
3

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Complexities, Boundaries, and Critical Race Theory

Gloria Ladson-Billings

University of Wisconsin, Madison

The Sunday, May 20, 2001, headline on the *Chicago Tribune* read, “A Multicultural State for Sears.” The sub-heading pointed out that Sears, one of the largest retailers in the United States, was targeting Black and Latino consumers. (In this chapter, the term *Black* designates all individuals of African descent. In cases where the reference is solely to Blacks who also have a U.S. heritage, the term is *African American*.) The ease with which a major newspaper used the term *multicultural* tells us something about how power and domination appropriate even the most marginal voices. Multicultural has made it to Main Street.

This chapter examines the ways current ideas about the term *multicultural* must give way to new expressions of human and social diversity. It argues for reconceptualized views of difference that often are forced to operate in old social schemes. Placed in a linear chronology, this chapter would necessarily cover a large volume, not a chapter. Thus the liberty taken with this discussion is to appropriate a metaphor—jazz—to scaffold the changing, often conflicting, developments and iterations of this field we call multicultural education.

Carl Engel’s discussion of jazz in 1922 pointed out that “good jazz is a composite, the happy union of seemingly incompatible elements. . . . It is the upshot of a transformation . . . and culminates in something unique, unmatched in any other part of the world” (p. 6). Engel

further asserts that “jazz is rag-time, plus ‘Blues,’ plus orchestral polyphony; it is the combination . . . of melody, rhythm, harmony, and counterpoint” (p. 8). Finally,

Jazz is abandon, is whimsicality in music. A good jazz band should never play, and actually never does play, the same piece twice in the same manner. Each player must be a clever musician, an originator as well as an interpreter, a wheel that turns hither and thither on its own axis without disturbing the clockwork.” (p. 9) (A number of these jazz references come from the *Atlantic Monthly’s* jazz archives, which can be found on the Internet at www.theatlantic.com/unbound/jazz.)

Indeed, what we now call multicultural education also is a composite. It is no longer solely race, or class, or gender. Rather, it is the infinite permutations that come about as a result of the dazzling array of combinations human beings recruit to organize and fulfill themselves. Like jazz, no human being is ever the same in every context. The variety of “selves” we perform have made multicultural education a richer, more complex, and more difficult enterprise to organize and implement than previously envisioned. In 1955, Arnold Sundgaard pointed out:

A song of itself is not jazz, no matter what its origin. Jazz is what the jazzmen [*sic*] searching together bring to it, take from it, find within it. . . . Much is left free for improvisation, and no precise method of notation has been developed to indicate its rhythmic and emotional complexities. . . . The song and its arrangement become

The author is indebted to Thomas Popkewitz of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter.

... a means to an end. The music used ... is somewhat incidental to the inspired uses to which it is put. For this reason jazz ... thrives on endless exploration and ceaseless discovery. (pp. 1–2)

Again, like jazz, multicultural education is less a thing than a process. It is organic and dynamic, and although it has a history rooted in our traditional notions of curriculum and schooling its aims and purposes transcend all conventional perceptions of education. Early attempts at multicultural education were rooted in what Hollinger (1995) called the ethnoracial pentagon, that is, African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinas/os, Native Americans, and European Americans. These static categories held some political sway but began to lose their social and symbolic meanings because of the changes in the everyday lives of most people. Racial and ethnic inequity and discrimination had played significant roles in contouring the U.S. landscape. But demographic shifts, a growing understanding of the multiple identities that people inhabit and embrace, and an awareness of other forms of oppression made the ethnoracial distinctions a limited way to talk about multiculturalism and multicultural education.

Perhaps the limitation in this thinking about multiculturalism stems from limited thinking about the term *culture*. Most common definitions of culture describe it either as “an aesthetic phenomenon” (Coffey, 2000, p. 38) or a particular way of life that includes knowledge, values, artifacts, beliefs, and other aspects of human endeavor peculiar to any group or groups of people (Williams, 1976). It is this latter definition that has come to be associated with multiculturalism. However, Coffey (2000) cites Tony Bennett in describing new thinking about culture:

[It] is more cogently conceived ... when thought of as a historically specific set of institutionally embedded relations of government in which the forms of thought and conduct of extended populations are targeted for transformation—in part via the extension through the social body of the forms, techniques, and regimens of aesthetic and intellectual culture. (Bennett, 1992, p. 26)

Bennett’s (1992) work is informed by Foucault’s (1991) writing on governmentality and argues that culture is created through the processes of social management, and that it is both the object and the instrument of government. This definition does not negate the materiality of culture (that is, the objects and practices of culture) but expands conventional notions of culture to include the way both specialized and everyday practices are marked as culture. The very human endeavors that may be seen as normal or commonsensical are culturally bounded. Multiculturalism cannot be seen merely as a study of the other, but rather as multiple studies of culture and cultural practices in the lives of all humans.

Another theme of this chapter is that the notion of America, like jazz, does not lend itself easily to definition and prescription. Ward and Burns (2000) link jazz to America:

It is America’s music—born out of a million American negotiations: between having and not having; between happy and sad, country and city; between black and white and men and women; between the Old Africa and the Old Europe—which could only have happened in an entirely New World.

It is an improvisational art, making itself up as it goes along—just like the country that gave it birth.

It rewards individual expression but demands selfless collaboration.

It is forever changing but nearly always rooted in the blues.

It has a rich tradition and its own rules, but it is brand-new every night.

It is about just making a living and taking terrible risks, losing everything and finding love, making things simple and dressing to the nines.

It has enjoyed huge popularity and survived hard times, but it has always reflected Americans—all Americans—at their best (p. xxi)

I argue that this multilayered, eclectic description of America is similarly evident in new notions of multicultural education. The early beginnings of multicultural education (see J. A. Banks, Chapter 1, this volume) are reminiscent of the early beginnings of jazz. Scholars as far back as George Washington Williams in the 1880s and W.E.B. DuBois in the first decades of the 20th century began to articulate a new vision of history that positioned African Americans as fully human cultural agents. The dissonance caused by this “new” vision of history parallels the dissonance from early jazz stirrings. The editor of *Etude* magazine (cited in Ward & Burns, 2000) asserted that the music was “syncopation gone mad. . . . Whether it is simply a passing phase of our decadent art culture or an infectious disease which has come to stay . . . time alone can tell” (pp. 14–15).

However, by the 1960s and 1970s social movements concerning the rights of African Americans, Latinas/os, Native Americans, Asian Americans, women, and the poor were sweeping across America. By appropriating the language of civil rights and the strategy of legal remedies, various groups were able to make use of existing laws and push for new ones that recognized their basic humanity. The parallel moment in jazz was roughly between 1917 and 1924, or the emergence of the jazz age. It was during this era of World War I and the Roaring Twenties that jazz became clearly established in the United States. In 1926, R.W. S. Mendl stated that “jazz is the product of a restless age: an age in which the fever of war is only now beginning to abate its fury: when men and women, after their efforts in the great struggle, are still too much disturbed

to be content with a tranquil existence” (quoted in Ward & Burns, 2000, p. 102).

In the Ward and Burns volume (2000), a quotation from Duke Ellington captures another central point of this discussion, that of freedom and liberation:

Jazz is a good barometer of freedom. . . . In its beginnings, the United States of America spawned certain ideals of freedom and independence through which eventually jazz was evolved, and the music is so free that many people say it is the only unhampered, unhindered expression of complete freedom yet produced in this country. (p. vii)

Multicultural education, like America itself, is about the expression of freedom, but notions of freedom and liberation almost always involve contestation. The work of the social movements was taken up by theorists and practitioners to create new curriculum and instructional practices to reflect changes in the sociopolitical landscape. Work by James A. Banks, Gwendolyn Baker, Carl Grant, and Geneva Gay built on the ethnic studies work of scholars such as Carlos Cortés, Jack Forbes, Asa Hilliard, Barbara Sizemore, and others to create rubrics for curriculum designers and teachers who took on the task of aligning school curricula with emerging scholarly evidence about the histories, cultures, lives, and experiences of various peoples. More important, this work challenged old perceptions of America as a “White” country.

Today it is almost impossible to walk into an elementary school in the United States and not find representation of “multicultural America.” These representations take the form of characters in reading books, bulletin board displays, assembly programs, and even school supplies (Crayola crayons offers what it calls a “multicultural” crayon set purportedly with hues that represent various skin colors). But it is just this commonality (as expressed earlier in the Sears store example) that has forced scholars and activists to begin pushing the boundaries of multicultural education and argue against the ways dominant ideologies are able to appropriate the multicultural discourse (McCarthy, 1988; Wynter, 1992). At the secondary school level, there are an array of courses (typically electives) and clubs that acknowledge the cultural contributions of various groups formerly ignored by the school curriculum. However, these efforts typically represent what King (2001) calls “marginalizing knowledge,” which “is a form of curriculum transformation that can include selected ‘multicultural’ curriculum content that simultaneously distorts both the historical and social reality that people actually experienced. . . . This form of marginalizing inclusion is justified in the (indivisible) interest of ‘our common culture’” (p. 274).

McLaren (1994, 2000) introduces the notions of “critical multiculturalism” and/or “revolutionary multiculturalism” to interrupt the diversity discourse that

emerged to supplant and subvert the original intentions of theorists who set out to create a pedagogy of liberation and social justice. King (2001) calls for “deciphering culture-centered knowledge” that leads to “changed consciousness and cognitive autonomy [that] can be a foundation for curriculum transformation” (p. 276). This “new multiculturalism,” like the new jazz ushered in by alto saxophonist Ornette Coleman, represents a “permanent revolution” (Davis, 1985, p. 1). In his discussion of Coleman’s work, Davis said:

What must have bothered musicians . . . more than the unmistakable southern dialect of Coleman’s music was its apparent formlessness, its flouting of rules that most jazz modernists had invested a great deal of time and effort in mastering. In the wake of bebop, jazz had become a music of enormous harmonic complexity. By the late 1950s it seemed to be in danger of becoming a playground for virtuosos, as the liberating practice of running the chords became routine. If some great players sounded at times as though they lacked commitment and were simply going through the motions, it was because the motions were what they had become most committed to. (p. 4)

Critical multiculturalism that relies on a deciphering knowledge seeks to push past going through the motions of multiculturalism. The remainder of this chapter discusses a rubric for thinking about multicultural education, the extant tensions within the field, a rearticulation of race, and a look at current trends in multicultural education.

A RUBRIC FOR THINKING ABOUT MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

The discomfort is also there, of course, in the music’s structure. Rather than following standard chord progressions and traditional solo structures, large portions of the ensemble’s repertoire are devoted to impromptu explorations of a semiotic freedom (Heble, 2000).

Banks (Chapter 1, this volume) puts forth five dimensions of multicultural education that help us understand its comprehensive and multifaceted nature: content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and an empowering school culture (see Banks for a full explanation of these elements). This chapter focuses more directly on the knowledge construction aspect of his dimensions because new notions of knowledge, what is knowable—or the epistemological basis of a discipline or area of study—determines its theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical trajectory. Gordon (1997) reminds us that “mainstream social science knowledge is grounded in the standards for knowledge production that have developed in the physical sciences (Keto, 1989), in which the main purpose of research is seen as seeking universal ‘truths,’

generalizations one can apply to all—“totalizing schemas” (p. 47).

Gordon further asserts that epistemological paradigms emerging from the experiences of people of color and women offer a challenge to these mainstream perspectives.

Culturally centered research (here the term *cultural* refers to a variety of human groupings: race, ethnicity, gender, social class, ability, sexuality, and religion) argues against the claims of universality and objectivity of knowledge that mainstream research presumes. It recognizes that both the knower and the known have particular standpoints grounded in historical, political, social, and economic contexts. Thus it is important to make clear the frame of reference from which the researcher works and understands the world. Gordon (1997) argues that this challenge to mainstream research has caused an “epistemological crisis” (p. 49). However, mainstream scholars have found ways to construe multicultural education as a part of the dominant paradigm. Both McLaren (1994) and King (2001) provide clear examples of this.

McLaren (1994) argues that multiculturalism has taken on a variety of forms that move it away from ideals of liberation and social justice. He terms these forms conservative (or corporate) multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism, and left-liberal multiculturalism. McLaren is careful to identify these forms as heuristic devices, not meant to serve as essentialized and fixed categories but rather as useful categories to describe an array of thought and practice evident in schools and society today. One reason these categories become important is, as McLaren states, that “multiculturalism without a transformative political agenda can be just another form of accommodation to the larger social order” (p. 53).

Conservative or corporate multiculturalism is a strategy for disavowing racism and prejudice without conceding any of the power or privilege the dominant class enjoys. For example, the approach of the Sears store mentioned in the beginning of this chapter represents the way corporate interests have attempted to mobilize the multicultural rhetoric to promote consumption (and perhaps exploitation of workers). Their message, like that of Glazer (1997), is that we are all multiculturalists now. Corporate or conservative multiculturalism has a veneer of diversity without any commitment to social justice or structural change. Like King’s (2001) description of marginalizing knowledge, conservative multiculturalism is a “form of curriculum transformation that can include selected ‘multicultural’ curriculum content that simultaneously distorts both the historical and social reality that people actually experienced” (p. 274). So even though students might see representations of various groups in their texts and school curriculum, how those people are represented may be conservative or marginalizing. A typical textbook strategy for accomplishing this is to place

information about racially and ethnically subordinated peoples in a special features section while the main text, which carries the dominant discourse, remains uninterrupted and undisturbed by “multicultural information.”

The second type of multiculturalism McLaren (1994) identifies is liberal multiculturalism. This rests on a perspective of “intellectual sameness among the races . . . or the rationality imminent in all races that permits them to compete equally in a capitalist society” (p. 51). In King’s (2001) analysis, this might be thought of as “expanding knowledge.” This represents a kind of curriculum transformation, but the “rotation in the perspective of the subject can multiculturalize knowledge without changing fundamentally the norm of middle-classness in the social framework’s cultural model of being” (p. 275). This type of multiculturalism finds a ready home in the academy because it tries to address the concerns of all groups equally without disturbing the existing power structure. Thus most campuses offer programs and activities directed at African Americans, Latinas/os, Asian Americans, Native Americans, women, gays, lesbians, the disabled, and other identified groups. However, these programs and groups operate in isolation from each other, and the campus community rarely calls into question the way White middle-class norms prevail.

The perspectives of liberal multiculturalism are similar to what Sleeter and Grant (1987) identified as a human relations approach to multicultural education. Here emphasis on human sameness fails to reveal the huge power differentials that exist between the White middle class and other groups in U.S. society. By acknowledging the existence of various groups while simultaneously ignoring the issues of power and structural inequity, liberal multiculturalism functions as a form of appeasement. As previously stated, liberal multiculturalism argues for intellectual sameness among distinctive cultural groups. This form of multiculturalism also holds on to notions of meritocracy and argues for equal opportunities to compete in a capitalist market economy. This thinking fails to recognize the structural and symbolic practices that militate against the ability of the poor, women, and non-White ethnic and cultural groups to access (and succeed in) the society.

For example, Conley (2000) describes his growing up poor in a New York housing project that was almost all Black and Latino. Even here, his White skin privilege prevailed. All of his Black classmates were regularly struck by teachers for misbehavior, but “everyone involved, teacher and students, took it for granted that a Black teacher would never cross the racial line to strike a White student” (Conley, p. 45). Later, as a sociology professor, Conley began to ask his students a simple question: how they got their first job. Almost all of his African American and Latina/o students reported that they

searched the newspaper classified advertisements or responded to help wanted signs in store and business windows to search for work. Almost none of the White students found their first jobs that way. Instead, family, friends, and other familiar connections meant that employment came to them.

It is important to point out that the advantage of White skin privilege is not totally invisible to Whites. Hacker (1992) asked his White students at Queens College how much they would want in the way of "compensation" if they were to become Black for the next 20 years. Hacker reminded the students that they would suffer no loss of resources, intellect, or social status in this hypothetical skin change experiment. Still, students reported that they would want \$1 million in compensation. Thus White college students believe their White skin is worth at least \$50,000 a year.

Sims (1982) gave curriculum examples of liberal multiculturalism in her description of children's fiction. She categorized those books that merely colored in the faces of children while maintaining a story line that gave no indication of the characters' racial and cultural experiences as "culturally neutral." Classics such as Ezra Jack Keats's *A Snowy Day* or *Whistle for Willie* are prototypical examples of such books. The story purports to be a universal one, where the characters' racial identity adds nothing to the story line. Rather, such books attempt to underscore the human commonality rather than differences.

A third approach to multiculturalism is what McLaren (1994) calls "left-liberal multiculturalism." This form of multiculturalism emphasizes cultural differences to the point of exoticism. According to McLaren, "the left liberal position tends to exoticize 'otherness' in a nativistic retreat that locates difference in a primeval past of cultural authenticity" (p. 51). The reliance on separate and distinct campus programs of identity politics fosters this essentialized notion of culture. Few, if any, programs in ethnic studies, gender, sexuality, or disability integrate across identities; rarely are there Black women's studies programs or Latino gay programs.

Current academy relations treat identity politics as monolithic and essentialized. Even within programs, there is often little room for perspectives that stretch the epistemological and ideological boundaries. Dyson (1994) argues that "contemporary African American culture is radically complex and diverse, marked by an intriguing variety of intellectual reflections, artistic creations, and social practices" (p. 218). Surely the same can be said of every other cultural group. Scholars such as Lowe (1996), Anzaldúa (1987), and Warrior (1995) examine the complexities of ethnic identities within Asian American, Latina/o, and American Indian groups, respectively.

In speaking of the cultural complexities of Black identities and cultures, Gilroy (1993) urges people of African

descent (particularly those in the Diaspora) to avoid the "lure of ethnic particularism and nationalism" (p. 4) in favor of "global, coalitional politics in which anti-imperialism and anti-racism might be seen to interact" (p. 4). Further, Gilroy encourages people of various racial and cultural identities to break out of linear, absolutist renderings of their cultural selves that often characterize ethnic studies agendas. Instead, Gilroy points back to DuBois's (1953/1989) powerful notion of double consciousness as an appropriate rubric for understanding the identity challenge of all peoples who suffer the oppression of dominant culture norms and constraints. McKay and Wong (1996) provide another compelling example of the way people eschew the ethnic, racial, and/or cultural boundaries established by totalizing discourses, to act in ways that more accurately reflect current identities. In their study of adolescent Chinese immigrants, they found that the students had different motivations for learning (or not learning) English, tied to their identities and influenced by economic status, peer groups, neighborhoods, and academic ability.

Finally, McLaren (1994) offers a notion of critical multiculturalism. Here he calls for a restructuring of the social order through a radical approach to schooling. McCarthy (1988) suggests that because multiculturalism originates in the liberal pluralist paradigm it is limited in its ability to create long-lasting substantive social change. Instead, from McCarthy's perspective multicultural education represents a "curricular truce" (p. 267) that was designed to pacify the insurgent demands of African Americans, Latinas/os, Asian Americans, and Native Americans during the 1960s and 1970s.

King (2001) offers what she terms "deciphering knowledge" as an emancipatory form of cultural knowledge. Drawing heavily on the work of Sylvia Wynter (1989, 1992) and novelist Toni Morrison (1989, 1991), King asserts that deciphering knowledge is "aimed at changed consciousness and cognitive autonomy" as the "foundation for curriculum transformation" (p. 276). Though not specifically postmodern, this work engages Foucault's notion (1972) of the archaeology of knowledge to reveal the discursive practices that support the racial and power ideologies that contour the social order. Such work examines both the explicit and implicit texts to articulate meaning and intentions. For example, Morrison's (1991) examination of classics from the American literary canon exposes how race was configured throughout the texts without ever having to use the familiar terms and codes. A much less sophisticated example of "text" can be seen in everyday advertising and media representations. For example, when George Herbert Bush ran for president in 1988 his campaign aired what came to be known as the "Willie Horton ad." The literal representation of the ad was one of a particular criminal, Willie Horton, who was

released from jail by Mr. Bush's opponent, only to kill again. Applying deciphering knowledge to the ad/text allows us to see the way Horton was a proxy for the supposed danger and criminality of African American men. On the opposite end of the spectrum is the way that various ethnic and cultural groups members are recruited to represent a form of "contained diversity." For example, high-level government officials and appointees can be used to reflect a commitment to diversity regardless of their lack of interest or personal commitment to social justice and transformative social change. Deciphering knowledge helps people see through the veneer of inclusion to the ways in which diversity or multiculturalism is being manipulated to maintain and justify the status quo.

Another example of critical multiculturalism and deciphering knowledge is the postcolonial project. Smith (1999) points out that from the perspective of the colonized, the very term *research* is linked to European imperialism and colonialism. This notion was established earlier by Fanon (1963, 1967), who explained the ways European education creates a sense of alienation and self-negation in the colonized. Writing from a place of "alterity" (Wynter, 1992), those who are positioned as "others" see the social framework from another perspective, not unlike DuBois's (1953/1989) double-consciousness:

the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second sight in this American world—a world which yields him no true self consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. (p. 3).

TENSIONS WITHIN THE FIELD

[John] Coltrane seemingly forsook lyricism for an unfettered quest for ecstasy. The results remain virtually indescribable, and they forestall criticism with the furious directness of their energy. Yet, their effect depends more on the abandonment of rationality, which most listeners achieve only intermittently if at all.

—Strickland (1987)

For the sake of argument, let us presume that we agree that McLaren's (1994) critical multiculturalism and King's (2001) deciphering knowledge are indeed what we mean when we refer to multiculturalism. Such agreement does not necessarily resolve tensions within the field of multiculturalism. Although multicultural education began as a challenge to the inequities that students of color experienced in school and society, it soon became an umbrella movement for a variety of forms of difference—

particularly race, class, and gender. Within each category of difference, other issues emerged: linguistic, ethnic and cultural, sexual orientation, and ability.

The work of feminists gave rise to demands for social equity for women and supported an epistemological challenge to the academy. Work by Gilligan (1977), Noddings (1984), Lather (1991), Code (1991), and others challenged the notion that conventional positivist paradigms represent the full spectrum of social and educational experiences. Feminist scholars demanded that new forms of scholarship be represented in the academy. Thus gender work became another task of the multicultural project. Schmitz, Butler, Rosenfelt, and Guy-Sheftall (2001) point out that there exists a "continuing tension in feminist scholarship, the tension between an emphasis on equality . . . and an emphasis on difference" (p. 710). I would argue that this tension runs deeper because of the complex and multiple identities women assume. Jaimes and Halsey (1992) suggest that the work of Native American women is one of sovereignty over Western feminism. Similarly, African American women such as Audrey Lourde, bell hooks, Alice Walker, and Patricia Hill Collins have asked about the place of Black women and their particular issues in the feminist discourse. Although Frankenberg (1993) has clearly acknowledged that race shapes White women's lives, many others have ignored race and class in their discussions of feminist work. Trinh T. Minh-ha (1989) argues that we cannot think of race and gender as separate and distinct identities because this creates dichotomous thinking that serves the interests of the dominant order:

Many women of color feel obliged [to choose] between ethnicity and womanhood: how can they? You never have/are one without the other. The idea of two illusorily separated identities, one ethnic, the other woman (or most precisely female), partakes in the Euro-American system of dualistic reasoning and its age-old divide-and-conquer tactics. . . . The pitting of anti-racist and anti-sexist struggles against one another allows some vocal fighters to dismiss blatantly the existence of either racism or sexism within their lines of action, as if oppression only comes in separate, monolithic forms. (p. 105)

Perhaps the emblem of the fissure between race and gender in the United States was the O. J. Simpson trial (see Morrison & Lacour, 1997). Feminists (many of the more vocal ones were White) advocated constructing the trial around the worrisome women's issue of domestic violence. However, both Simpson's defense team and segments of the African American community saw the trial as an opportunity to underscore the way the justice system (and the society) uses a racial measurement to determine the kind of available justice defendants receive.

Another point of tension for feminists is around class issues. The seemingly stunning efforts of the women's

movement to help women gain access to middle-class positions in the corporate sector, the academy, and social services pale in comparison to the continued problems of women in poverty, women's health, and child support and care. Women of color often find themselves in poverty alongside men of color (James & Busia, 1993). Thus their social and political allegiances are complex and multiple. Recognizing the masculinist discourse of the 1960s civil rights movement (both the nonviolence of Martin Luther King and the self-determination of the Black Panther Party), African American women still understand the need to work with African American men who are locked out of economic opportunities right along with them.

Still another source of tension regarding multiculturalism and feminism is in the global realm. In an edited volume entitled *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (Okin, Cohen, Howard, & Nussbaum, 1999), Okin raises important questions about ways that group rights may trump women's rights on issues of polygamy, genital mutilation, forced marriage, differential access for men and women to health care and education, disparate rights of ownership, and unequal vulnerability to violence. Her main argument is that some group rights can endanger women. However, there are non-Western feminists who challenge the essentialized and stereotypical representations of women within their cultures (Afsaruddin, 1999). These feminists offer a variety of perspectives, some of which challenge notions of moral universalism and the imposition of Western standards on all women in all circumstances. Afsaruddin points out that the lives of women in Muslim societies are not uniform, unchanging, or monolithic. Rather than accept the idea that feminism is incompatible with Islam, Afsaruddin asserts that Western readings of Muslim traditions such as veiling by educated women in urban centers may be "the farthest thing from tradition" (p. 23). The meaning of the veil in these contexts may reflect Muslim women's decision to claim both private and public identities on their own terms.

It is not just feminism and its warrants on equity and social justice that have caused a sort of "family feud" in multiculturalism, but also the new studies that emerged around linguistic diversity, immigrant status, social class, ability, and sexuality. Although these varied and multiple identity categories do not compete as they are embodied in single individuals (for example, a Mandarin-speaking disabled lesbian Asian American woman), politically the categories are pitted against each other and compete for primacy on academic and policy agendas. Reed (1997) and Palumbo-Liu (1995) grapple with the intercultural and intracultural struggles that emerge from our increasing diversity. Tensions between older and newer immigrant communities (for instance, Chinese American, Vietnamese, Laotian, and Hmong immigrants), tensions between immigrant communities and constitutive

communities of color (such as Korean Americans and African Americans), and tensions resulting from biracial and multiracial identities all are examples of the changing cultural landscape. Political issues like those that emerged in California around undocumented workers (Proposition 187), affirmative action (Proposition 209), and bilingual education (the Unz Amendment) often reveal fissures and fractures in loosely aligned coalitions of oppressed peoples.

Of course, the tensions of class and economic asymmetry continue to plague discussions of multiculturalism. Because so much of the debate has centered on equal access and improved achievement in schools (Banks & Banks, 2001; Grant & Sleeter, 1997), a major interpretation of the project has been one of gaining access to the extant economic order. Sleeter & Grant (1987) analyzed the various forms multicultural education takes and concluded that only those that included a social reconstructionist perspective could be legitimately seen as multicultural. However, few expressions of multicultural education in school take on the critique of capitalism as systemically inequitable (McCarthy, 1993; Olneck, 1990). Increasing disparities between the rich and poor, the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, and a burgeoning underclass (Collins & Yeskel, 2000) make very real Justice Brandeis's comment that "you can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, or democracy. But you cannot have both" (Goldman, 1953, p. xi). These economic disparities occur both internationally and intranationally. Thus the concerns of a middle-class White woman or a middle-class African American man seem to take on less urgency in the face of the exploitation of Latin American and Southeast Asian workers who toil for pennies a day to make high-priced basketball shoes or baseballs. The cries of environmentalists to save the rain forests meet with hostilities from starving indigenous peoples. As Nobel Prize-winning economist Amartya Sen (1995) argues, everyone is for equality; it's just that what constitutes equality for one is not the same as for another. For instance, amid the affirmative action debate, both sides lay claim to the rhetoric of equality. Those on the left insist that the need to redress past wrongs is the only way to ensure the disruption of the cycle of inequity (Bell, 1987; Crenshaw, 1988). Those on the right insist that granting special preferences only furthers inequity (see, for example, arguments advanced by McWhorter, 2001; Sowell, 1984; and Steele, 1990).

In the face of the events that occurred in the United States on September 11, 2001 (reference is to the attack on the World Trade Center in New York City; the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.; and the downed airplane in Pennsylvania), new fault lines have been drawn concerning diversity, inclusion, and democracy. Despite the long-standing presence of Muslims in the United States, the

national gaze on Islam cast the religion in quite a different light. Now, those who practice Islam are configured in a narrow outline: Arab, Middle Eastern, religious fundamentalist, terrorist, fanatic. They have become the new “other” in the same way that American Indians, African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans were at various points in our history. Of course, this current depiction of Muslims narrows and limits the full spectrum of people who practice the religion. For instance, there are 1,209 mosques in the United States, the typical mosque is ethnically diverse, and 30 percent of Muslims in this country are African Americans (U.S. Department of State, 2001). So although Muslims of Middle Eastern origin have been made the proxy for all who practice Islam, the empirical evidence reveals that adherents to the faith are as diverse and complex as any other human group (Eck, 2001).

What does a critical resistant multiculturalism look like in a community where African American Christians, Yemeni immigrant Muslims, Orthodox Jews, Korean Buddhists, and Spanish-speaking Chicana/o Catholics all must vie for rights and opportunities? What happens when among this group there are feminists and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals at odds with some of the religious tenets of one or more of these groups? It is this “big tent” multiculturalism that has rendered much of what happens in the name of multiculturalism ineffective. The Democratic Party in the United States refers to itself as a big tent party because it purports to include everyone; unfortunately, this inclusion has not considered what happens when some groups under the tent are at odds with others.

What one group perceives as the multicultural agenda is something else for another. Victims of racism and ethnic discrimination and violence worry that attention to other forms of human diversity dilutes multicultural education’s ability to address their concerns. Feminists and other proponents of gender equity may feel marginalized within the multicultural education discourse. The complexity of identities that individuals experience makes it difficult to craft a multicultural mission that speaks to the specificity of identity. However, attempts to be all things to all people seem to minimize the effective impact of multicultural education as a vehicle for school and social change.

The identity politics of multicultural education is cast as a struggle for rights. The discussion of various groups within the rhetoric of rights provides a new way to think about these conflicts. The next section discusses Critical Race Theory as a way to formulate a rights-based discourse. It is important to note that by taking up Critical Race Theory as a theoretical framework, one is not necessarily privileging race over class, gender, or other identity category. Critical Race Theory is a complex legal and intellectual tool for making sense of all forms of human inequality. The strategies it deploys can be used by

scholars working on issues of gender, class, ability, and other forms of human difference. Its use in this chapter is as an exemplar of new scholarship. The references made here are specifically to race because of the body of scholarship that has emerged in this area.

CRITICAL RACE THEORY AS A MULTICULTURAL HEURISTIC

I did not come to America to interpret Wagner for the public. I came to discover what young Americans had in them and to help them express it. I am now satisfied that the future of music in this country must be founded upon what are called the Negro melodies. In the Negro melodies of America I discovered all that is needed for a great noble school of music. They are pathetic, tender, passionate, melancholy, solemn, religious, bold, merry, gay, or what you will.

—Antonín Dvořák, 1892 (cited in Ward & Burns, 2000, p. 10)

It may seem strange to return to a discussion of race after going to great lengths to explain the human complexity with which we are now faced. However, this argument is not about race as positivist social science defines it or how notions of liberalism embrace it. Rather, Critical Race Theory (CRT) is about deploying race and racial theory as a challenge to traditional notions of diversity and social hierarchy.

Although we are just beginning to see CRT in education (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tate, 1997), it has its beginnings in the 1970s with the early work of legal scholars Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman and their growing dissatisfaction with the slow pace of racial reform in the United States (Delgado, 1995). Soon they were joined by others; by the mid-1990s legal scholars had written more than 300 leading law review articles and a dozen books on the topic.

CRT incorporates scholarship from feminism, continental social and political philosophy, postmodernism, cultural nationalism, and a variety of social movements. Cornel West (1995) identifies CRT as

an intellectual movement that is both particular to our postmodern (and conservative) times and part of a long tradition of human resistance and liberation. On the one hand, the movement highlights a creative—and tension ridden—fusion of theoretical self-reflection, formal innovation, radical politics, existential evaluation, reconstructive experimentation and vocational anguish. But, like all bold attempts to reinterpret and remake the world to reveal silenced suffering and to relieve social misery, Critical Race Theorists put forward novel readings of a hidden past that disclose the flagrant shortcomings of the treacherous present in the light of unrealized—though not unrealizable—possibilities for human freedom and equality. (pp. xi–xii)

CRT begins with a number of premises. First and foremost is the proposition that “racism is normal, not aberrant, in American society” (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv). Because racism is such an integral part of our society, “it looks ordinary and natural to persons in the culture” (p. xiv). For instance, from time to time instances of racist behavior are exposed in “surprising” places such as corporate boardrooms (see, for example, White, 1996). These incidents are followed by public outrage and demands for redress. However, these instances keep happening over and over because they are normal, ordinary features of the society. Similarly, sexism, patriarchy, heterosexism, able-ism, classism, linguisticism, and other forms of hierarchy that come from dominance and oppression are also normal. Thus the theory’s identification of racism as normal provides an important tool for identifying other such “normal, ordinary” thinking in the society.

A second aspect of CRT is the use of storytelling to challenge racial (and other) oppression. The significance of this storytelling is not merely to exhibit another form of scholarship but rather to use stories to “analyze the myths, presuppositions, and received wisdoms that make up the common culture about race” (Delgado, 1995, p. xiv). CRT storytelling begins with the premise that a society “constructs social reality in ways that promote its own self-interest (or that of elite groups)” (p. xiv). Thus, it is the responsibility of CRT theorists to construct alternative portraits of reality—portraits from subaltern perspectives.

A third aspect of CRT is Derrick Bell’s (1980) concept of interest convergence. Here Bell argues that a society’s elites allow or encourage advances by a subordinated group only when such advances also promote the self-interest of the elites. Two examples of interest convergence are the way affirmative action policies are enacted and the specific instance of the state of Arizona and the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday. Despite all of the conservative arguments against affirmative action, an analysis of affirmative action policies indicates that White women, because of their large number, are the major beneficiaries of affirmative action (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). However, most White women have some relationship to White men, whether as spouses, partners, siblings, parents, or children. This means that White men and White children can share the financial and social benefits that White women enjoy as a result of affirmative action. Thus the interests of women and people of color converge with that of White men who receive the ancillary benefit of White women’s improved labor conditions.

In the specific case of the state of Arizona and Martin Luther King, Jr., Day, then-governor Evan Mecham argued that the state could not afford to observe the holiday. However, after threatened boycotts from tourists, various African American civil rights groups, and the National

Basketball Association, the state reversed its decision. It did not have a change of heart about the significance of honoring Martin Luther King, Jr.; rather, the potential loss of revenue meant that the state had to have its interests converge with that of African Americans.

CRT theorists have also tried out new forms of writing. Since some are postmodernists, they believe that form and substance are intimately linked. They use biography, autobiography, narratives, and counternarratives to expose the way traditional legal scholarship uses circular and self-serving doctrines and rules to bolster its arguments. Most mainstream legal scholarship embraces universalism over particularism, but CRT responds to a “call to context” (Delgado, 1995, p. xv) and a critique of liberalism, which is a system of civil rights litigation and activism that depends on incremental change, faith in the legal system, and hope for progress.

Although a number of the more prominent names in CRT are African Americans (Derrick Bell, Robin Barnes, Kimberle Crenshaw, Lani Guinier, Cheryl Harris, Charles Lawrence, Patricia Williams), Latina/o scholars (and other scholars of color) also have served as important architects of this movement. Richard Delgado, Ian Haney Lopez, Michael Olivas, Gerald Torres, Margaret Montoya, Mari Matsuda, Robert Chang, Leslie Espinoza, Jayne Chong-Soon Lee, and Lisa Ikemoto all have written important law review articles that sculpt the body of knowledge we have come to know as Critical Race Theory. This work is not just about the Black-White binary. The group known as the LatCrits (see Delgado, 1992, 2000; and Olivas, 1995) are developing a stream of CRT focused on language and immigration issues. Other CRT scholars work primarily on issues facing women of color; there are still other scholars (Grillo & Wildman, 1995; Haney Lopez, 1995) who focus on making systems of privilege more apparent. Through their work they examine the social construction of Whiteness and how Whiteness becomes the default racial identity—never occupying a space of otherness or difference.

For those who think that CRT is only about race, in the narrowest sense of the term, Delgado (2000) has an important response:

Minority groups in the United States should consider abandoning all binaries, narrow nationalisms, and strategies that focus on cutting the most favorable possible deal with whites, and instead set up a secondary market in which they negotiate selectively with each other. . . . The idea would be for minority groups to assess their own preferences and make tradeoffs that will, optimistically, bring gains for all concerned. Some controversies may turn out to be polycentric, presenting win-win possibilities so that negotiation can advance goals important to both sides without compromising anything either group deems vital. . . .

Ignoring the siren song of binaries opens up new possibilities for coalitions based on level-headed assessment of the chances for

mutual gains. It liberates one from dependence on a system that has advanced minority interests at best sporadically and unpredictably. It takes interest convergence to a new dimension. (p. 306)

Although CRT's relationship to law is evident, its use in education represents a new dimension and challenge to liberal orthodoxy in the field. However, several scholars have attempted to address the way CRT creates a new way to analyze and critique current practices in schooling and education (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999; Tate, 1997; Taylor, 1998). CRT connections to issues like school funding (Kozol, 1991) and school desegregation (Shujaa, 1996) are fairly evident. But other aspects of schooling are amenable to a CRT analysis, for example, curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Curriculum

CRT sees the official knowledge (Apple, 1993) of the school curriculum as a culturally specific artifact designed to maintain the current social order. As Swartz (1992) suggests:

Master scripting silences multiple voices and perspectives, primarily legitimizing dominant, White, upper-class, male voicings as the 'standard' knowledge students need to know. All other accounts and perspectives are omitted from the master script unless they can be disempowered through misrepresentation. Thus, content that does not reflect the dominant voice must be brought under control, *mastered*, and then reshaped before it can become a part of the master script. (p. 341)

This kind of master scripting means stories of people of color, women, and anyone who challenges this script are muted and erased. The muting or erasing of these voices is done subtly, yet effectively. Instead of omitting them altogether, they can be included in ways that distort their real meaning and significance (King, 1992). Examples of this muting and erasure are evident in the way cultural heroes are transformed in textbooks to make them more palatable to dominant constituencies. Rosa Parks becomes the tired seamstress rather than a lifelong community activist. Martin Luther King, Jr., becomes a sanitized folk hero who enjoyed the support of all "good" Americans rather than the FBI's public enemy number one who challenged an unjust war and economic injustice (Dyson, 2000). Che Guevara, the Black Panthers, Japanese American resistance to the internment camps, and countless other counternarratives rarely exist in the curriculum.

In addition to the content of the curriculum, CRT also raises questions about its quality. Many children of the dominant group have an opportunity for "enriched" and

"rigorous" curriculum. Poor, immigrant, bilingual, and children of color usually are confined to the "basics." As Kozol (1991) observes:

The curriculum [that the White school] follows "emphasizes critical thinking, reasoning and logic." The planetarium, for instance, is employed not simply for the study of the universe as it exists. "Children also are designing their own galaxies," the teacher says. . . .

"Six girls, four boys. Nine white, one Chinese. I am glad they have this class. But what about the others? Aren't there ten Black children in the school who could enjoy this also?" (p. 96)

Recent emphasis on testing in the nation's schools has meant that many schools serving subordinated students spend most of the day with no curriculum outside of test preparation. McNeil (2000) states that students experience "phony curricula, reluctantly presented by teachers in class to conform to the forms of knowledge their students would encounter on centralized tests" (p. 5).

Students who are not in the social, political, economic, and cultural mainstream find their access to high-quality curriculum restricted. Such restriction is a good example of CRT theorist Cheryl Harris's (1993) notion of use and enjoyment of property. Harris argues that Whiteness is a form of property that entitles Whites to rights of disposition, use and enjoyment, reputation and status—and the absolute right to exclude. The failure of many groups to participate in advanced classes and other school-sponsored enrichment activities is not by happenstance. The infrastructure and networks of Whiteness provide differential access to the school curriculum.

Instruction

Haberman (1991) describes what he terms the "pedagogy of poverty," reflecting the basic mode of teaching in schools serving poor urban students (who are likely to be students of color, immigrants, and children whose first language is not English). This pedagogy consists of "giving information, asking questions, giving directions, making assignments, monitoring seatwork, reviewing assignments, giving tests, reviewing tests, assigning homework, reviewing homework, settling disputes, punishing noncompliance, marking papers, and giving grades" (p. 291). According to Haberman, none of these functions is inherently bad, and in fact some might be beneficial in certain circumstances. But "taken together and performed to the systematic exclusion of other acts they have become the pedagogical coin of the realm in urban schools" (p. 291). Haberman contrasts this pedagogy of poverty with "good" teaching, which he says involves student engagement with issues important to their lives; explanations of human differences; major concepts and ideas; planning what they will be doing; applying ideals

to their world; heterogeneous groups; questioning common sense; redoing, polishing, or perfecting their work; reflecting on their own lives; and accessing technology in meaningful ways. It is no surprise that the kinds of instruction students have access to breaks along racial fault lines.

McLaren (2000) calls for a critical pedagogy that is a “way of thinking about, negotiating, and transforming the relationship among classroom teaching, the production of knowledge, the institutional structure of the school, and the social and material relations of the wider community, society, and nation-state” (p. 35). Of course, critical pedagogy must be performed by critical pedagogues, and few, if any, teacher preparation programs systematically prepare such teachers.

CRT’s project is to uncover the way pedagogy is racialized and selectively offered to students according to the setting, rather than to produce critical pedagogy. Ladson-Billings’s (1994) writing on culturally relevant pedagogy describes the work of teachers whose sociopolitical consciousness infused their teaching in a community primarily serving African American students. These teachers understood the decidedly racial and political perspective of their work and unashamedly took on oppressive structures from the school administration and state mandates.

Assessment

Current cries for accountability almost always mean some form of testing, preferably standardized testing. The George W. Bush administration claims that it will “leave no child behind” through the use of “state-of-the-art tests” and argues that “teaching to the test is really teaching those things we have already decided every child should know and be able to do” (U.S. Department of Education, 2001, pp. 7–8). For the CRT theorists, most of the tests children of color, poor children, immigrant children, and limited-English-speaking children experience inevitably legitimize their deficiencies.

In the classroom, a poor-quality curriculum, coupled with poor-quality instruction, a poorly prepared teacher, and limited resources add up to poor performance on the so-called objective tests. CRT theorists point out that the assessment game is merely a validation of the dominant culture’s superiority. In his “Chronicle of the Black Crime Cure,” Bell (1987) tells a story of a Black street gang member who finds a magical stone that he ingests. Instantly, the gang member is converted. He stops all wrongdoing and begins fighting crime wherever he finds it. Then he distributes the magical stones to the rest of his band. They too become converts and fight crime everywhere. By some mechanism, the group is able to distribute the magic stones to every Black community in the country. Crime plummets. There are no more muggings,

burglaries, rapes, or murders in the communities. However, all of the social barriers that supposedly were closed because of Black “criminal tendencies” remain intact. Jobs do not become available to Blacks. White neighborhoods do not welcome Blacks. Schools, which are now filled with well-behaved and eager Black children, continue to offer poor-quality teaching.

More important, the “Black Crime Cure,” which to this point in the chronicle has been a perennial excuse for inequitable treatment and policies, begins to undermine the crime industry. Police officers, judges, court workers, prison guards, and weapons manufacturers experience serious job cutbacks. Hundreds of millions of dollars are lost, and many begin to see how the lack of Black crime undermines the social order. The cave that holds the magical stones is mysteriously blown up.

The “Black Crime Cure” is a good example of a CRT narrative. Bell has taken a fanciful story as a canvas on which to reveal the ways that race and other social inequity are important tools for maintaining the privilege of the dominant group. An analogous education story might be called the “Achievement Gap Cure,” where Black, Latino, and American Indian families find a magical potion that allows their children to equal and exceed the academic performance of White middle-class students. Were this to happen, the dominant group would be deeply affected. All the education positions in remediation and special education would be lost. Every researcher who has made a career describing low performance and prescribing remedies would have to develop a new research agenda. More important, White middle-class parents would lobby for a new way to identify their children as superior. Such was the case in an upper-middle-class California school community that tried to detrack mathematics courses (Kohn, 1998). White middle-class parents vehemently opposed detracking because there would be no way to determine how much better their children were than other children—and to keep their children from forming social networks with the “others.”

From a CRT perspective, current assessment schemes continue to instantiate inequity and validate the privilege of those who have access to cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Indeed, the entire history of standardized testing has been one of exclusion and social ranking rather than diagnosis and school improvement. Intelligence testing, for example, has been a way to legitimate the ongoing racism aimed at non-White peoples (Aleinikoff, 1991; Gould, 1981). The history of the United States is replete with examples of how people of color have been subordinated by “scientific” theories, each of which depends on racial stereotypes that make the socioeconomic condition of these groups seem appropriate. Crenshaw (1988) contends that the point of controversy is no longer

that these stereotypes were developed to rationalize the oppression of people of color but rather that they “serve a hegemonic function by perpetuating a mythology about both [people of color] and Whites even today, reinforcing an illusion of a White community that cuts across ethnic, gender, and class lines” (p. 1371).

The promise of CRT is that it can be deployed as a theoretical tool for uncovering many types of inequity and social injustice—not just racial inequity and injustice. Some aspects of this new scholarship are beginning to appear in the current scholarly efforts in multiculturalism and multicultural education. Examples of this work are presented in the next section.

CURRENT TRENDS IN MULTICULTURALISM

My music is the spiritual expression of what I am—my faith, my knowledge, my being. . . . When you begin to see possibilities of music, you desire to do something really good for people, to help humanity free itself from its hang-ups.

—John Coltrane (quoted in Ward & Burns, 2000, p. 436)

The possibilities that this current era offers for multiculturalism and multicultural education seem endless. In addition to adding new areas such as disability studies (Linton, 1998; Shakespeare, 1998) and queer studies (Fuss, 1991; Sedgwick, 1990), cultural studies, postcolonial, postmodern, and poststructuralist studies all attempt to push past conventional and essentialized thinking about race, class, and gender. But these “new studies” are not unproblematic. Multicultural education’s seeming allegiance to the triumvirate of race, class, and gender may have rendered it less useful to scholars and practitioners who have to work with the complexities of identities that do not fit into fixed categories. Thus cultural studies, with its multiple lenses and multilayered perspectives, began to fill this space. Unfortunately, the complexity of identity may also mean that some explanations offered by cultural studies are too diffuse and rhetorical to be meaningful in everyday lives, especially in pre-K–12 classrooms. Sometimes what is pushing up against an individual is racism or sexism, or class discrimination plain and simple. An argument about one’s complex identity does not alleviate that oppression.

Similarly, although postcolonial theory serves as a useful rubric for scholarship, the people who live under these regimes ask, as Aboriginal activist Bobbi Sykes did most memorably,

“What? Post-colonialism? Have they left?” (cited in Smith, 1999, p. 24). Smith further asserts that “there is also, amongst indigenous academics, the sneaking suspicion that the fashion of post-

colonialism has become a strategy for reinscribing or reauthorizing the privilege of non-indigenous academics because the field of ‘post-colonial’ discourse has been defined in ways which can still leave out indigenous peoples, our ways of knowing and our current concerns.” (p. 24)

On the question of the postmodern, multiculturalism again offers an important challenge. Clearly oppressed peoples have argued about the contested nature of history and other social phenomena (Smith, 1999). West (1993) argues that postmodernism is attractive, for example, to Black intellectuals because it “speaks to the black postmodern predicament, defined by rampant xenophobia of bourgeois humanism predominant in the whole academy, the waning attraction to orthodox reductionist and scientific versions of Marxism, and the need for reconceptualization regarding the specificity and complexity of African American oppression” (p. 80). But as Smith points out, “there can be no ‘postmodern’ for us until we have settled some business of the modern” (p. 34).

Perhaps the place where these new trends can most help multiculturalism and multicultural education is methodology. Early scholarship in multiculturalism seemed to mimic mainstream scholarship, with its use of surveys, interviews, content analysis, and other apparently positivist approaches to research. Multiculturalism and multicultural education have access to more expanded methodologies such as narrative inquiry (Tierney, 1995), counterstories (Bell, 1998), historical ethnographies (Siddle Walker, 1996), autobiography, portraiture (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997), and a full range of indigenous projects: claiming, testimonies, celebrating survival, remembering, indigenizing, intervening, revitalizing, gendering, connecting, envisioning, reframing, restoring, returning, democratizing, naming, protecting, creating, and sharing (Smith, 1999). Fewer academic writers have taken up the challenge to “talk back” (hooks, 1989) in their own languages. Notable exceptions are the work of Ngugi Wa Thiong’o (1986) and Anzaldúa (1987), which use native languages to work against oppression. Wa Thiong’o asserted that “language carries culture and the language of the colonizer became the means by which the ‘mental universe of the colonized’ was dominated” (quoted in Smith, 1999, p. 36).

The other more present trend in multiculturalism and multicultural education is globalization. Even though multicultural education has always included some acknowledgment of international iterations (Moodley, 1983; Troyna & Williams, 1986; Verma & Bagley, 1982), like their U.S. counterparts they were local expressions of multiculturalism that deal primarily with the cultural landscape of particular nation states. Now with the increasing blurring of national geopolitical borders, notions of difference and otherness take on new meaning. Technological

advances mean that the West can (and does) assert its hegemony over what people see and hear, how they speak, and ultimately what they think. Communication satellites, fiber optic cables, the Internet, and e-mail bring every corner of the world into our homes. Almost everywhere in the world, people have access to CNN, ESPN, and other U.S.-generated images and perspectives. Thus a worldwide vision of civilization, progress, aesthetics, standard of living, and advance reflects what the world of Western television and other media project.

In this more global environment, the question of group rights versus individual rights takes on new meaning (Kymlicka, 1995). Group and individual rights in South Africa shape up differently from such rights in Germany. Pan-ethnic rights signal new alignments and configurations. Despite the controversy over Huntington's (1997) assessment of realignment in world allegiances, he clearly raised some important questions about how culture may be positioned to trump nationality. Huntington argues that instead of national allegiances, the world is divided along what he terms civilizational allegiances. Thus Spanish speakers, regardless of their national residence, may demonstrate a strong affinity to each other in relation to other groups, or Muslims worldwide may cohere in opposition to Jews or Christians. However, it is equally important to avoid the single-explanation trap that substitutes culture for economy. Indeed, the melding of culture, economy, and politics makes for a new calculus where disruption in one part of the world causes tremors throughout the world. The breakup of the Soviet Union, war in the Balkans, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, and famine in East Africa all work to configure nation-states in different ways. Previously "White" nations find their streets and communities home to immigrants from Black, Brown, and Yellow nations. Those nations that formerly talked about diversity and multiculturalism in the abstract now come face to face with multicultural, multilingual everyday lives.

The enduring question facing multicultural education is what to do as a school reform effort in the face of this rapid social and cultural change. Multicultural education faces pressure from forces of school reform and standardization on one end of the spectrum and the complexities and changes occasioned by globalization on the other. Gay (2001) points out the current lag between multicultural education theory and practice. Such a gap is likely to be exacerbated by the call for standardized tests as the primary measure of achievement as well as the sheer volume of new knowledge about the world and increasing global interactions. College and university programs seem to be moving in two directions related to these pressures. To conform to the demands of state and national external reviews, some programs of teacher preparation are developing standards-based programs (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2002)

that at least nominally address diversity. At the same time, more graduate programs include opportunities for advanced work in multicultural education, multiculturalism, and cultural studies.

Where multiculturalism and multicultural education go from here is difficult to predict. Will it follow the 1970s jazz lead, succumb to the pressures of conformity, and produce a fusion that is palatable but without substance? Or will it be the jazz that Wynton Marsalis (cited in Ward & Burns, 2000) recognizes?

That's the thing in jazz that got Bix Beiderbecke up out of his bed at two o'clock in the morning to pick that cornet up and practice with it into the pillow for another two or three hours. Or that would make Louis Armstrong travel around the world for fifty years non-stop, just get up out of his sickbed, crawl up on the bandstand, and play. The thing that would make Duke Ellington, Thelonius Monk, Miles Davis, Charlie Parker—any of these people that we've heard about—all these wonderful people—give their lives. And they did give their lives for it, because it gives us a glimpse into what America is going to be when it becomes itself. And this music tells you that it *will* become itself. (p. 460)

SUMMARY COMMENTS AND FUTURE QUESTIONS

This chapter began by highlighting the growing presence of multicultural forms in the society. It points out that the current popularity of multiculturalism and multicultural education does not necessarily speak to the complexity and dissonance that is occurring within the field. The chapter uses work by McLaren (1994) and King (2001) as rubrics for rethinking and rearticulating what we mean by multiculturalism and multicultural education. Rather than one multiculturalism, both theorists offer multiple representations of multiculturalism that are aimed at decidedly different agendas. The chapter endorses McLaren's critical resistant multiculturalism and King's deciphering knowledge as a form of emancipatory practice.

Next, the chapter discusses some of the tensions that exist within the field. It points out that some traditional issues of multiculturalism began to bump up against each other around race, class, gender, language, immigrant status, ability, and sexuality. Uneasy alliances seem to find multiculturalism an uncomfortable space, and several movements for social justice and equity actually worked against each other. Out of this discussion flows an explanation and analysis of Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a heuristic for multiculturalism and multicultural education. The chapter explains CRT as a strategy for reinventing legal scholarship in civil rights and then explores ways it might apply to education. Finally, the chapter points out the ongoing challenges multiculturalism and multicultural education face with increasing demands by diverse groups, the growing complexities of

the human condition, and expanding methodologies. The chapter concludes by recognizing globalization as an ever-present force in our thinking about multiculturalism and multicultural education.

In the midst of the complexity and seeming confusion, what, then, are the research and scholarship agendas for multiculturalism and multicultural education? How will academics take on the challenge of writing and researching in a rapidly changing sociocultural reality? Where do the concerns of schoolchildren (no matter where they are in the world) who are left behind in the information age surface as we attempt to unravel and unpack our projects? What, if anything, is to be done about the fissures and fractures? What will constitute the next generation of new scholarship for even newer directions in multicultural education?

These are important questions as we move into a world where globalization defines the economy, culture, and politics of people everywhere (Suárez-Orozco, 2001). The fact of a worldwide media that transports not only news and information but also cultural images of how to be and act in the world means that our conceptions of culture can no longer be simplistic, one-dimensional, and essentialized. The hegemony of world English reinscribes the power of the West—particularly the United States and its

allies—at the same moment the West itself is being contested. The United States and the Western European nations are undergoing demographic changes that challenge perceptions of them as White, Christian nations.

Scholars will need to respond to the postcolonial and multiple discourses that worldwide change demands. Their work will have to incorporate heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity and be more tentative in its assertions. Scholarship will be more like everyday life: less certain, less definitive, and less prescriptive. In K-12 classrooms, teachers will have to work back and forth between individual and group identities, while at the same moment taking principled stands on behalf of students who, because of some perceived difference or sense of otherness, are left behind. The new work of multicultural education must be more generative. Both scholars and classroom teachers must look for opportunities, new ways to think and learn about human diversity and social justice. They must be willing to push innovation in multicultural education. Multicultural education must be open to conflict and change, as is true of any culture and cultural form if it is to survive. Multicultural education, like jazz, must remain “gloriously inclusive” (Ward & Burns, 2000, p. 460). Each epoch must offer us a new direction in multicultural education.

References

- Afsaruddin, A. (Ed.). (1999). *Hermeneutics and honor: Negotiating female public space in Islamic/ate societies*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Aleinikoff, T. A. (1991). A case for race-consciousness. *Columbia Law Review*, 91, 1060–1125.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Ante Lute Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1993). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C.A.M. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Bell, D. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518–533.
- Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: The elusive quest for racial justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (1998). *Afrolantic legacies*. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Bennett, T. (1992). Putting policy into cultural studies. In L. Grossbert, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 23–27). London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & F. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487–511). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Coffey, M. (2000). What puts the “culture” in “multiculturalism”? An analysis of culture, government, and the politics of Mexican identity. In R. Mahalingam & C. McCarthy (Eds.), *Multicultural curriculum: New directions for social theory, practice, and policy* (pp. 37–55). New York: Routledge.
- Collins, C., & Yeskel, F. (2000). *Economic apartheid: A primer on economic inequality and security*. New York: New Press.
- Conley, D. (2000). *Honky*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Crenshaw, K. (1988). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. *Harvard Law Review*, 101, 1331–1387.
- Davis, F. (1985). Ornette's permanent revolution. [On-line]. Available: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/jazz/dornette.htm
- Delgado, R. (1992). Rodrigo's chronicle. *Yale Law Journal*, 101, 1357–1383.
- Delgado, R. (Ed.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Delgado, R. (2000). Derrick Bell's toolkit—Fit to dismantle that famous house? *New York University Law Review*, 75, 283–307.
- DuBois, W.E.B. (1953/1989). *The souls of Black folk*. New York: Bantam Books. (Originally published in 1953)
- Dyson, M. E. (1994). Essentialism and the complexities of racial identity. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 218–229). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Press.
- Dyson, M. E. (2000). *I may not get there with you: The true Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Free Press.
- Eck, D. (2001). *A new religious America: How a “Christian country” has become the world's most religiously diverse nation*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Engel, C. (1922). Jazz: A musical discussion. [On-line]. Available: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/jazz/cengel.htm
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skins, White masks*. New York: Grove Press.

- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fuss, D. (Ed.). (1991). *Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Gay, G. (2001). Curriculum theory and multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 25–43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 481–517.
- Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glazer, N. (1997). *We are all multiculturalists now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldman, S. (Ed.). (1953). *The words of Justice Brandeis*. New York: Schuman.
- Gordon, E. W. (1997). Task force on the role and future of minorities: American Educational Research Association. *Educational Researcher*, 26(3), 44–52.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.
- Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1997). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Grillo, T., & Wildman, S. M. (1995). Obscuring the importance of race: The implication of making comparisons between racism and sexism (or other-isms). In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical Race Theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 564–572). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Haberman, M. (1991). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 290–294.
- Hacker, A. (1992). *Two nations: Black and White, separate, hostile, unequal*. New York: Basic Books.
- Haney Lopez, I. (1995). White by law. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical Race Theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 542–550). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106, 1707–1791.
- Heble, A. (2000). *Landing on the wrong note: Jazz, dissonance and critical practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Hollinger, D. (1995). *Postethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black*. Boston: South End Press.
- Huntington, S. (1997). *The clash of civilization and the remaking of world order*. New York: Touchstone.
- Jaimes, M. A., & Halsey, T. (1992). American Indian women at the center of indigenous resistance in contemporary North America. In M. A. Jaimes (Ed.), *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization, and resistance* (pp. 311–344). Boston: South End Press.
- James, S., & Busia, A. (Eds.). (1993). *Theorizing Black feminisms: The visionary pragmatism of Black women*. New York: Routledge.
- King, J. E. (1992). Diaspora literacy and consciousness in the struggle against miseducation in the Black community. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61, 317–340.
- King, J. E. (2001). Culture-centered knowledge: Black studies, curriculum transformation, and social action. In J. A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 265–290). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kohn, A. (1998). Only for my kid: How privileged parents undermine school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79, 568–577.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Kymlicka, W. (Ed.). (1995). *The rights of minority cultures*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7–24.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. H. (1997). *The art and science of portraiture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Linton, S. (1998). *Claiming disability: Knowledge and identity*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lowe, L. (1996). *Immigrant acts*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McCarthy, C. (1988). Reconsidering liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 265–279.
- McCarthy, C. (1993). After the canon: knowledge and ideological representation in the multicultural discourse on curriculum reform. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 289–305). New York: Routledge.
- McKay, S., & Wong, S. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 577–608.
- McLaren, P. (1994). White terror and oppositional agency: Towards a critical multiculturalism. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 45–74). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the pedagogy of revolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McNeil, L. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing*. New York: Routledge.
- McWhorter, J. (2001). *Losing the race: Self-sabotage in Black America*. New York: HarperPerennial Library.
- Minh-ha, T. T. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcolonially and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Moodley, K. A. (1983). Canadian multiculturalism as ideology. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 6, 320–331.
- Morrison, T. (1989). Unspeakable things unspoken: The Afro-American presence in American literature. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 28(1), 1–34.
- Morrison, T. (1991). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness in the literary imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morrison, T., & Lacour, C. B. (Eds.). (1997). *Birth of a nationhood: Gaze, script, and spectacle in the O. J. Simpson case*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Okin, S., Cohen, J., Howard, M., & Nussbaum, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Is multiculturalism bad for women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Olivas, M. (1995). The chronicles, my grandfather's stories, and immigration law: The slave traders chronicle as racial history. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical Race Theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 9–20). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Olneck, M. (1990). The recurring dream: Symbolism and ideology in intercultural and multicultural education. *American Journal of Education*, 98(2), 147–174.
- Palumbo-Liu, D. (Ed.). (1995). *The ethnic canon: Histories, institutions and interventions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Parker, L., Deyhle, D., & Villenas, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Multiculturalism: E pluribus plures. *American Scholar*, 59(3), 337–354.
- Reed, I. (Ed.). (1997). *Multi-America: Essays on cultural wars and cultural peace*. New York: Viking Press.
- Schlesinger, A. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections of a multicultural society*. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Schmitz, B., Butler, J., Rosenfelt, D., & Guy-Sheftall, B. (2001). Women's studies and curriculum transformation. In J. A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 708–728). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sedgwick, E. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sen, A. (1995). *Inequality reexamined*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shakespeare, T. (Ed.). (1998). *Disability reader: Social sciences perspectives*. London: Cassell.
- Shujaa, M. (Ed.). (1996). *Beyond desegregation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Siddle Walker, E. V. (1996). *Their highest potential: An African American school community in the segregated south*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sims, R. (1982). *Shadow and substance: Afro-American experience in contemporary children's fiction*. Urban, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, 7, 421–444.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Sowell, T. (1984). *Civil rights: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: Morrow.
- Steele, S. (1990). *The content of our character: A new vision of race in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Strickland, E. (1987). What Coltrane wanted. [On-line]. Available: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/jazz/strickla.htm
- Suárez-Orozco, M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education: The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71, 345–365.
- Sundgaard, A. (1955). Jazz, hot and cold. [On-line]. Available: www.theatlantic.com/unbound/jazz/sungaar.htm
- Swartz, E. (1992). Emancipatory narratives: Rewriting the master script in the school curriculum. *Journal of Negro Education*, 61, 341–355.
- Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (vol. 22, pp. 195–247). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Taylor, E. (1998, Spring). A primer on CRT. *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 19, 122–124.
- Tierney, W. (1995). (Re)presentation and voice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1, 379–390.
- Troyna, B., & Williams, J. (1986). *Racism, education, and the state: The racialisation of education policy*. London: Croom Helm.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Report of the Population*. [On-line]. Available: www.census.gov
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001, August). *Back to school, moving forward*. Washington, DC: Educational Publications Center.
- U.S. Department of State. (2001). [On-line]. Available: <http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/muslimlife>
- Verma, G., & Bagley, C. (Eds.). (1982). *Self-concept, achievement and multicultural education*. London: Macmillan.
- Wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. London: Currey.
- Ward, G. C., & Burns, K. (2000). *Jazz: A history of America's music*. New York: Knopf.
- Warrior, R. A. (1995). *Tribal secrets: Recovering American Indian intellectual traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- West, C. (1993). *Keeping faith: Philosophy and race in America*. New York: Routledge.
- West, C. (1995). Foreword. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. xi–xii). New York: New Press.
- White, J. E. (1996, November 25). Texaco's high-octane racism problems. *Time*, 148, pp. 33–34.
- Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords*. London: Fontana.
- Wynter, S. (1989). Beyond the word of man: Glissant and the new discourse of the Antilles. *World Literature Today*, 63, 637–648.
- Wynter, S. (1992). *Do not call us "Negroes": How "multicultural" textbooks perpetuate racism*. San Francisco: Aspire Books.

