe that it permits us to rest content in treating actions alone. It demands that we transform the underlying conditions that give birth to those actions and the mode of consciousness that breeds them.

In conclusion, we need to open our ears as well as our eyes if our thinking is to make it past our nose. This would also enable us to think within our limits. We open our eyes and ears not only to our own context but to the context of others as well. Doing so would make it immediately obvious that the material circumstances of others differ from our own and that they have generated different tacit assumptions in response to those material circumstances. Certainly, this would not prevent cross-cultural lessons from being learned, but it might prevent us from assuming that it would be better if we all traveled along the same path and forcing our own global road map on others to follow.

References

Sachs, W. 1993a. Environment. In *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*, ed. by W. Sachs. Atlantic Heights, N.J.: Zed Books.

Sachs, W. 1993b. Global ecology in the shadow of 'development'. In *Global Ecology: A new arena of political conflict*, ed. by W. Sachs. Atlantic Heights, N.J.: Zed Books.

Think Locally, Act Globally: An Indigenous Perspective

Greg Cajete

I do not think that the views of Professor Prakash and Professor Snauwaert concerning the ecological metaphor "think locally, act globally or locally" are necessarily as diametrically opposed as they may seem. Both positions can be

seen as equally applicable, depending on the requirements of the context and circumstances to which they are applied.

This may be explained by the metaphor "the good red road" sometimes used by Lakota people to describe a third position between two seemingly opposing positions, orientations, or actions. The "good red road" is a perspective recognized and applied by many indigenous peoples ... the classic yin-yang principle. It is another way of saying that the truth of any matter lies somewhere between two positions. It is also a way of saying that a dynamic harmony or balance will always tend to manifest that affirms the essence of both positions. This essentially means working with a "moving center" — one that moves to one side or the other as circumstances require and that supports or indicates appropriate action for that particular situation.

I agree to a certain extent with both Professor Prakash and Professor Snauwaert. I am well aware of the way the "global" orientations in education, politics, and economics have been essentially co-opted for further perpetuation of the "old" paradigm consciousness and values while purporting to be "green" and conducting business as usual. I am also painfully aware of the fact that the environmental movement still remains largely a monocultural Western phenomena and is, indeed, viewed as such by many people of color worldwide. This is primarily because the role, influence, and nature of the "cultural environment" and social diversity have been so poorly understood and applied mostly by contemporary environmentalists and environmental policy makers. It is a blind spot and an entrenched assumption in mainstream environmental circles that has rarely been honestly addressed. It is indeed true that every action begins with and in reference to where you live and the "tribe" that you acknowledge as your own. Environmental action is always applied with the greatest tangible effect at the local level.

Yet, with all this, the relative truth of interdependence cannot be denied. Interdependence is described by another often used Lakota metaphor, "we are all related," which at one level of its interpretation means we are related to, affect, and have responsibility for the Earth and a greater universe. As many Indigenous philosophies have always purported and now studies in New Physics of the phenomena "nonlocal mind" and Bell's Theorem seem to indicate , communication and action can occur and be an influence beyond the confines of material time and space.

I believe that the challenge is to educate for a deeper understanding of the workings and applications of both positions. Think locally, act locally *and* think locally, act globally simultaneously or in the degree that is needed for each activity or circumstance. At our best, we are wondrously capable of adapting, holding or applying more than concepts simultaneously and creatively in our life. This is what the new environmental education must become — a celebration and a revitalization of our holistic nature.

Think Ecologically, Act Locally: On Becoming Native to a Place

Dilafruz R. Williams

The Prakash and Snauwaert debate on globalization versus localization, I believe, can be framed as follows. Prakash argues: Global thinking is an impossibility and only local thinking is possible. Global actions are necessarily parochial, bent on spreading the Western cultural, economic, and consumeristic values. On the other hand, local thinking and the associated local actions are radically pluralistic, embedded in the myriads of traditions, customs, and cultures at danger of being crushed by the Western globalization movements. Therefore, we should abandon the idea of global action *vis-à-vis* global thinking and modify our mind-set for local thinking and local actions. Her critique of global thinking is primarily drawn from Berry (1972, 1987), whose artful living does not permit him to separate culture from agriculture, which are both enmeshed and implicated as local endeavors.

Snauwaert challenges her premises and her conclusion. He argues that because we live in a world of complex interdependence, our consciousness must transcend our locality. While he agrees that global thinking — literally speaking — is not possible, it is dangerous not to recognize that local thinking must surpass its local context in order to gauge the consequences of local actions. Specific communities affect and are influenced by other communities, he argues. Building on Dewey, Snauwaert proposes that global thinking itself be redefined as "the transcommunal application of democratic social intelligence." This requires that locales and their communities necessarily engage in communication, inquiry, and debate with others — "transcommunally" — in order to comprehend the consequences of conjoint activity.

On examining the two positions, it is clear to me that Snauwaert challenges Prakash's project of localization on the issue of parochialism. He finds Prakash's rejection of global thinking in favor of local thinking to be problematic and dangerous, pointing to the issue of closed communities that such thinking would result in. Moreover, he argues that localization would result in balkanization, which would be a direct threat to democracy. Hence, Snauwaert proposes global thinking, which, according to him, would sustain the democratic values of pluralism since tolerance and diversity would be feasible through such thinking.

Snauwaert's dominant paradigm is unquestioningly Western, one that is built on the assumption that the promotion of "transcommunal interaction" results in diversity. He ignores the power structures involved in such communication — the power of the North over the South and the power of the self-proclaimed "civilized" over the indigenous. Nor does he address Prakash's main point that the spread of globalization has resulted in actually *squashing* diversity. The devastation of traditions, customs, cultures, and modes of agriculture of the South is a clear indication of how this dominant paradigm of the North has played havoc by dislocating scores of people from their communities and their self-sustaining means of livelihood. While his concern for balkanization must be addressed by Prakash, we must question the taken-for-granted assumptions about the existence ofequal power structures that are necessary for the kind of "application of democratic social intelligence" that Snauwaert proposes. Global projects undertaken by the West systematically crush diversity and promote homogeneity. In seeking megasolutions to megaproblems, modernity's monoculture has spread its tentacles globally.

In this essay, I would like to address several issues pertaining to the debate over "globalization versus localization" drawn from the slogan "think globally, act locally." First, is

"global thinking" impossible, as Prakash claims? What is meant by "global thinking"? Second, what are the implications of "local thinking" that Prakash proposes? Third, since Snauwaert argues against Prakash's balkanization *vis-à-vis* localization, the question arises: Does local action have to be based solely on local thinking? The most laudatory proposal of Prakash — that of localized action — needs to be seriously pursued if we are to begin to deal with the ecological crises we face. This localized action, I will argue, does not preclude a consideration of factors extending beyond the local — one of Snauwaert's concerns. Hence, the following questions would also need to be pursued: What is the project of localization? Why is localization important? What caution must be taken not to make the local, parochial? Through an example, I will show that in order to become native to a place, which I view as a project of localization, we must think ecologically. I reject Snauwaert's view of thinking and acting globally. I also propose that we replace the slogan "think globally, act locally" not with "think locally, act locally," as Prakash does, but with "think ecologically, act locally."

Clarifying the slogan "think globally, act locally"

I begin by drawing attention to the first part of the slogan — think globally — that Prakash claims is impossible to do. I believe that the phrase "global thinking" is not meant to be taken literally. It is a figurative form of speech that urges people to go beyond their limited views of who they are and where they live in order to gain a broader perspective. In other words, to "think globally" means to try to comprehend the broader implications of the actions of one's locale, one's commune, or one's self beyond the boundaries of place and vice versa. It is not a claim at all that each one of us must fathom every facet of the globe. Thus, I see no point in discussing whether or not global thinking is possible in the sense that Prakash claims that we can "never know the globe." That is true. But the slogan is not meant to convey that we should know the globe; instead, it urges us to go beyond the local.

To the extent that "global thinking" is meant to urge people to go beyond the local and take a broader perspective, it can serve a useful purpose. However, because of the historical linkage of "global thinking" with "global action," the phrase gets distorted resulting in globalized actions. Globalization projects advocated by global thinking have been methodically destroying the countless traditions, cultures, and their modes of agriculture, as I discussed earlier. In view of this association of global thinking with global action, the slogan "think globally, act locally," was developed. Nonetheless, the phrase "global thinking" should be abandoned because of the abusive imagery of dominance associated with such language. I propose this, not because it is "impossible to think globally" as Prakash argues, but because it deliberately stimulates and spurs "global action." However, to reject the phrase "think globally" and replace it with "think locally," as Prakash does, is equally problematic. Local thinking per se conjures narrow and parochial images. An example might help here. It would be useful to recognize that we always live downstream. Hence, local actions must be based on thinking that goes beyond the local. Since we are affected by what happens upstream, we must not only be aware but also willing to act based on the knowledge of what happens upstream. Similarly, we are morally obliged to recognize that our actions will likely affect others who live downstream from us. This kind of recognition, comprehension, and thinking about our interconnectedness is extremely crucial as we *locally* begin to address the ecological problems that we confront. However, if we were to indulge solely in local thinking, then the very sort of individualism that has brought us into our present ecological imperilment would be further intensified.

I believe that the crux of the slogan "think globally, act locally" that needs to be seriously pursued is the latter part: act locally. Prakash urges attention toward this action, and I feel that she must be taken seriously, given the urgent need for ecological sustainability that confronts us. Global actions, being at a megascale, try to provide megasolutions for our ecological problems. Such megasolutions discount the multitude of local understandings of problems such as topsoil erosion, pollution, extinction of local species, discordant interaction and disruption of the harmonious balance of nature in a region, and so on. The "global" cannot account for the cultural underpinnings of the local (Bowers 1993). The deep insight, discernment, and perception obtained through local human-scale efforts are missed when massive global actions are undertaken. Yet, while the important project of localization, i.e., local action, must indeed take into consideration the local ecological and cultural context, it cannot be driven solely by local thinking. Instead, it needs to be based in a consciousness that is broader than the local. This, I believe, can be found in the ecological paradigm. Hence, I propose an alternative: "think ecologically, act locally."

To give an example, in the next section I explore Wes Jackson's proposal for "becoming native to this place." The concern for such nativeness arises when one has a sense of what is happening ecologically beyond one's locale. In essence, this is a project of localization — i.e., local action — that requires an ecological consciousness and worldview.

On becoming native to a place

Place is important to any discussion of possibilities for localization or local action. Giddens provides an important distinction between *space* and *place*. One of the consequences of modernity is that we have a sense of space but no sense of place. He writes:

> The coming of modernity increasingly tears space away from place fostering relations between 'absent' others, locationally distant from any given face-to-face interaction. In conditions of modernity, place becomes increasingly phantasmagoric: that is to say, locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences quite distant from them. What structures the locale is not simply that which is present on the scene; the "visible form" of the locale conceals the distanciated relations which determine its nature (Giddens 1990, 18–19).

It is this disembeddedness of local communities that Jackson tries to address. Becoming native in the modern world, according to Jackson (1994, 3), means "becoming native to our places in a coherent community that is in turn embedded in the ecological realities of its surrounding landscape" As he explains:

> [The] majority of solutions to both global and local problems must take place at the level of the expanded tribe, what civilization calls community. In effect, we will be *required* to become native to our little *places*, if we are to become native to this *place*, this continent. (Jackson 1994, 2; italics in original)

Since our break with nature came with agriculture, Jackson explains that it is fitting that the healing of the local

culture begin with agriculture. In Jackson's view, becoming native to this place would require the establishment of meaningful contact between the earth and ourselves, a contact which the project of modernity has broken. Jackson's project goes beyond the present cries of sustainability and bioregionalism; it is both cultural and ecological in scope. It requires that we look for "elegant solutions predicated on the uniqueness of the place" (Jackson 1994, 49). A greater effort is required than "planting trees and welcoming back wild animals since we have less topsoil, fewer species, less germplasm in our major crops, and more shopping centers," he writes (Jackson 1994, 18). We must begin by accepting how profoundly ignorant we are; we must remember our past, that is, call on the historical sources embedded within the local culture as we seek solutions, keep our projects small-scale, and, when things do not work out, be humble enough to acknowledge their failure as we further our quest (p. 24).

The "operating paradigm" for becoming native to this place is an ecological worldview. For Jackson, this means that the ecological paradigm — using nature as measure — would need to penetrate all of our society's elements such as economics, health, and communities. This worldview recognizes as its fundamental principle that the living world or the biosphere is the living source of all wealth. Living systems are homeotelic, seeking to maintain the critical order or stability of the whole, as Goldsmith (1993, 20) eloquently explained. Similarly, for Jackson:

> An ecological worldview is also an evolutionary view. Time-honored arrangements would inform us of what *has* worked without our running the empirical experiment. Our evolutionary/ecological worldview would inform our decisions ... [that is] we must turn to nature to inform us, to serve as a reference, must turn our thoughts to building a science of ecology that reflects a consultation of nature. Ecology is the most likely discipline to engage in a courtship with agriculture as we anticipate marriage. (Jackson 1994, 25)

The "mindscape of the future" must have some memory of the ecological arrangements that shaped us and of the social structures that served us well. Like Prakash, Jackson also views grand solutions as inherently anti-native because they are unable to vary across the various mosaics of our ecosystems (Jackson 1994, 100). Instead, to become native to a place would require that we begin by "mimicking nature," he urges. The Land Institute near Salina in Kansas is his own attempt at becoming native to that place.

Such a project is necessarily one of cultural affirmation, one of cultural diversity (Jackson 1994, 106). By arresting consumerism and the mind-set that promotes the indiscriminate rape of nature, Jackson hopes to disengage the West from an extractive economy to one that would help build a natural ecosystem community. Elsewhere, I have argued that we must reconceptualize the notion of community by going beyond a consideration of the human to include the biotic (Williams 1993). Becoming native to a place would naturally lead to the formation of local communities that are interested in relearning the art and craft of ecological thinking and being. As Jackson (1994) explains, humanity has now entered the fourth phase of the organizing structure of our lives — ecology (the first three being the church, the nation-state, and economics).

And, finally, the project of localization cannot presume that a community exists. Communities come into existence when there is dependence and also common purpose. As Berry (1987, 192) says, "A community is by definition placed." Becoming native would mean that an ecological mind-set or worldview would draw humans together to become placed, since it would require being embedded in a conscience that is broader than one fitting the local. Such a project would require that we move against the grain of modernity by reviving the local. Thus, "think ecologically, act locally" would be a more appropriate moral injunction.

References

Berry, W. 1972. *A continuous harmony: Essays cultural and agricultural.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Berry, W. 1987. *Home economics.* San Francisco: North Point Press.

Bowers, C. 1993. *Education, cultural myths, and the ecological crisis.* Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The consequences of modernity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Goldsmith, E. 1993. *The way: An ecological world-view.* Boston, Mass.: Shambhala.

Jackson, W. 1994. *Becoming native to this place.* Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky.

Williams, D. 1993. Re-embedding community. In *Philosophy of Education*, ed. by Audrey Thompson, 90–95. Normal, Ill.: Philosophy of Education Society.

From Global Perspective to an Open Horizon or Ever-Deepening Synthesis

Robert Vachon

I would like to offer three sets of remarks. The first two are excerpts from Raimon Panikkar's writings. The last is my own, although it takes inspiration from the latter's other writings.

An open horizon[1]

Note that we have said *open horizon* and not *global perspective*, as it is so often put nowadays. The ideal of a global perspective — with all the well-intentioned slogans ("think globally, act locally," etc.) — is unconvincing on at least two grounds.

First of all, it is, strictly speaking, a contradiction in terms. There can be no perspective of 360 degrees, not even of 180. Any perspective is limited, and the human being cannot have a global vision of anything. It would not only have to encompass contradictory visions, but also exhaust the knowledge (vision) of the thing(s) in question. Both are impossible.

Secondly, enthusiasm for the global perspective appears to me as a vestige of the die-hard imperialistic habit of presenting something that is believed to be really universal and for the benefit of all humanity. The danger here lies in uncritically extrapolating one's limited perspective into a global imperative that is supposed to suit everybody; the fit is never perfect, and the consequences can be devastating indeed. This attitude — often unwittingly — perpetuates the same old archetype of one truth, God, church, civilization, etc., and today, one technology and one economic market.

The *open horizon*, on the other hand, is meant to preserve the validity of this trend toward unity and universality, but without closing it up in any single perspective, vision, or

system. We need a horizon in order to see and to understand, but we are aware that other peoples have other horizons; we aspire to embrace them, but we are aware of the ever elusive character of any horizon and its constitutive openness.

This last consideration should be taken very seriously in order to avoid the common mistake of worshipping modernity, as if the latest discovery and the most recent study were the definitive ones, or at least truer than any previous ones, and so would offer a better basis for synthesis. Here a double factor seems to play an essential role. On the other hand, once we have reached a certain degree of intellectual sophistication, we cannot renounce the universality that accrues to our opinions in the precise realm in which they claim to be true. This is a basic axiom of thinking. It cannot be denied, for contradicting it would already require the very validity that it denies. Any statement is a true statement insofar as it claims to state the truth. On the other hand, however, we know that although no period in human history has had the "last" word, each word has a certain working validity in and for its own time. The same can be said of every author and every statement.

Our problem is not to know whether today's open horizon will not be merely another limited human perspective tomorrow. This is the well-known hermeneutical problem: the text is always a function of its context. In what sense can we have universal statements if these depend on a particular context and we have no universal context?

To put it in our concrete terms: Does this mean that when we speak of the end of a period and of a certain global vision, we are stumbling into the same pitfall as our predecessors? If I am saying, for instance, that we now have the possibility of a global vision and a holistic conception of reality, am I not a naive victim of the same mirage?

It is for this reason that a second degree of sophistication, as it were, is needed in order to escape the Scylla of agnosticism and avoid the Charybdis of dogmatism. Here I would distinguish between *relativism* and *relativity*, between an agnostic attitude which is intellectually paralyzed due to a fear of error and a relational awareness which understands that because all knowledge and even all being is inter- and intra-related, nothing has meaning independent of a delimited context.

Finally, there is one thing I should like to stress: no solution will be found, no convincing answer can be given until Man by himself discovers a myth, a horizon which satisfies his intellectual and emotional capacities. In other words, the presentation of a unifying paradigm, which is not at the same time a monolithic and closed system, seems to be of the utmost importance. These considerations form the overall background of the hypothesis I propose here. I am not presenting a system that is a systematic treatise regarding the situation of Man in the universe. I am offering a synthesis which not only remains open but which also allows and even calls for differing interpretation.

Further, I suggest that this synthesis belongs to the order of myth, that is, not a vision of a vision, but merely a vision. The communication of a vision is not a showing (of pictures — of reality), but a communion (in seeing — the universe): a myth."[2]

Let us stop speaking about 'the global village'[3]

Our use of language reveals how we see the world and uncovers our unconscious assumptions. Many people still go on speaking about the "Third World," for instance, because it is a handy phrase, without questioning the obnoxious idea that the gross national product, or at least the number of dollars per capita, should be made the decisive criterion for the evaluation of peoples. It is only for practical reasons, they say; and this is precisely the worst part of it: the primacy given to those "practical reasons."

Something similar, if not worse, happens with the optimistic, naive, and ultimately technocratic description of the world as a "global village." Probably very few of those who use it have ever lived in a real village. What they actually mean is that the world is becoming a megalopolis, which is something very different, and they welcome this as a sign of progress. They mean that there is now a system of communication which covers the planet — in the few major world languages, of course, and in order to convey economic, military or so-called political information. You do not communicate love, or a joke, or anything which has no "global" interest. The "global village" means that "we" — the rich, the "experts," or even the "well-to-do" revolutionaries — can travel, or rather fly, from one continent to another, probably to or through a chain of hotels which are part of some great technological complex. The "global village" means that such technological complexes have now extended their tentacles over the whole surface of the planet, and that we should rejoice that "it pays" — for us, of course — for this allows trade, business and — magical modern word — "communication."

The idea of the "global village" fills the minds and even the hearts of those who use the phrase with the good feeling that finally we have achieved something positive in our world. It is always an optimistic phrase. People unconsciously feel good about it. And here is where I detect unconscious colonialism. As we cannot have a global empire or a universal church, let us, at least, have a "global village," which will serve as a Trojan horse through which we can smuggle in the technology we want, the "science" we profess, and the system we advocate.

Do we perhaps have in mind something like Los Angeles in California writ large? An immense area of land covered by houses and more houses, separated by highways, with significant air pollution, but also private swimming pools and all gadgets of technological communication, where roads cover 70% of the land and people do not walk any more, not only because the streets are not safe, but also because the "practical" unit is the thousand steps of the car — that is, the mile (*mille passus*) — and not the one step of the leg.

The "global village" means, in fact, not a real village, but a megamachine, a global network depending on mechanical and intensive techniques, all of them artificial, controlled from a few privileged places. Those who like this speak of a "global perspective." That is a contradiction in terms. There is no perspective through 360 degrees. A real village does not pretend to have a "global perspective." It defends its own vision, colors, sounds and smells. A village is a cluster of houses; it is a "vicinage," a word which comes from the Latin *vicus* and Sanskrit *veshas*, meaning house, dwelling place, settlement for neighbors (*vecinos* still in Spanish).

A village is there to *live* in, as the wise Nagas in the northeast of India have done so effectively: the village has gates and there they live, talk, and enjoy life. For work, they have created a town outside the village, frequented mainly by all those immigrants from other parts of India who come there for business — even if they call it "progress."

A village cannot be global. It is, on the contrary, a microcosm. Its life is interior and therefore it does not need to spread thinly around the globe. A village is not a ball (globe) on which to slide or be thrown around. A village is stable and has roots. A village has its language, its customs, its rhythms. It has also, certainly, its villains, but Interpol is not needed to locate them. The whole village knows them: that landlord in the upper street, that publican at the crossroads, that beggar in the outskirts, and the hypocrite who we do not need to mention.... Nothing is more differentiated than a village. Each person in it has a face, a name, even a nickname. Anonymity is impossible, for the villagers are not a mass. I am not glorifying the village. Riots in a village can be terrifying, and the burden of your past sins can be unforgivable. Yet you are free to wander away and start anew somewhere else.

The "global village" is not a village for the real villagers of the globe. Never before have there been so many "have-nots" in the world. If we were in a global village, they would be visible to all. But they are hidden from the view of the defenders of the "global village." They are the under-pariahs, kept out of sight, hidden in three-quarters of the world in the so-called Third World which, if it should be called anything, should be called the Two-Thirds World. The statistics are today common knowledge. Never have there been so many hungry people, so many displaced persons, so many war casualties, so many dictators and exploiters as now.

The constructors of the "global village" think they need one language for the "global village." But what we really need is a Pentecost where each can speak the proper dialect and be understood by the other. What we need is many villages, each of them conscious of being the center of its world, the hearth of its inhabitants; and, at the same time, containing paths along which pilgrims — not tourists — travel, keeping one village in communication with another. Technology is the world of means. What are our final ends?

Local and global: A fundamental distinction

A person is always a personal existential reality, concrete, communal, a center of the universe (a microcosm), and a whole, that is, holistic. Furthermore, it is always cultural and transcultural at the same time but never acultural. It is always ontonomous (not simply autonomous and/or heteronomous). An individual is always an abstraction, an impersonal unit of an impersonal collectivity, a particular aspect of some general definition, theory or system, or aggregate. It is always part of an abstract globe. It is autonomous (independent) or heteronomous (dependent on another, that is, a non-self).

Modernity, which is based on abstract rationality rather than on reality, tends to reduce the person to an individual, an atom, a statistic, a majority/minority, a social security number, a function, a citizen, etc. It tends to reduce existential, ultimately nondefinable community to a sociological category: a collectivity, majorities and minorities. It tends to confuse what is concrete with what is a particular case of our general definition and theories. It confuses reality with our general visions of it. It confuses wholesomeness and integrity with abstract globality and our integration to it. It forgets that persons are not primarily autonomous or heteronomous but ontonomous beings, concrete knots in the web of interconnectedness of life and of reality.

Now both "local" and "global" can be interpreted in either of these two ways:

If seen from an abstract, rational, objective approach, local means a 'sector,' something isolated, individual, particular, autonomous. Global means something general and functionally related. But in relation to Personal Communal Concrete and Universal Reality, both notions, that is, local and global, are then pure abstractions in an endless dialectical fight for supremacy. They are in a vicious circle. No way out.

If seen however from an existential, holistic, communion approach, local can mean something personal, communal, concrete, ontonomous, whole; there can be no person without a community, both being the result of the whole of reality. A person is what is most intimate and universal in each one of us. Global can mean personal, communal, concrete, universal, whole, ontonomous (that is, the web or interrelatedness of the whole concrete reality that being is). Then, local is incomprehensible without the global, and global is incomprehensible without the local. Not monism, nor dualism, but nonduality. But modernity really thinks that globalness is a modern phenomenon, that it depends primarily on our interpretation of it, on our consciousness of it, and especially on technology. It has appropriated the words global and universal to mean scientific, objective, and technological knowledge and its products. This is arrogance that needs to be radically debunked as is done so well in the Madhu Suri Prakash article. It would be unfortunate if her statements are reduced to petty, provincial, so-called tribalistic ghettoizing statements as modern globalists would be tempted to quip. We must not, however, allow the modern globalists to appropriate reality and to reduce the latter to the "global village" or the megalopolis, nor to confuse existential holistic education with global education, that is, education to an abstract system.

Man is both a person and an individual, both a community and a collectivity, both concrete and particular, both universal and general. Holistic education is one that embraces all dimensions without reducing reality to man's interpretations of it. It is under-standing, that is, standing under the dynamic spell of life and reality in all its sacred, human, cosmic dimensions. It is a cosmotheandric experience — an ever open horizon, which calls for many interpretations.

Notes

1. This excerpt is from Raimon Panikkar's *The Cosmotheandric Experience* (New York: Orbis, 1993), 12–15.
2. The word *myth* is used here in the sense explicated in my *Myth, Faith and Hermeneutics* as the most basic horizon of intelligibility. Myth is what you believe in without believing that you believe in it: "the ultimate reference point, the touchstone of truth by which facts are recognized as truths. Myth, when it is believed and lived from inside, does not ask to be plumbed more deeply, that is, to be transcended in the search for some ulterior ground: it asks only to be made more and more explicit, for it expresses the very foundation of our conviction of truth" (*Myth*, 98–99). See also Virginia Corwen, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven, 1960, pp. 127ff.) who gives the following comprehensive definition of myth: "a statement of truth cast in dramatic form to suggest the dynamic interrelation of the divine, the world and man."
3. See Raimon Panikkar, *The Tablet*, 9 July 1983. Reprinted in *Interculture* 81, (Oct.–Dec. 1983): 34–36.

The Problem of Double Binds in the Prakash/Snauwaert Exchange

Chet Bowers

I found much that I agree with in Madhu Suri Prakash's "From Global Thinking to Local Thinking" and in Dale S. Snauwaert's response. Both arguments, however, contain serious double binds that cannot be ignored. In spite of this limitation, the main themes developed in both arguments point to the need for a radical reformulation of the conceptual foundations of how we understand the nature and purpose of public education. After I explain the nature of the most significant double bind that characterizes each argument, I shall devote the remaining remarks to clarifying the contribution made by both papers to putting educational theory on a more ecological pathway.

The double bind in shifting from global to local thinking

In many ways, Prakash's analysis of why the liberal/capitalistic ideal of global thinking is both an epistemological impossibility and a powerful metaphor that serves to hide ecologically and culturally destructive practices stands out as one of the most radical statements to be made by an educational theorist. Indeed, it is far more radical than the ideas of Dewey and Freire; it is even more radical than the various Marxist analyses that dominated educational theory during the seventies and early eighties. What makes Prakash's argument so radical is her ability to recognize the presumptions (indeed, hubris) of Western modernism and to frame her recommendations for change in terms of a deep understanding of differences in cultural epistemologies and traditional practices — including cultural ways of understanding the "individual's" relationship to the larger group.

This deep cultural perspective is profoundly different from the tourist-level approach to multicultural education that is now the current educational fad. Her view of local knowledge involves respecting a wide range of local traditions for encoding, storing (in song, dance, narratives, ceremonies, social and mechanical technologies, etc.) and communicating knowledge transgenerationally within cultural groups that must meet the test of ecological sustainability in terms of the local bioregion. Cultural groups that do not meet this test are heavily criticized by Prakash.

I agree with her that the complex cultural storehouse of knowledge that meets this test is more reliable than the context-free and print-dependent knowledge given high status in Western educational institutions. I also agree with her that the experts who promote modernization through the ideology of global thinking are often motivated by a desire to recreate the world in the image (and economic interest) of the West and are often unable or unwilling to recognize the contradictions between their guiding godwords and the devastating impact that modernization has on both the moral ecology of cultural groups and the environment. In addition, I understand her point that different cultural views of reality lead to fundamentally different ways of understanding the rights and responsibilities of the "individual." I even have an intellectual understanding of how certain traditional forms of authority can be seen within a cultural group as being more legitimate than the universal human rights based on the Western view of the individual. But here I find myself wanting to be more specific about the cultural group's practices and beliefs before I go on to agree that all Western notions of human (even individual) rights are culturally hegemonic and morally bankrupt.

This brings me to what I see as the most important double bind in Prakash's argument for the primacy of local knowledge over global/abstract ways of thinking. Her argument is based on representing the nature of local knowledge, including its environmental effects, in an overly one-sided way that includes only positive examples. Her examples of the disruptive influence of Western institutions committed to creating an economic and technologically interdependent world represents a different kind of one-sided thinking. That is, the World Bank, Coca Cola, and other transnational institutions that are widely recognized, even in the West, for their ecologically and culturally disruptive practices are given as the only examples of globally oriented thinking. Local resistance to the development schemes of these economically oriented institutions, as is now occurring in the Mexican state of Chiapas and elsewhere around the world, gives a degree of credence to the sharp boundaries that characterize how she frames traditional/modern cultural relationships. Unfortunately, not all forms of local cultural knowledge and practice can be supported — even by those who may be inclined to agree with her mostly abstract and highly selective examples of local knowledge. And this is where the double bind arises for me.

Where the respect of local knowledge argument might lead the outsider to acknowledge that environmental practices, human rights issues, and economic/technological needs should be worked out by the members of a cultural group in ways that build upon the best of their traditions, there are some practices and ways of thinking that cannot be so easily ignored. The practice of killing a women because her style of dress violates local religious norms, burning the wife on the funeral pyre of her husband, the practice of female circumcision in parts of Africa, etc., make it impossible for me to give a blanket endorsement to the viability and autonomy of all forms of local knowledge. Local cultural practices such as stripping the land bare of trees and other soil-preserving vegetation and killing rare animals for their supposed powers as aphrodisiacs further lead me to take a highly qualified approach to embracing the legitimacy of all local forms of knowledge.

The double bind is magnified by the recognition that a cultural group's practices cannot always be judged only in terms of local moral and ecological standards. Attempts to alter these local practices through educational or more direct political means has usually involved some form of foreign intervention, which always holds the potential of unanticipated consequences that often make the cure worse than the disease. It may be that the double bind inherent in Prakash's argument for local knowledge can never be eliminated. But her argument could be strengthened, and the double bind problem reduced, if she would make explicit the moral/ecological convictions that influence how she framed the forces of good and evil and then state these convictions in the form of criteria that can be used for recognizing when local knowledge should be respected and in other ways given active support.

The double bind in the application of "democratic social intelligence"

When we face up to the cultural practices that have reduced male fertility in industrialized countries since World

War II by 50% and are altering the reproductive cycles of many species or project the near-term global consequences of rapidly declining fisheries, forests, and sources of fresh water, it is difficult to discount Snauwaert's argument that interdependence is the dominant characteristic of today's world. His discussion of how permeable cultural (and I would add, ecosystem) boundaries have become is also insightful because it raises the critically important question of whether the processes of modernization that concern Prakash are always exogenous or can also have endogenous sources. But it is his recommendation for communication and problem solving in this culturally diverse and interdependent world that highlights a different kind of double bind. His recommendation that Dewey's method of intelligence be extended as the "transcommunal application of democratic social intelligence" while being justified as a free, open, and democratic form of political discourse can only be practiced by ignoring the deep cultural epistemological differences that Prakash articulates so clearly. In effect, Snauwaert repeats Dewey's mistake of thinking of intelligence and forms of communication as a social rather than cultural phenomena.

As I explained in *Education, Cultural Myths, and the Ecological Crisis* (1993, 87–105), Dewey did not understand that his method of intelligence is based on a number of culturally specific assumptions. Even though he deconstructs the notion of intelligence as an attribute of the autonomous individual, his way of understanding social intelligence, particularly the emphasis he gives to using it for the purpose of politicizing every aspect of group life, fails to take account of the cultural differences in ways of knowing, coding, and communicating between generations. Nor does he recognize any source of authority for knowledge and value claims other than that of the scientific method. While Dewey argued for a process-oriented democratic polity, the cultural epistemology embedded in Dewey's method of participatory decision making results in a double bind when this method is imposed on members of non-Western cultural groups. His method of intelligence even delegitimates the forms of authority basic to the cultural beliefs of Western minority groups who do not accept the appropriateness of the scientific method of problem solving in all areas of cultural life.

Snauwaert's insensitivity to the need to take cultural differences into account when discussing how members of different groups are to participate in the process of "democratic social intelligence" (which should read "undemocratic Western scientific intelligence") also shows up in his lumping of Dewey, Habermas, Berry, and Gandhi together as sharing essentially the same democratic, local knowledge orientation. Although they may be in agreement when such political metaphors as democracy, community, and communicative competence are used in a highly abstract way, a closer examination of their respective cultural orientation reveals profound differences in how they would interpret them. For example, Habermas's requirements for communicative competence cannot accommodate either the different forms of communal knowledge valued by Berry or Berry's criteria for accountable communication. Dewey's cultural epistemology led him to interpret progress (growth in the reconstruction of experience) in a way that was at odds with Gandhi's understanding of progress, democracy, and the moral ecology of community life.

There is no culturally neutral communication and inquiry process. Nor is there a culturally uniform view of which aspects of group life should be dealt with through "inquiry, debate, and participation" — which represent our ideal of the political process. Indeed, many cultural groups have limited the scope of the political process by encoding, storing, and renewing group knowledge through such other forms of participatory activity as dance, narrative, music, and the visual arts. To ignore these profound cultural differences in theoretical writings that address critically important issues is to continue the double bind of addressing what are essentially cultural beliefs and practices without a deep understanding of the nature and complexity of different cultural traditions.

Contributions of Prakash and Snauwaert to educational theory

In spite of the double binds, there are many contributions that Prakash's article makes to educational theory. The one I find to be the most important is her way of centering cultural beliefs and practices as the basic framework within which educational issues must be considered. Educational theorists have ignored culture, including the significance of how a cultural group's epistemology is reproduced in the metaphorical languages used to sustain the group's daily practices. By continuing to think in terms of society, educational theorists have continued to maintain the fiction that the individual is the basic social unit. Even Freire, who has written directly about different forms of cultural praxis, did not get beyond the superficial understanding of culture that led him to represent critical reflection as an essential aspect of being human — that is, individuals avoid being in an oppressed condition only as they rename the world in ever new and more progressive ways. Educational theorists are not alone in using sociological categories rather than basing their efforts on the study of the different cultural epistemologies and ways of encoding and renewing group knowledge. Nor are they alone in ignoring the importance of understanding differences in cultural/natural system relationships. With few exceptions, philosophers, political theorists, and economists continue to ignore that the "individual" is really a cultural being (even when engaged in critical reflection and creative expression) and that institutions, technologies (including computers), and even scientifically based knowledge are based on generally unconsciously held, culturally specific assumptions.

By framing her argument in terms of local cultural knowledge and the modern form of cultural consciousness that foregrounds the individual as the basic social unit and change as the universal expression of progress, Prakash makes it difficult to ignore the fact that culture (in all its complexity, double binds, differences and unconscious forms of expression) is the starting point for postmodern educational theorists. If her analysis contributes to the recognition that the educational relevance of understanding culture should not be limited to classroom ethnographies but should, rather, be the basis of a paradigm shift, she will have made a real contribution to the field.

Snauwaert's emphasis on this being a "world of complex interdependence" also makes a contribution to the field of educational theory that needs to be further developed. But the danger of "interdependence" becoming part of the ritualized political vocabulary (like "empowerment," "democracy," "global village," etc.) can be partly avoided if we use the term "ecology" in place of "interdependence." Ecological systems, whether we are referring to the classroom or a coastal estuary,

can be understood as nested within larger systems. The structural coupling of these autopoietic systems, including the structural coupling between cultural and natural systems, involves interdependence where changes in the patterns of one autopoietic system alter the patterns in connecting systems.

The use of ecology as the guiding metaphor for understanding relationships also makes it more difficult to ignore that the most fundamental forms of interdependence are not only between cultural groups but also between cultural groups and the life-sustaining characteristics of natural systems. Whereas the image of a "world of complex interdependence" can easily be used to justify the spread of current economic and technological practices that benefit the privileged cultural groups in Western and Asian countries, the term ecology, in its present usage, foregrounds the environment as an essential part of any interdependent relationship.

But the use of ecology has more direct significance for reconstituting (remetaphorizing) the current basis of educational theory. As David Flinders and I attempted to explain in *Responsive Teaching: An Ecological Approach to Classroom Patterns of Language, Culture, and Thought* (1990), the concept of ecology helps to illuminate the cultural patterns that are part of the communication/learning processes occurring in the classroom. The use of an ecological model for understanding teacher decision making, rather than the various industrial models widely used as the basis of many teacher education programs, foregrounds the multiple ways in which the teacher mediates the language processes essential to how students will be able to understand their own cultural experience, as well as the transcultural communication and thinking processes occurring in the classroom. In effect, the use of an ecological model helps teachers recognize cultural patterns that would otherwise exert a more tacit influence on communication and learning patterns. It also serves to remind teachers that the content of the curriculum must be continually assessed in terms of whether it contributes to an ecologically sustainable future.

When used as a root metaphor, ecology also enables us to reconceptualize a number of educational goals that continue to be framed in terms of the modern image of the autonomous individual. Moral education, how educators understand creativity and intelligence, and the current orthodoxy that represents the student as learning primarily from their own direct experience are all based on a set of cultural assumptions about the autonomous nature of the individual. These assumptions have also led educators to accept uncritically the long-held view that language is a conduit through which ideas, information, and, now, data are passed between individuals (the sender/receiver model of communication) and to the view that the rational process is free of cultural influence. Indeed, this view of language and of the rational process are essential to maintaining the myth of the autonomous individual. In turn, this view of the individual supports the modern myth relating to the cultural free nature of language and the rational process.

To cite one example of how an ecological way of understanding reframes our ability to recognize the connections between a cultural group's way of knowing and the encoding characteristics of language, we can take the process of moral education, which most educators now treat as some form of rational or emotive decision making on the part of the individual student. As a number of linguists have pointed out, languages are used to communicate about relationships. In understanding how past processes of metaphorical thinking about relationships are encoded in the language that thinks us as we think within the language, we can see how language can also be understood as encoding the moral sensitivities of the language community.

This leads to the recognition that the language used in every area of the curriculum is part of the process of moral education — as we can easily recognize when we make explicit the moral templates embedded in the patriarchal language that was a taken-for-granted aspect of the curriculum before feminists clarified how changing the language was essential to different moral relationships between men and women.

Curriculum content communicated through computers teaches students to understand the moral dimension of human/nature relationships in instrumental and anthropocentric terms — even when the computer is being used to simulate changes in ecological systems or to engage in environmental problem solving. The content of other areas of the curriculum can also be seen as encoding the dominant language community's moral templates that are to govern human to human and human to environment relationships — if we would just make the effort to make it explicit.

Thinking of creativity and intelligence (even the process of experiential learning) as being part of a larger cultural ecology, as well as how they contribute to more sustainable cultural/natural system relationships, also makes more sense than the individually centered view of creativity and intelligence still embraced at nearly all levels of the educational establishment. Both creativity and intelligence are understood in radically different ways when we start with the recognition that the individual is nested in cultural traditions, and these cultural traditions are always nested in natural systems. This recognition of interdependence and structural coupling of cultural and natural systems leads to different criteria of accountability for determining what should be considered creative and intelligent behavior. These different criteria, in turn, lead to different approaches to curriculum and processes of learning than is dictated by the modern view of the individual.

Prakash and Snauwaert touch on essential elements of this paradigm shift — though I am inclined to think that Snauwaert's tendency to look back to Dewey will make it difficult from him to break with the more problematic of modernist assumptions. But the real challenge not addressed by either Prakash or Snauwaert (or educational theorists generally) is how to make an ecological way of thinking a basic part of teacher education and graduate education programs. If my argument is correct, and I think the supporting evidence is overwhelming about the way current thinking is based on the root metaphors of the past, we are faced with a situation in which the cultural epistemology that was the basis of the modernizing process that Prakash views so critically continues to dominate teacher education programs and graduate schools of education. That this epistemology, along with the pressures of an exploding world population, is accelerating the destruction of the life-sustaining characteristics of natural systems is the ultimate double bind that now needs to be addressed.

Book Reviews

The Universal Schoolhouse: Spiritual Awakening Through Education

by James Moffett

Published by Jossey-Bass (San Francisco), 1994; 389 pages; hardcover; $27.

Reviewed by Kathleen Kesson

James Moffett has been an influential educator and scholar in the field of English education for many years. With this newest book, he attempts to weave together the best of his thinking about curriculum, pedagogy, and the organization of school life with his own evolving understanding of spirituality. It is an ambitious project and represents for Moffett a courageous expansion of the boundaries of both conventional thinking and professional academia. The result of his synthesis is a text which will undoubtedly inspire educators and parents seeking a vision of education that embodies an expanded sense of spirituality, which may provoke secular critics who see no room for the mystical in education, and which will definitely provide valuable food for thought for anyone who is concerned about the multiple social crises we face.

Moffett asks a central question perennially asked by education theorists: Can schooling transform society? His answer is an unequivocal "yes," and his book is devoted to explicating an educational culture with the capacity to generate higher consciousness, which in turn might regenerate society. There is a sense of urgency in this undertaking, which we glean from some introductory words:

> The many interlocking problems of this nation and this world are escalating so rapidly that only swift change in thought and action can save either. The generation about to enter schools may be the last who can still reverse the negative megatrends converging today. (p. xii)

Moffett takes the necessity for swift change to heart with his far-reaching prescriptions for a program of holistic school reform that takes into account multiple and interlocking contexts of experience: individual consciousness, family, neighborhood, society, and cosmos. The book paints a broad sweep, and practitioners who seek specific and concrete guidance about how to facilitate "spiritual awakening through education" may be disappointed. *The Universal Schoolhouse*, however, adds an important dimension to what is often a flat and unimaginative discourse on school reform, and it deserves an important place on the growing list of literature about spirituality and education.

The most significant accomplishment of this book, in my opinion, is the effort to link educational policy to an evolving set of understandings about human potential. Education scholars agree that decisions about curriculum, instruction, and educational policy arise out of fundamental assumptions and core beliefs about human nature, knowledge, and the place of humanity in the world. Philosophers in this field ask whether the child is a *tabula rasa*, or blank slate, at birth or whether there is some inborn "essence" to be drawn out; they ask whether knowledge exists outside the human mind or only in the interaction of mind and world; they ask whether development is programmed by biology or determined by culture. Seldom, however, do such philosophical discussions take place in teacher education courses, in schools, or in communities. So the assumptions that govern educational decisions remain at a mostly unconscious level.

With his chapter on spiritual development theory, Moffett makes his assumptions explicit and endeavors to explicate a development theory that takes into account what we are only beginning to understand about human possibilities. He takes seriously the accounts of mystics who have expounded such ideas as clairvoyance, telepathy, and other "paranormal" mental and spiritual powers, as well as the related theories of karma and reincarnation. Drawing mostly upon the development theory of Rudolph Steiner, he carefully weighs ideas about spiritual development against the more commonly accepted development concepts from Freud, Erikson, Piaget, and Bruner and attempts to synthesize the intuitive ideas of spiritual philosophers with the empirical observations of the scientific developmentalists. This updating of theosophical and anthroposophical views of development is a crucial step in the creation of an educational theory that might include a spiritual dimension. The novel insights he presents about intractable problems of child development suggest that this is a fruitful line of inquiry, worthy of more attention from educational researchers, philosophers, and development theorists.

Moffett treads carefully where controversial spiritual ideas are presented. Acknowledging the difficulties many westerners face when presented with esoteric teachings, he is clear in his assertion that educators

Kathleen Kesson is on the core faculty at Goddard College in Plainfield, VT and is the director of its Summer Institute on Teaching and Learning.

need not believe in mystical concepts or extrasensory powers to facilitate spiritual development in students. Rather, he suggests, "any frame of reference for educational planning should allow for, *not rule out*, such possibilities, which, if real, would be extremely important not so much for the powers themselves as for what they would imply about human nature and capacity, including the understanding of other childhood creativity" (p. 273). At the very least, in other words, schooling should cease to inhibit the spiritual development of human beings! On the positive side, he presents us with intriguing possibilities for creating an educational culture that might more closely resemble the learning that individuals undertake when they move consciously onto the path of spiritual development, raising the very real possibility that the focus of public education and the purpose of life could actually be one and the same: "inner growth for meaning."

Central to Moffett's vision of education is a radically individualized approach to education. This is accomplished through the decentralization and wide distribution of educational resources, with unlimited and unrestricted personal access to them. This is a compelling, though politically complex, idea. (Unfortunately the book does not deal at length with the complexities of implementation.) The centrality of individualism and personal choice in his theory reveals the modernist, western assumptions on which Moffett, as well as most Euro-American theorists base their theories. Culturally specific ideas, such as the idea of a vertical evolution of consciousness from a "group mind" toward individualized perception and judgment, the corresponding idea that "learning takes place only in individuals" (p. 7), and the idea that there is a necessary linear developmental sequence from individual liberty to spiritual consciousness are presented as universal truths rather than relative cultural perspectives. This theoretical weakness, however, does not diminish Moffett's culturally relevant supposition that Americans have not yet understood the unforeseen consequences that have attended the liberation of the individual. He argues convincingly for the cultivation of inner, spiritual resources as a way to cope with the existential crisis wrought by unlimited consumer choice and uninhibited individual expression.

The Universal Schoolhouse ranges from the highly esoteric to the eminently concrete. Advocates of such familiar reforms as apprenticeships, internships, school/business partnerships, the merging of social services and education, and a "cradle-to-grave learning network" will find ideas of interest here. Visionaries and educational activists will find an important theoretical framework against which to measure current initiatives. I especially enjoyed his section on the arts, in which he touched upon the spiritual significance of the arts, with their capacities to heal, increase awareness, foster individuation, and push back the boundaries of everyday experience. He speaks in this section of an important historic function of the arts, of a time when communities sung, chanted, made music, and danced to "entrance themselves into a reintegration with Spirit" (p. 75). I would have appreciated more such specific discussion about the relationship between pedagogy, curriculum, learning environments, and spiritual development. But this level of specificity is not the primary intent of the book. Its strength is in its sweeping vision, with its many points of departure from which other thinkers might take off.

I used this book recently in an undergraduate education course entitled "Education for the 21st Century." My students found his vision intriguing and inspiring, but echoed my desire for more specificity both in its pedagogical dimension and in the very real arena of educational politics. I hope this will be forthcoming in James Moffett's next book!

This Rough Magic: The Life of Teaching

by Daniel Lindley

Published by Bergin and Garvey (Westport, CT), 1993; 142 pp., $17.00.

Reviewed by Heidi Watts

Daniel Lindley has written a wise and graceful little book: a synthesis from his experience and his reflections as ateacher. Lindley believes that good teaching unites biography with pedagogy, by which he means that teachers must teach out of their own lives, their own experiences, and their own emotions to touch the lives and the feelings of their students. This book is an illustration of what he means as he shares with us a few of his significant experiences as a student teacher, a high school English teacher, a teacher of teachers, and a Jungian analyst. The book may be of special interest to English teachers because that is the experience out of which Lindley draws his examples, but the insights into what teaching is, and what it means to grow as a teacher will resonate with anyone who has been in a classroom.

Heidi Watts has been a teacher for almost 40 years, alternating between teaching children and teachers. In and out of the classroom, by way of two teachers' centers, she has settled down at Antioch New England, where she works with preservice and experienced teachers in master's degree programs.

The central metaphor, teaching as "rough magic," is drawn from Prospero's realizations and changing roles in *The Tempest*, and winds through the book to illuminate the progression through four stages of teaching. The first, familiar to all teachers, is survival — "simply getting used to it"; the second is managing — "simply teaching with some competence whatever one has been given to teach"; the third is being oneself as a teacher — not "merely teaching" but being comfortable and unique in the role, feeling empathy with students and a special relationship to the subject; in the fourth stage, the teacher transfers ownership over the process of learning to the student — letting go of the self and enabling the students to come to their own discoveries and to be the creators for their own learning. This is the art, rather than the craft, of teaching, "the art of celebrating the final and total disconnection of student from teacher" (27). In this fourth stage, Lindley is not talking about a laissez-faire, free-school approach. Prospero, with his magic, is quite able to calm the winds or raise the tide, to catch his creatures and to make them do his will, but when he is supremely capable he can voluntarily release them so that they are no longer either bound or dependent, and "abjuring this rough magic" set them free.

In his descriptive journey through these stages, Lindley addresses aspects of the craft of teaching, such as the importance of skillful questioning, the significance of story as a basis for curriculum, the addressable and unaddressable issues in the life of a teacher. The strongest theme, however, is the significance of relationship: relationship between the teacher and what she is teaching; between the teacher and the student or students; between how we teach, how we were taught, and how our teachers were taught.

Some of this is familiar ground, though presented with distinctive imagery and clarity, but Lindley's discussion of the liminal space between teacher and student, adult and child seems to me a new contribution. Moving from the craft of teaching into the insights of psychology, Lindley creates a picture of the child-in-the-adult meeting with the adult-in-the-child to create the liminal space, "the moral center" of teaching. "Each teacher has a conscious out-in-the world teacher self as well as an unconscious inner child. And each student has an unconscious inner adult.... Teaching happens on the border between childhood and adulthood, between unknowing and knowing, between mystery and certainty. Good teachers know how to live in this liminal space: they contain and therefore express knowledge and uncertainty at once" (114). The third stage is characterized by an energizing and creative tension "between the opposites of child and adult, a stage lived in liminality" (122).

The movement here is a gradual changing of focus, from the initial preoccupation with self, in survival, to self as teaching professional, learning the skills of the trade; to the wholeness of oneself expressed in teaching, with parts of that self meeting in a relationship of equality with some aspects of the self within the student. Finally, "the fourth stage is a resolution of that tension, a movement to a unitary state in which the final triumph of the teacher is that paradoxically he becomes unnecessary" (122).

As I was reading *This Rough Magic*, I found myself referring to first one idea and then another when talking with my students, teachers in training, and experienced teachers. I described the kind of teacher talk that arises out of the despair and alienation teachers feel when faced with the desperate lives of too many of their students or find themselves yet again the public scapegoat for the ills of our society. This is the kind of talk that Lindley says will "eat your liver" if the situations are beyond our control, and he offers at the same time some ways to differentiate between which problems we can address and which we cannot.

I've mentioned the stage theory, or referred to the rewards of teaching as he describes them, and I see recognition in the faces of these teachers, heads nodding in agreement, voices saying, "Hmm ... yes ... yes, but ..." Lindley has put words to what we knew intuitively, affirming his conviction that the understanding is already there in the student, stored in some not yet articulated way. That's magic enough for the moment.

Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession

by Lynn G. Beck

Published by Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1994; 160 pages, paperback..

Reviewed by John C. Carr

In both philosophical and pragmatic terms, this book presents a case for its title: *Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession.* In this as in previous writings, Beck impresses me as a true scholar. She has a rich knowledge of administrative history, an

John Carr is Associate Professor of Education at Plymouth State College of the University System of New Hampshire. He is a member of the Educational Administration faculty and Director of the New Hampshire Middle Level Institute. He has taught or directly supervised at all levels of education from kindergarten through doctoral study.

astute sense of where we are now, and the ability to project a more perfect future for educational administrators and for those entrusted into their care.

I believe it is important for readers of this review to have an up-front understanding of the reviewer's theoretical and practical orientation. As a former public school teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent who has finally found time for reflection, I have a proactive bias. I believe the educational leader searches for an ideal future expressed in terms of the recipients of one's service and makes no apologies for pursuing that vision. I see the leader as a servant who values the importance of community, a community in which educators demonstrate their commitment to the learners' development by providing them with both support and challenge in appropriate measure. As I read this book, it occurred to me, somewhere between Chapters Three and Four, that Beck's understanding of the words administrator and educator is closely tied to their Latin derivations: *administrare,* to minister, *educere,* to lead forth, and *educare,* to bring up. By the end of the Chapter Five, I could not help but read Beck's work as an articulate affirmation of many of my own beliefs.

Beginning with a quotation from T. S. Eliot, Beck acknowledges the challenge involved in finding words to define caring. She then proceeds, brick by brick, to build a formidable foundation for the caring paradigm:

> I am concentrating on caring that is oriented toward persons and, further, am emphasizing both ethics and activities concerned principally with caring *for*. (p. 5)
>
> Scholars who have explored this topic in depth note that caring always involves, to some degree, three activities. They are: (1) receiving the other's perspective; (2) responding appropriately to the awareness that comes from this reception; and (3) remaining committed to others and to the relationship. (p. 12)

Beck's components involve being open, being nurturing, working within a community, and being willing to make sacrifices.

> Caring is, finally, distinguished by the fact that there is a commitment between the people who care. This commitment shifts caring from being a conditional act dependent on merit or whim, and moves it toward being an unconditional act marked by acceptance, nurturance, and grace. (p. 20)

Having established a definition of caring, Beck cites several perspectives and literally hundreds of sources to justify the need for a preeminent ethic of caring. To accomplish this, Beck draws selectively but profusely from history, anthropology, management, economics, philosophy, psychology, religion, sociology, and even fiction. For example, Huckleberry Finn's steadfast commitment to Jim contrasts clearly with Holden Caulfield's cynicism in *Catcher in the Rye.* "This cynicism and the alienation and lack of commitment it represents apparently are common in the lives of those deprived of the opportunity to give or receive care" (p. 54). Beck provides two philosophical pillars for her caring ethic. Regarding a deontological (non-consequentialist) perspective, Beck states, "I emphasize arguments that propose that it is the nature of individual persons, and logically by extension, individual administrators to seek to give and receive nurturance" (p. 29). Following with teleological (consequentialist) arguments, Beck asserts, "Schools as organizations are, by their very nature, especially suited for caring interactions" (p. 29).

Although I found Beck's documentation and research to be meticulous, substantial, and carefully considered, I wonder why her defense of a caring ethic omitted several of the human relations movement's most compelling concepts. I refer specifically to Maslow's "B love" (his hierarchy of needs is mentioned) and to Rogers's "unconditional positive regard." In addition, there is no reference to Mary Parker Follett who is, in my judgment, the primogenitrix of humane relationships in American management literature. In spite of these omissions, I applaud Beck's exhaustive analysis intended to "justify the legitimacy of exploring the possibility that this ethic might be right and useful for school leaders" (p. 57).

Right and useful, I agree. In Chapters Four through Six, Beck moves from concept to reality, addressing how and why the caring ethic can support those of us who labor in the field of administration as well as those who work to prepare future administrators. Regarding administrative practice, Beck states that her work is, "a description — not a prescription — focusing on three general role expectations caring leaders would seek to fulfill" (p. 105). She identifies the roles as, "(a) values driven organizer; (b) capable and creative pedagogue; and (c) cultivator of a nurturing culture" (p. 78). Beck then defines leadership behavior and provides specific examples of the roles mentioned above.

It is my opinion that Beck's roles are more than defensible. They are indispensable if we are to move educational leadership to a higher dimension, to a place where values drive intelligent decision making, where the leader is respected as *teacher*, and where the word "we" replaces the words "them" and "I" in *our* educational communities. Most accurately, I see professors of educational administration — those who train administrators — as the audience for this book. It is this group Beck addresses in Chapter Six where, in her consideration of a construct for the preparation of caring administrators, she includes both programmatic and analytical components, each with objectives and suggestions

for course content. Dewey stated that we "teach more by action than by precept." Beck exhorts university faculty to combine scholarship and caring, even as she has done in this book.

> In their scholarship, they must pursue excellence, and in their interactions, kindness, and mutual support.... It is inescapable for academicians who are genuinely concerned with developing caring and competent school leaders consistent with an ethic of care. (p. 130)

Beck's is a learning community where children are safe, where role power is secondary to open intelligent debate, where persons of goodwill are welcome, and where cynics need not apply. She acknowledges that transformation is painful and uncomfortable. It takes the caring, commitment, vision, and courage of real people who are dedicated to the proposition that all humans have value.

Reclaiming Educational Administration as A Caring Profession may be read in three hours or three years, but do not wait three years to read it. I am ordering copies for my colleagues as we examine our existing administrator preparation program. We can all use a healthy dose of Lynn Beck's Caring.