Multicultural education grew out of social protest movements of the 1960s, particularly challenges to racism in education. Banks (Chapter 1, this volume) traces the roots of multicultural education to the ethnic studies movement of the 1960s, which is itself a legacy of earlier ethnic studies pioneers such as Carter G. Woodson and W.E.B. DuBois. During the 1960s, in the context of social activism addressing a range of manifestations of racism, community groups, students, and ethnic studies scholars pressed for the inclusion of ethnic content in the curriculum in order to bring intellectual counternarratives to the dominant Eurocentric narratives. Multicultural education thus began as a scholarly and activist movement to transform schools and their contexts. Over time, as more and more people have taken up and used multicultural education, it has come to have an ever wider array of meanings. In the process, ironically (given its historical roots), a good deal of what occurs within the arena of multicultural education today does not address power relations critically, particularly racism. This chapter will review some of today's critical discourses for their implications for multicultural education. Our intent is not to move multicultural education away from its core conceptual moorings, but rather to anchor the field more firmly in those moorings.

Many contemporary renderings of multicultural education examine difference without connecting it to power or a critical analysis of racism. This is probably because the great majority of classroom teachers and school administrators are White and bring a worldview that tacitly condones existing race and class relations. For example, Sleeter (1992) studied a group of teachers who had volunteered to participate in a staff development project in multicultural education. Of 26 who discussed what multicultural education meant to them by the second year of the project, 7 White teachers saw it as irrelevant to their work and 6 White teachers saw its main purpose as helping students learn to get along with each other. Eight teachers (1 African American and the rest White ESL or special education teachers) saw multicultural education as building students' self-esteem in response to exclusion of some students' experience in school and the wider society. Five (2 African American and 3 White) had more complex conceptions, but only one of these directly connected multicultural education with social activism. In short, almost all of these educators filtered their understanding of multicultural education through conceptual discourses of individualism and psychology and took for granted as neutral the existing structures and processes of school and its relationship to communities.

At the same time that multicultural education has been acquiring a range of meanings, many theorists and educators (inside and outside multicultural education) who are concerned about racism, oppression, and how to build democracy in historically racist and hierarchical multicultural societies have advanced perspectives that explicitly address social justice. To distinguish these perspectives from noncritical orientations toward multicultural
education, some have begun using the term critical multiculturalism (e.g., Kanpol & McLaren, 1995; May, 1999a; Obidah, 2000).

Some conceptions of critical multiculturalism foreground racism. On the basis of an analysis of teacher education student responses to a discussion of race, Berlak and Moyenda (2001) argued that liberal conceptions of multiculturalism support "white privilege by rendering institutional racism invisible," leading to the belief that injustices will disappear if people simply learn to get along (p. 94). They stated that "central to critical multiculturalism is naming and actively challenging racism and other forms of injustice, not simply recognizing and celebrating differences and reducing prejudice" (p. 92). McCarthy (1995) argued that various models of multicultural education rest far too heavily on attitude change as a means of social transformation and take for granted essentialized racial identities, failing to situate racial inequality within global relations. Critical multiculturalism "links the microdynamics of the school curriculum to larger issues of social relations outside the school" (p. 43). Similarly, in an effort to join antiracism with multicultural education, May (1999a) stated that critical multiculturalism "incorporates postmodern conceptions and analyses of culture and identity, while holding onto the possibility of an emancipatory politics" (pp. 7-8).

Other conceptions link multiculturalism with critical pedagogy (Kanpol & McLaren, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Kanpol and McLaren used the term critical multiculturalism to emphasize that "justice is not evenly distributed and cannot be so without a radical and profound change in social structures and in terms of a development of historical agency and a praxis of possibility" (p. 13). Obidah (2000) described herself as a critical multiculturalist because the tools of both critical pedagogy and multicultural education have helped her link a dynamic conception of culture, identity, and lived experience with an analysis of power structures and pedagogy.

This chapter explores the implications of critical traditions for multicultural education in order to connect it more firmly to its transformative roots and to encourage dialogue across contemporary critical traditions. We realized that in order to keep the chapter manageable, we could focus on only three traditions. We selected critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education. The chapter therefore omits groundbreaking work in multicultural feminism (e.g., Collins, 1990), critical cultural studies (e.g., Hall, 1993), and disability studies (e.g., Linton, 1998), which also have implications for multicultural education. Each section that follows provides a brief genealogy, implications, and limitations for each of the three bodies of literature as they relate to multicultural education. The final section of the chapter sketches out a synthesis of this analysis; in the process it suggests the need to expand the dialogue among critical pedagogy, critical race theory, antiracist education, and multicultural education.

Critical pedagogy can be defined as "an entry point in the contradictory nature of schooling, a chance to force it toward creating conditions for a new public sphere" (Giroux, 1983, p. 116). According to Giroux (1992), critical pedagogy should "explore how pedagogy functions as a cultural practice to produce rather than merely transmit knowledge within the asymmetrical relations of power that structure teacher-student relations" (p. 98). Theorists of critical pedagogy view schools as "contradictory social sites" (Giroux, 1983, p. 115) in which class relations are not simply reproduced but also contested through the actions students and educators construct every day. As such, youth could learn collectively to construct a new democratic public sphere. Critical pedagogy, then, offers a language of both "analysis and hope" (McLaren, 1991, p. 30). Gay (1995) described many conceptual parallels between multicultural education and critical pedagogy and advocated an active coalition between the fields.

Critical pedagogy can be traced to at least two genealogical roots: (a) critical theory and the Frankfurt School and (b) the work of Paulo Freire and Latin American liberation movements. The Frankfurt School, which began in Germany prior to World War II, connected a Marxist analysis of class structure with psychological theories of the unconscious to understand how oppressive class relations are produced and reproduced. The culturalist paradigm of the Frankfurt School emphasized human agency, focusing on the lived experiences of people and how consciousness is formed within class struggles. The structuralist paradigm analyzed how oppressive political and economic structures are reproduced, but it tended to ignore or deny personal agency (Giroux, 1983). The rise of Nazism in Germany caused many members of the Frankfurt School to flee to the United States, where theorists in many disciplines took up critical theory. Critical theorists do not necessarily practice or write about critical pedagogy. In the 1980s, theorists such as Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren applied critical theory's analytical tools to pedagogy, creating a "pedagogy of critical theory" (Pruyn, 1994, p. 38). According to Giroux (1983), critical pedagogy seeks to "bridge the agency-structural dualism" of the Frankfurt School by viewing youth culture as a site of cultural production, social struggle, and social transformation (p. 139).
A second genealogical root of critical pedagogy is the work of Freire (1970, 1973, 1976) and Latin American liberation movements. Freire began writing while in exile in Chile. He had promoted popular literacy in Brazil, connecting the act of reading with the development of critical consciousness. Freire argued throughout his life that oppressed people need to develop a critical consciousness that will enable them to denounce dehumanizing social structures and announce social transformation. In the process of teaching literacy to adults, he created culture circles in which students took up topics of concern to them, discussed and debated in order to clarify and develop their thinking, and developed strategies for action. Freire did not call these culture circles “schools” because of the passivity traditionally associated with school learning. A fundamental task in culture circles was to distinguish between what humans have created and what nature created, in order to examine what role humans can play in bringing about change. Freire’s connection between critical education and political work for liberation took up questions similar to those being asked by critical theorists.

Potential Implications of Critical Pedagogy for Multicultural Education

Critical pedagogy has four main implications for multicultural education: (a) conceptual tools for critical reflectivity; (b) an analysis of class, corporate power, and globalization; (c) an analysis of empowering pedagogical practices within the classroom; and (d) a deeper analysis of language and literacy than one finds generally in the multicultural education literature.

Critical pedagogy as a theoretical space develops several concepts that relate to multicultural education, among them voice, culture, power, culture, and ideology. In so doing, it offers tools for critical reflectivity on those concepts. Voice is grounded in Freire’s notion of dialogical communication, which rejects both the authoritarian imposition of knowledge and also the idea that everyone’s beliefs are equal. To Freire (1998), the development of democratic life requires critical engagement with ideas through dialogue. Dialogue demands engagement; it occurs neither when some parties opt out silently nor when those with the most power simply impose their views. Voice is rooted in experience that is examined for its interests, principles, values, and historical remembrances (Darder, 1995; Giroux, 1988; hooks, 1994). The concepts of voice and dialogue act as tools for uncovering whose ideas are represented and whose ideas have been submerged, marginalized, or left out entirely.

Critical pedagogy offers tools for examining the concept of culture. Simplistic conceptions of culture are common in multicultural education, although many multiculturalists also critique them. McCarthy (1998) noted that too often “culture, identity, and community are narrowly read as the final property of particular groups based on ethnic origins” (p. 148); for example, teachers commonly conflate ethnicity and culture, seeing them as synonymous. Within this conception of culture, “multiculturalism is generally about Otherness” in a way that makes Whiteness and racial struggle invisible and takes for granted boundaries of race, ethnicity, and power (Giroux, 1992, p. 117). Whose conceptions of culture tend to predominate, and what gets left out of those conceptions? For example, hybrid cultural identities defy fixed and essentialized definitions of culture (e.g., see Darder, 1995; McCarthy, 1998). Dominant cultures can be examined with much greater depth when contextualized within relations of colonialism and power than when they are decontextualized (McLaren & Mayo, 1999). Popular culture as a form of collective meaning making also “counts” as culture (Giroux & Simon, 1989; Livingstone, 1987; Shor, 1980).

Power is yet another concept within multicultural education that critical pedagogy helps to examine (Kinche-loe & Steinberg, 1997). Giroux (1985) pointed out that some progressive and multicultural education discourses “quietly ignore the complexity and sweat of social change” and reduce power and domination to misunderstandings that can be corrected by providing accurate information (p. 31). Challenging power relations is central to critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970), which is based on an analysis of structural as well as cultural power. It is the centrality of interrogating how power works and how power relations can be challenged that led McLaren (2000) to focus on revolution rather than reform. Multicultural education in its inception challenged power relations, particularly racism, and for some multicultural educators power remains a central concept. However, power is often displaced by more comfortable concepts such as tolerance. Critical pedagogy offers an important critique of that displacement and continues to ask the question, Comfortable for whom?

Ideology is a concept that is central to critical pedagogy but used surprisingly little in multicultural education. Ideology refers to “the formation of the consciousness of the individuals” in a society, particularly their consciousness about how the society works (Apple, 1979, p. 2). Within multicultural education, curriculum is often discussed in terms of bias, a concept that does not necessarily lead to an analysis of power and consciousness. Similarly, examining teachers in terms of attitudes focuses on individual psychology rather than collective power. Ideology offers a much more powerful conceptual tool, connecting meanings with structures of power on the one hand and with individuals on the other. Ideology as a tool of analysis “helps to locate the structuring principles and
ideas that mediate between the dominant society and the everyday experiences of teachers and students" (Giroux, 1983, p. 161). It helps us examine who produces what kinds of ideologies, why some ideologies prevail, and whose interests they serve (see Apple, 2000). Ideology can also serve as a reflexive tool of critique when multicultural education itself is conceived as a field of discourse. Lei (2001), for example, examined the ideology of multicultural education as it was used in specific contexts in order to question whose interests those conceptions served, what issues they foreground, and whose interests and points of view were displaced.

A second potential implication of critical pedagogy is its analysis of social class, class power, corporate power, and global corporate control. Although multicultural education grew primarily out of racial and ethnic struggle, critical pedagogy grew primarily out of class struggle. In the United States, connections between race and class tend to be undertheorized partially because of the myth that the United States is a "classless" society, which leads to a general refusal to examine class relations critically. Yet the forms and persistence of racism can be understood more clearly when racism is connected historically with capitalism (Marable, 2000; Rodgiger, 1991; Sleeter, 2001). Freire (1973) specifically located his work in a history of colonialism and class struggle: "It was upon this vast lack of democratic experience, characterized by feudal mentality and sustained by a colonial economic and social structure, that we attempted to inaugurate a formal democracy" (p. 28).

Connections between racism and global capitalism lend urgency to the significance of class. Over the past two decades, a small corporate elite has extended global control markedly and consolidated means for wealth accumulation. At the same time, however, even critical pedagogues have retreated from concern with class and capitalism. McLaren (1998) argued that the "growing diasporic movements of immigrants in search of employment across national boundaries" has led to an increased discourse around ethnicity, but domesticated ways of thinking about it have displaced critiques of capitalist expansion. Given the rampant and unchecked expansion of global capitalism, critical pedagogy and multicultural education need to "address themselves to the adaptive persistence of capitalism and to issues of capitalist imperialism and its specific manifestations of accumulative capacities through conquest" (1998). Multicultural education could benefit from a trenchant analysis of capitalist expansion and global capitalism. Increased poverty, racial strife, incarceration of youth of color, movements of people around the globe, and corporate-driven school reforms can be understood more clearly when class is part of the analysis. That is not to imply that class should be given primacy over race or gender, but rather that these concepts should be developed as connected structures of oppression, lenses of analysis, and sites of struggle.

A third potential implication of critical pedagogy for multicultural education is its examination of how power plays out in the classroom, and its connection of pedagogical processes with empowerment. In this regard, critical pedagogy and feminist pedagogy share similar concerns (hooks, 1994; Lather, 1991). Multicultural education as a field has extensively examined school knowledge and developed insights for transformative curricula, usually discussing pedagogy mainly in relationship to strategies that support high achievement for all students (e.g., Banks, 1999; Bennett, 1998). Critical pedagogy complements this work by conceptualizing students as creators of knowledge and by connecting student-generated knowledge with student empowerment. Freire (1970) explicitly rejected a "banking" form of pedagogy "in which students are the depositories and the teacher is the depoisor" (p. 53), viewing it as an instrument of control over the masses. Instead, he viewed empowering pedagogy as a dialogical process in which the teacher acts as a partner with students, helping them examine the world critically, using a problem-solving process that begins with their own experience and historical location.

Several critical pedagogy theorists have written about the use of this form of pedagogy in their own classrooms. Most of these discussions focus on adult students (e.g., Ada, 1988; Curtis & Rasool, 1997; Mayo, 1995; Shor, 1980, 1992; R. I. Simon, 1992; Sleeter, 1995; Solorzano, 1989), although a few focus on the K-12 level (Bigelow, 1990; Goldstein, 1995; Peterson, 1991). In all of these discussions, pedagogy starts with students' lived experience and involves students in analysis of that experience. Students are treated as active agents of knowledge creation, and classrooms as democratic public spheres. Class materials are used as tools for expanding students' analyses, rather than as content that is simply deposited into the students. This view of pedagogy complements multicultural education well.

A fourth potential implication of critical pedagogy for multicultural education is its analysis of language and literacy, which connects to concerns of bilingual educators. Multicultural education and bilingual education have emerged as distinct fields, with some overlap. For example, an ERIC search in June 2001 yielded 5,117 journal articles with multicultural education as a keyword and 3,216 journal articles with bilingual education as a keyword, but only 431 articles with both multicultural education and bilingual education. Language and culture are part of each other, the fields need bridging, and critical pedagogy is one bridge.

Drawing from his experience teaching literacy to adults, Freire distinguished between technical and critical approaches to literacy. A technical approach focuses
on language as a subject distinct from the world of stu-
dents, or "words emptied of the reality they are meant to
represent" (Freire, 1973, p. 37). Critical literacy begins
with words within students' experience and then situates
them historically, helping students learn to question their
world, with language serving as a tool of critical analysis.

Language, then, is a key tool in development of con-
sciousness and voice. Macedo and Bartolome (1999) chal-
enged the notion that multicultural education can take
place in English only, noting that "one cannot celebrate
different cultural values through the very dominant lan-
guage that devalues, in many ways, the cultural experi-
ences of different cultural groups," and that "language is
the only means through which one comes to conscious-
ness" (p. 34). Identity, values, experiences, interpreta-
tions, and ideologies are encoded linguistically; one
knows the world and oneself through language. Because
consciousness is shaped through language, language can
serve as a means of control as well as a means of libera-
tion (Giroux & McLaren, 1992; Macedo, 1994).

These ideas resonate with many second language
teachers and bilingual educators who are conscious of
oppression. For example, on the basis of his work as an
ESL (English as a Second Language) teacher to adult
farmworkers, Graman (1988) explained that when lan-
guage was treated as a subject abstracted from everyday
life, students lost interest. Drawing language from life and
then examining students' problems and dreams politically
in the context of second language instruction engaged
them in learning and helped them use education to act on
their own behalf. In short, critical pedagogy can enrich
analysis of language within multicultural education.

Limitations of Critical Pedagogy and Its Implications for
Multicultural Education

Critical pedagogy has two major limitations that need to
be acknowledged. First, although it developed through
practice in Latin America, within the United States it has
been developed mainly at a theoretical level, often leav-
ing practitioners unclear about what to do. Its theoretical
writings tend to be conceptually dense, which many prac-
titioners find difficult to understand, although one can
find literature that shows what critical pedagy "looks
like" in practice (e.g., Bromley, 1989; Pruyn, 1994, 1999;
Students for Cultural and Linguistic Democracy, 1996;
Wink, 1997). In this, a strength and limitation of critical
pedagogy are joined. Critical pedagogues argue that the
ideology of the teacher is of central importance; critical
pedagogy cannot be reduced to method or technique. At
the same time, teachers need guidance when translating
ideological clarity into practice; radical teachers can still
teach in very traditional ways (Pruyn, 1999). This trans-
lation needs to go far beyond learning steps or seeing

lesson plans, since critical pedagogy directly opens up
very difficult and painful issues in the classroom
(Elsworth, 1989; Obidah, 2000). We have worked with
many teachers who, even when they are drawn to ideas
of critical pedagogy, end up dismissing it because they do
not know what to do with it in their classrooms. Particu-
larly given the back-to-basics turn of the past several
years, critical pedagogy suggests a very different paradigm
from that institutionalized in most schools. There is a
need for practical guidance that does not, in the process,
sacrifice conceptual grounding.

Second, most of the literature in critical pedagogy does
not directly address race, ethnicity, or gender, and as such
it has a White bias. Since much of it grows from a class
analysis, with some exceptions it foregrounds social class.
Critical pedagogy may well appeal to radical White edu-
cators who see class as the main axis of oppression, but
doing so can marginalize race and have the effect of ele-
vating the power of largely White radical theorists over
theorists of color, even if this is not intended. Further,
White theorists taking on race and racism does not
resolve the problem of Whites having the power to define
how race and racism are theorized. In a discussion of Chi-
can/a/o border pedagogy, Elenes (1997) argued that peo-
dle of color must articulate theory for themselves.

However helpful writings of White critical pedagogues
might be, White writers still produce silences and
assumptions that arise from lived experiences. She writes:

"Much of the problematic of this discussion over differences is that
universality only those who are marked as different were con-
sidered in the theorization of difference. If differences are going to
be constituted in nonessentialist ways, it is necessary to mark,
deconstruct, and decentor whiteness and privilege. (p. 371)"

Elenes found much value in critical pedagogy writings,
but at the same time she pointed out that the privilege of
White theorists needs to be examined critically.

Grande (2000) took this argument further, pointing
out ideas and assumptions that are central to critical ped-
agogy that clash with indigenous perspectives. Critical
pedagogues question essentialized identities and value
border crossing, while the history of border crossing and
blending cultures has meant "Whistream America... .
appropriating Native lands, culture, spiritual practices,
history and literature" (p. 481). Further, the "seemingly
liberatory constructs of fluidity, mobility, and transgres-
sion" are part of "the fundamental lexicon of Western
imperialism" (p. 483). Thus, although the insights of cri-
tical pedagogy and their implications for multicultural
education are valuable, one also needs to be concerned
with how the power to name the issues affects both which
issues get addressed and whose interests are served in the
process.
Critical race theory is an analytical framework developed primarily, though not exclusively, by legal scholars of color to address social justice and racial oppression in U.S. society. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2001), "The critical race theory (CRT) movement is a collection of activists and scholars interested in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power" (p. 2). Among CRT's basic theoretical themes is that of privileging contextual and historical descriptions over abstract or ahistorical ones. It is therefore important to understand the genealogy of CRT in education with respect to its contextual and historical relations to critical legal studies, the civil rights movement, radical/U.S. third-world feminists, and the other theoretical traditions from which it borrows (Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993). Its conception can be located in the mid-1970s with the work of legal scholars such as Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman, who were frustrated with the slow pace of racial reform within the liberal civil rights tradition in the United States. They were joined by other legal scholars, students, and activists who felt that the advances of the civil rights movement had been stalled and in fact were being rolled back (Delgado & Stefancic, 2000).

During the 1980s, CRT continued to emerge as a response to critical legal studies (CLS). CLS originated with a predominantly White male group of leftist law professors who challenged the traditional legal scholarship that creates, supports, and legitimates social power in U.S. society (Matsuda et al., 1993). As Wing (1997) pointed out, "People of color, white women, and others were attracted by CLS because it challenged orthodox ideas about the inviolability and objectivity of laws that oppressed minorities and white women for centuries" (p. 2). However, some of these scholars also felt that CLS excluded the perspectives of people of color and that the CLS movement was inattentive to racism's role in both the U.S. legal system and U.S. society. As a result, legal scholars of color began articulating a theory of race and racism that "allows us to better understand how racial power can be produced even from within a liberal discourse that is relatively autonomous from organized vectors of racial power" (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995, p. xxv).

Just as CRT builds on the insights and weaknesses of CLS, it also draws on the work of ethnic studies and U.S. third-world feminisms. Some would argue that the genealogy of CRT goes back as far as W.E.B. DuBois, Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, Cesar Chavez, and the Black Power and Chicano movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Most recently, critical race theory has borrowed much from the postmodern cultural revolution in the humanities and from postcolonialism and poststructuralism (Roithmayr, 1999). Indeed, CRT has expanded to include complementary branches such as Latina/o critical race theory (LatCrits), critical race feminists (FemCrits), and Tribal Crits (Brayboy, 2001). These branches continue to influence and reshape a growing CRT movement that includes more than 400 CRT law review articles and dozens of books (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001).

Although CRT began in legal studies, it has spread to other disciplines, including education. One might think of CRT in education as a developing theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and pedagogical strategy that accounts for the role of race and racism in U.S. education and works toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating other forms of subordination (Solorzano, 1998). Since 1994, scholars of color in the field of education have been increasingly employing it in their research and practice. Tate's autobiographical article in Urban Education (1994) was the first explicit use of CRT in education. A year later, Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) laid the conceptual background for much of the applied CRT work done shortly thereafter. Today a growing body of scholarship in education uses CRT as a framework to examine a variety of educational issues at both the K-12 and the postsecondary levels (e.g., Aquitue, 2000; Gonzalez, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1998, 1999, 2000; Lynn, 1999; Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas 1999; Solorzano, 1997, 1998; Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Villalpando, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000, 2001; Tate, 1997; Villenas & Deyhle, 1999). Special journal issues on CRT in education have also appeared (International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 1998; Qualitative Inquiry, 2002; Equity and Excellence in Education, 2002).

**Potential Implications of Critical Race Theory for Multicultural Education**

Critical race theory has at least three important implications for multicultural education: (a) it theorizes about race while also addressing the intersectionality of racism, classism, sexism, and other forms of oppression; (b) it challenges Eurocentric epistemologies and dominant ideologies such as meritocracy, objectivity, and neutrality; and (c) it uses counterstorytelling as a methodological and pedagogical tool.

Although multicultural education emerged as a challenge to racism in schools, its writings tend to focus on classroom practices without necessarily contextualizing classrooms within an analysis of racism. Teacher training in multicultural education often takes the form of offering solutions to problems connected to race and ethnicity without digging very deeply into the nature of the problem. CRT in education is similar to antiracist education...
standing of the current inequities in schools and districts. They write, "Recurring discussions about property in the form of course offerings, classroom resources, science labs, technology, and certified and pre-

One example of using race as an analytical tool is found within what Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) called the "property issue." Critical race legal scholars introduced the property issue by examining the historical construction of Whiteness as the most valued type of property and how the concept of individual rights has been linked to property rights in the United States since the writing of the U.S. Constitution (Bell, 1987, Harris, 1993). Ladson-Billings and Tate demonstrated that property relates to education in explicit and implicit ways. One obvious example is how property owners largely reap the highest educational ben-

In addition to using race as an analytical tool, critical race theorists challenge the separate discourses on race, class, and gender and focus on the intersectionality of subordination (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). Crenshaw (1993) saw intersectionality as a concept that links various forms of oppression (racism, classism, sexism) with their political consequences (e.g., global capitalism, growing poverty, large numbers of incarcerated youth of color). The property issue is an example of how the intersection of race and class interests offers a more complete understanding of the current inequities in schools and districts in which the majority of students are poor and of color.

Recently, the branch of CRT called Latina/o cri
totheory (LatCrit) has added layers of complexity to theorize about "raced" education in ways found too infrequently in multicultural edu-

A second potential contribution of CRT is the way that it challenges Eurocentric epistemology and questions dominant discursive notions of meritocracy, objectivity, knowledge, and individualism. The concept of episte-
mology is more than just a "way of knowing" and can be defined as a "system of knowing" that is linked to worldviews that are based on the conditions under which people live and learn (Ladson-Billings, 2000). Ladson-Billings argues that "there are well-developed systems of knowl-

dominate Euro-American epistemology" (p. 238). Critical race theorists ground their research in these systems of knowledge and "integrate their experiential knowledge, drawn from a shared history as 'other' with their ongoing strug-

gles to transform" (Barnes, 1990, pp. 1864–1865).

For example, in his study of socially active African American teachers, Lynn (1999) drew from African-

centered epistemological paradigms and critical race theory to theorize about a critical race pedagogy that is in part based on a system of knowledge that counters the dom-
iminate Euro-American epistemology. He defined critical race pedagogy as "an analysis of racial, ethnic, and
was in some ways similar to the Freirean notion of critical pedagogy that encourages inquiry, dialogue, and participation in the classroom. However, Lynn demonstrated two key differences between a critical pedagogy and a critical race pedagogy: the daily struggle against racist discursive practices provided African American teachers with a unique position from which to build their curricula, and there was a strong emphasis on developing and maintaining a sense of cultural identity by teaching children about Africa and African American cultural experiences.

By grounding itself in systems of knowledge that counter a dominant Eurocentric epistemology, critical race theory in education offers a tool for dismantling prevailing notions of fairness, meritocracy, colorblindness, and neutrality (Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999). Raced and gendered epistemologies allow CRT scholars to deconstruct master narratives and illustrate the way in which discursive and cultural sites "may be a form of colonialism, a way of imparting white, Westernized conceptions of enlightened thinking" (Roithmayr, 1999, p. 5). For example, Gutiérrez (2000) examined Walt Disney's ideological shift from conservatism (1930s–1970s) to present-day liberal multiculturalism, particularly within its Spanish-speaking market. He argued that the discursive notions promoted by Disney continue to be based on dominant Eurocentric ideologies that maintain a form of cultural hegemony. He offered critical race theory as one of several ways to examine the master narratives (capitalist, racist, and heterosexist ideals) exposed specifically to Latina/o children and believed Disney movies provide "numerous opportunities for children and adults to engage in critical discussions regarding power, domination, and repression" (p. 31). These types of critical discussions that challenge the insidious nature of a Eurocentric epistemological perspective and dismantle master narratives can and should take place more frequently in multicultural classrooms. As this example shows, by engaging teachers and students in a critical analysis of epistemologies that underlie curriculum and other school processes, critical race theory offers tools that dig deeply into issues and problems that concern multicultural education.

A third (and potentially the greatest) contribution of CRT is its justification and use of storytelling in legal analysis and scholarship. CRT work in storytelling provides a rich way of conceptualizing multicultural curriculum. Because critical race scholars view experiential knowledge as a strength, they draw explicitly on the lived experiences of people of color by including such methods as storytelling, family history, biographies, parables, testimonios, cuentos, consejos, chronicles, and narratives. Storytelling has a rich legacy and continuing tradition in African American, Chicana/o, Asian American, and American Indian communities. Indeed, Delgado (1995) asserted that many of the "early tellers of tales used stories to test and challenge reality, to construct a counterreality, to hearten and support each other and to probe, mock, displace, jar, or reconstruct the dominant tale or narrative" (p. xviii).

Counterstorytelling is a methodological tool that allows one to tell the story of those experiences that are not often told (i.e., by those on the margins of society) and to analyze and challenge the stories of those in power (Delgado, 1989). The stories people of color tell often counter the majoritarian or stock story that is a natural part of the dominant discourse. Building on the work of Delgado (1989), some education scholars argue that these counterstories serve multiple methodological and pedagogical functions such as building community among those at the margins of society, putting a human and familiar face on educational theory and practice, and challenging perceived wisdom about the schooling of students of color (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002).

One way that education scholars are attempting to put a "human and familiar face to educational theory and practice" is through the development of composite characters that are based on interviews, focus groups, and biographical narratives in the humanities and social science literature. This work builds on the scholarship of Bell (1985, 1987), who tells stories of society's treatment of race through his protagonist and alter ego, Geneva Crenshaw; and Delgado (1993, 1999), who addresses race, class, and gender issues through Rodrigo Crenshaw, the half-brother of Geneva. The web of composite characters that have recently appeared in educational journals and chapters represent very real life experiences and are created to illuminate the educational system's role in racial, gender, and class oppression, as well as the myriad responses by people of color (Delgado Bernal, 1999; Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Villalpando, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000, 2001; Villalpando, 2003). In addition, these composite characters allow students and educators of color to relate to or empathize with the experiences described in the counterstories, through which they can better understand that they are not alone in their position. Solorzano (1998) writes:
In that space or moment when one connects with these experiences, these stories can be the catalyst for one's own coming to voice, of not feeling alone, and knowing that someone has gone before them, had similar experiences, and succeeded. (p. 131)

Counterstorytelling can serve as a pedagogical tool by allowing multicultural educators to better understand and appreciate the unique experiences and responses of students’ color through a deliberate, conscious, and open type of listening. In other words, an important component of using counterstories includes not simply telling nonmajoritarian stories but also learning how to listen and hear the messages in them (Delgado Bernal, 2002). Legal scholar Robert Williams (1997) believes that counterstorytelling and critical race practice are “mostly about learning to listen to other people’s stories and then finding ways to make those stories matter in the legal system” (p. 763). Likewise, learning to listen to counterstories and then making those stories matter in the educational system is an important pedagogical practice for teachers and students.

Indeed, Gay (1995) asserted that the foundation of multicultural curriculum should be counterstories, but much of what ends up passing for multicultural curriculum is the dominant story with “Others” incorporated into it. Yosso (2002) proposed a critical race curriculum that is based on counterstories, thereby providing “students with an oppositional language to challenge the deficit societal discourses with which they are daily bombarded” (p. 15). Rather than adding on the experiences of Others or pushing students toward “discovering” a monolithic people of color, her understanding of a critical race curriculum “explores and utilizes shared and individual experiences of race, class, gender, immigration status, language, and sexuality in education” (p. 16). As such, a multicultural curriculum that grounds itself in the counterstorytelling of critical race theory has the potential to move a watered-down multicultural curriculum away from simply celebrating difference and reducing prejudice, to a “critical race curriculum” that actively names and challenges racism and other forms of injustice.

Limitations of Critical Race Theory and Its Implications for Multicultural Education

Critical race theory has received numerous critiques within legal studies, but few within education. We will address two of these critiques: the essentialist critique and the personal stories and narratives critique. We will also address the problems associated with being a relatively new area of study in education.

Within legal studies, some critics of CRT argue that it is an essentialist paradigm based on race. In general, essentialism is rooted in an identity politics that is based on a unidimensional characteristic, such as race, ethnicity, or gender. Critics argue that an essentialist notion of identity is simplistic and does not allow for the myriad experiences that shape who we are and what we know. Crenshaw and colleagues write, “To be sure, some of the foundational essays of CRT could be vulnerable to such a critique, particularly when read apart from the context and conditions of their production” (Crenshaw et al., 1995, p. xxv). However, what many critics do not understand is that despite the name critical race theory, most critical race scholars argue against an analysis based solely on race or some other unitary essentialized defining characteristic. For example, Harris (2000) points to the inherent problem of race and gender essentialism in fragmenting people’s identities and experiences:

In this essay I use the term “gender essentialism” to describe the notion that there is a monolithic “women’s experience” that can be described independently of other facets of experience like race, class, and sexual orientation. A corollary to gender essentialism is “racial essentialism”—the belief that there is a monolithic “black experience” or “Chicano experience.” The effect of gender and racial essentialism and all other essentialisms, for the list of categories could be infinite—is to reduce the lives of people who experience multiple forms of oppression to addition problems: “racism + sexism = straight black women’s experience,” or “racism + sexism + homophobia = black lesbian experience.” (p. 263)

Certainly, “critical legal scholarship of race (and gender or sexual orientation) in recent times has interrogated and helped debunk various essentialisms and power hierarchies based on race . . . and other constructs” (Valdes, 1996, p. 3). With increased transnational labor and communication, many critical race scholars argue to move beyond essentialist notions of identity and of what counts as knowledge. Although race is foregrounded in CRT, it is viewed as a fluid and dynamic concept and as one of the many components that are woven together to form one’s positionality in a shifting set of social relationships.

There are numerous critiques of critical race scholars’ use of stories and narratives in legal scholarship (e.g., see Farber & Sherry, 1993, 1997; Posner, 1997). Many critical race scholars have responded in more detail than we can offer within the scope of this chapter. The critiques are grounded in a debate over alternative ways of knowing and understanding, subjectivity versus objectivity, and different conceptions of truth. Briefly stated, critics believe that CRT theorists relentlessly replace traditional scholarship with personal stories, which hardly represent common experiences. The proliferation of stories makes it impossible for others to debate . . . An inundation with narrative infects and distorts [their] attempts at analysis. Instead of scientifically investigating whether rewarding individuals according to merit has any objective basis, [they] insist on telling stories about their personal struggles. (T. W. Simon, 1999, p. 3)
Farber and Sherry (1993) argued against the pedagogical and methodological use of stories in legal scholarship, stating that “storytellers need to take greater steps to ensure that their stories are accurate and typical, to articulate the legal relevance of the stories, and to include an analytic dimension in their work” (p. 809). They also argued that just because counterstories draw explicitly on the lived experiences of people of color does not prove the existence of a new perspective based on “a voice of color.” They, in fact, disagreed that people of color write in a different voice or offer a new perspective that differs from traditional scholarship.

Interestingly, most critics do not acknowledge that Eurocentrism and White privilege appear to be the norm, many people continue to believe that education in the United States is a meritocratic, unbiased, and fair process. Delgado (1993) points out that “majoritarians tell stories too. But the ones they tell—about merit, causation, blame, responsibility, and social justice—do not seem to them like stories at all, but the truth” (p. 666). At the same time, critics argue that critical race scholars’ stories, narratives, and autobiographies are unreliable sources of truth (Posner, 1997). At issue is the question of what counts as truth and who gets to decide. Also at issue is the matter of how to generalize. Counterstories derive generalization through their resonance with lived experiences of oppressed peoples, rather than through parametric statistics, but some empirical researchers do not see this as a valid way of making claims that generalize.

Finally, critical race theory is a relatively new area of study in education with a limited amount of literature using it as an analytical framework, and with few specific connections to multicultural education. Although education scholars are reshaping and extending critical race theory in ways very different from what legal scholars are doing, they need more time to study and understand the legal literature from which it emerges (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Rothenayr, 1999). Most education scholars who use CRT make a sharp distinction between CRT and multicultural education on the basis of the popular manifestations of multicultural education that pay little attention to racism and its intersections with other forms of subordination. With a few exceptions (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1999), education theorists have not offered direct implications of CRT for multicultural education. The future of critical race theory in education and in multicultural education depends on the efforts of educators to explore its possible connections to racism in schools and communities of color (Farber, 1998; Tate, 1997).

As a relatively new area of study, CRT may face a problem that multicultural education has experienced: transmutation into a depoliticized discourse in schools. Ladson-Billings (1998) warns that CRT in education may continue to generate scholarly papers and debate, but she doubts that it will ever penetrate the classrooms and daily experiences of students of color. If it does, she worries that it may become a very different innovation, similar to the transmutation of multicultural education theory. She points out that many scholars such as James A. Banks, Carl Grant, and Geneva Gay began a “scholarly path designed to change schools as institutions so that students might be prepared to reconstruct the society” (p. 22). Yet in its current practice multicultural education is often superficial and based on holidays and food. In order to remain true to its principles of social justice and advocacy, critical race scholars will need to be attentive to the possibility of the transmutation of CRT into depoliticized discourses and practices in schools.

**ANTIRACIST EDUCATION**

Antiracist education emerged largely in opposition to multicultural education, particularly in Britain (Brandt, 1986), where it challenged “the apolitical and folksy orientation of multicultural education” (Bonnett & Carrington, 1996). Contexts in which multicultural and antiracist education emerged have differed across national borders, so national debates have differed (Bonnett & Carrington; May, 1999a); but debates have been vigorous, particularly in Canada and Britain (Modgil, Verma, Mallick, & Modgil, 1986). In both Britain and Canada during the late 1970s and 1980s, multicultural education was codified into national policy and school programs, drawing “its inspiration and rationale from white middle-class professional understandings of how the educational system might best respond to the perceived ‘needs’ and ‘interests’ of black students and their parents” (Troya, 1987, p. 308). Its critics saw multicultural education as a way for White educators to “manage” the “problems” brought about by ethnic minority students (e.g., James, 2001; Troya, 1987). Antiracist education grew, mainly in urban areas, out of community activism addressing racism in various dimensions of public life (Steiner-Khamsi, 1990). Antiracist education “can be defined as an action-oriented strategy for institutional, systemic change to address racism and the interlocking systems of social oppression” (Dei, 1996, p. 25).

In Britain, antiracist education was severely attacked by the New Right in the late 1980s. After 1988, national educational policy was “deracialized,” in that references to race and ethnicity were replaced by references to authority and national identity. Antiracist education was also criticized by its allies, who argued that it had marginalized culture and overly essentialized racial categories (Gillborn, 1995). Antiracism as a movement declined in
Britain and subsequently reemerged by making connections with critical versions of multicultural education (Bonnett & Carrington, 1996; May, 1994; Gillborn, 1995). In Canada, Australia, and elsewhere, distinctions between antiracism and multicultural education were less sharply drawn (May, 1999a). Antiracist education in Canada, for example, made connections with critical pedagogy and African-centered pedagogy (Dei, 1993, 1996).

In the United States, multicultural education initially grew out of the Black struggle in the context of the civil rights movement, rather than out of national policy debates. Therefore it did not prompt an activist counter-discourse until, over time, it had taken on watered-down and apolitical meanings. For some, multicultural education and antiracism are or should be interchangeable (see Nieto, 1992; Perry & Fraser, 1993; Sleeter & Grant, 1998; Thompson, 1997). Others, however, do not ground multicultural education in an analysis of structural racism, but rather in interpersonal prejudice, cultural difference, and cross-cultural misunderstandings. For example, Tiedt and Tiedt (1999) emphasize individual uniqueness, unity with diversity, and community building; the word racism does not appear in their book.

There have been a number of efforts to bring antiracist education and multicultural education together (e.g., May, 1999a). However, because multicultural education often takes forms that avoid racism, and because, like critical race theory, antiracism foregrounds race as a site of struggle, it has significant implications for multicultural education.

Potential Implications of Antiracist Education for Multicultural Education

Antiracist education has five main implications for multicultural education. It (a) directs attention specifically to challenging racism in education; (b) addresses racist school structures such as tracking, which are often not addressed in multicultural education; (c) situates culture within power relations; (d) connects school with community; and (e) problematizes Whiteness. As noted earlier, some multicultural educators also address these issues.

Antiracist education challenges systemic racism. Despite the work of many of its leading theorists, multicultural education is often enacted in schools by adding in contributions, advocating "let's all get along," or promoting individual upward mobility within hierarchical structures rather than critiquing the structures themselves (Kalin, 1998–99). Too often it takes the form of telling "white children about the lifestyles and cultural achievements of ethnic minorities" (Short & Carrington, 1996). The term itself—multicultural—suggests starting with the idea of "many cultures." For Whites, this idea can fit within the taken-for-grantedness of White dominance, the assumed normality and superiority of European and Euro-American cultures, and the assumption that society is already structured fairly.

Troya’s critique (1987) of four assumptions of multicultural education in Britain is relevant to the discussion here. First, "Britain is a multicultural society" (p. 313); the same can be said of Canada, the United States, and most other countries. Troya argued that this assumption correctly describes what is, but not what should happen as a result. Beginning with the premise of diversity rather than justice and solidarity leads to addressing only diversity and not necessarily justice. Second, "the curriculum should reflect that substantive fact (of multiculturalism)," and third, "learning about other cultures will benefit all students" (p. 313). Troya did not dispute the desirability of making the curriculum multicultural but questioned whether learning about "other cultures" is actually a corrective for racism. For members of oppressed groups, this proposition suggests that learning about diverse lifestyles enhances their life chances, which is fallacious. Assuming that White students will adopt antiracist behavior simply by learning about lifestyles of others is also questionable, and "increased knowledge of other groups might in fact enhance feelings of ‘differentness’" (p. 313). Flecha (1999) agreed, pointing out that neo-Nazis also "use the concept of difference to support their programs of hate" (p. 152). Also, adding into the curriculum other cultures does not necessarily lead to a critical examination of the dominant culture. The problem here is not learning about others, but rather doing so within a conceptual framework that does not question relationships between dominant and subordinate groups. Fourth, "cultural relativism is a desirable and tenable position" (p. 313). This assumption leads to "anything goes" rather than dialogue across groups about how to work through differences. In addition, the entire formulation following this line of reasoning assumes the state and its institutions to be culturally neutral.

Antiracist education, in contrast, focuses on "the racist underpinnings and operation of white dominated institutions . . . rather than ethnic minority cultures and lifestyles" (Troya, 1987, p. 310). In so doing, it directs attention to White supremacy, and to needs articulated by communities who are oppressed on the basis of race (Dei, 1996; Thompson, 1997). Antiracist education begins not with a description of changing demographics, which suggests a new problem stemming from immigration, but with an analysis of historic and contemporary imperialism and racism (Biunner & Tatum, 1999; Brandt, 1986; Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997; Walker, 1989). It examines how a racist system is maintained, roles of individuals in maintaining it, and how racism can be challenged both collectively and individually. Antiracist teaching entails helping students identify manifestations of racism,
learn how racism works, and learn to interrupt it. Antiracism gives tools not only to talk about racism but also to do something about it (James, 2001; Lee, Menkart, & Okazawa-Rey, 1998).

A second implication of antiracist education is that it questions various ways in which schools structure unequal access to education (Brandt, 1986; James, 1995; Lee, 1985; Perry & Fraser, 1993). Racist structures and processes can include institutionalizing better instruction for White children than for children of color; using tracking, special education, and gifted programs to differentiate instruction along racial lines; using racially biased tests and other assessment processes; employing mainly White professionals; and so forth. In other words, antiracism critiques the supposed neutrality of institutions such as schools; this does not necessarily happen in some versions of multicultural education (May, 1999b).

For example, the anthology Rethinking Schools: An Agenda for Change (Levine, Lowe, Peterson, & Tenorio, 1993) included a section critiquing tracking. The section examined race and class biases in tracking systems, class and race biases in standardized testing, biases in access to algebra, and teaching in untracked secondary-level classrooms. Similarly, Lee (1985) examined racism in academic expectations, career counseling, assessment, and placement. Although numerous multicultural educators also address racism in the structure and operations of schools, many do not. For example, Davidman and Davidman (1994) directed their book toward prospective teachers, offering mainly suggestions for how to integrate ethnic content into lesson plans. The book simply did not address patterns of racism institutionalized in schools.

A third implication of antiracist education is that it situates culture within relations of power (Dei, 1996). As mentioned earlier, multicultural education enacted in schools often assumes culture to be fixed and bounded, groups to be relatively homogeneous, and culture to be separate from its material and relational contexts. Antiracist educators point out that the experience of subjugation itself acts on the cultures of both those who are subjugated and those who dominate (May, 1999b). People take up and adapt cultural forms in response to experiences; rap music, for example, is a form of popular Black youth culture that often speaks to racial subjugation (Kattan, 1999). Further, global movements of peoples produce complex cultural identities that cannot be reduced to essentialist portrayals. Antiracist education is similar to critical pedagogy in conceptualizing culture within a nexus of power relations, overlapping histories, and complex identities (Dei, 1996).

A fourth implication of antiracist education is that it situates schooling in the broader community, viewing parents and community members as necessary parts of the education process (Perry & Fraser, 1993). Again, although some multicultural educators also do this, many do not. Part of the issue involves how one views race, power sharing, and professionalism. If one views teaching as "a series of technical decisions made by experts who have a claim to authority" (Sleeter & Montecinos, 1999, p. 116), then professionally trained educators should not share authority with parents. However, "for oppressed groups, framing teaching as a series of technical decisions made by experts constitutes cultural invasion—the dominant society renders as illegitimate systems of meaning and reality originating in oppressed communities" (p. 117). Antiracism directs attention toward relationships between historically oppressed communities and professionals who are complicit in perpetuating racism. Antiracist educators argue that transformation initiatives need to come at least in part from communities that are usually excluded from decision making, particularly communities of color (Dei, 1996; Lee, 1985). One reason antiracist education makes sense to First Nations people in Canada is that it advocates stronger community control of education for their own children (Young, 1993).

A fifth implication of antiracist education is that it problematizes Whiteness and White dominance (Stanley, 1998). Whiteness tends to be normalized in traditional discourse, and very often in multicultural education as well (Dei, 1996; Lee, 1995). White ethnic identities might be named, but Whiteness is not. When teachers teach what they believe are universals, they draw from Euro-American culture and experience. Multicultural becomes, then, the Other, implicitly exoticized and still deficient. By shifting the gaze, antiracism names and critiques dominance (Stanley, 1998). Teaching about racism, however, can place White students in the position of being the named oppressor, thus alienating them from dialogue and engagement (Gillborn, 1995). This presents a pedagogical dilemma for antiracist educators who embrace a student-centered pedagogy (Thompson, 2002). A goal of antiracist education is to help students make significant political shifts in their thinking around racism and privilege, and this "sits uneasily with the aims of student-centered education, which is meant to be open-ended and emergent" (p. 443). To understand and address the pedagogical tension, Thompson highlighted antiracist pedagogies articulated to Whiteness theorizing. Her work and that of other critical White theorists is beginning to offer alternative conceptions of Whiteness that take account of White responsibility for maintaining or challenging racism (see, for example, Curry, 2000; Daniels, 1997; Roediger, 1994; Scheurich, 2002; Segrest, 1994). Although we do not have space to review that literature here, it is important to note that antiracism helps to locate White people within multicultural education, and to critique depoliticized White identities.
Limitations of Antiracist Education and Its Implications for Multicultural Education

Antiracist education has three limitations. First, the term itself, with its oppositional stance toward multicultural education, suggests a binary with two opposing agendas, each of which supposedly has an internally consistent body of ideas and practices. This assumed binary has been problematic on a number of fronts. Banks (1984) pointed out that “the critics [of multicultural education] have chosen some of the worst practices that are masquerading as multicultural education and defined these practices as multicultural education” (p. 60). In fact, a fair amount of literature in antiracist education and multicultural education is virtually interchangeable.

Binaries assume that people within each camp think alike and define one camp as “good” and the other as “bad,” which closes off dialogue rather than encouraging it (Bonnell, 1990; Bonnett & Carrington, 1996; Green, 1982; Rattansi, 1999). Further, the terms themselves do not have the same meanings across national borders, which also confuses or greatly truncates discussion.

Second, antiracism has been criticized for giving too little attention to culture and too much attention to race, and in the process essentializing race as a construct. Gillborn (1995) and Mansfield and Kehoe (1994) synthesized criticisms of antiracism made by Paul Gilroy, Tariq Modood, and Kogila Moodley. Briefly, these critics argued that many groups see race as a construct that is used against non-Anglos and would rather give serious attention to culture, language, and religion instead. Antiracism is often too reductive, painting the world in black and white and leaving too little space for diverse ethnic minorities, which in Britain has alienated Asian Muslims. Further, antiracism has reduced even the experiences of Black people solely to race, giving too little credence to culture. Gillborn (1995) argued that rather than privileging either race or culture, we need to connect both, situating culture within a sociopolitical context. Similarly, Flecha (1999) pointed out that the older racial categories do not work well today, yet racist movements aimed toward exclusion are gathering momentum. Antiracism needs to develop a dialogic approach “emphasizing the need for equal rights among ethnicities” (p. 164). This means that an essential agenda for antiracist education is to work toward dialogue among diverse groups “that is oriented toward creating conditions for people from different cultures and ethnicities to live together” (p. 165).

A third limitation is that antiracist education can end up subsuming multiple forms of oppression (such as gender and class) under racism. Some educators who are trying to connect multiple forms of oppression, and who enter the dialogue through an interest in sexism or class oppression, do not see antiracist education as a venue for addressing anything except racism. For example, the focus on racism to the exclusion of other forms of oppression has alienated many White working-class youth who find it difficult to develop a sense of solidarity with oppressed people when the only identity they see for themselves is as the oppressor (Bonnell & Carrington, 1996). At the same time, in Canada antiracist educators have been making connections with multiple forms of oppression (e.g., Dei, 1999; James, 2001; Ng, Staton, & Scane, 1995) and offer ways of framing antiracism that address multiple oppressions without losing focus on racism, similar to the work of critical race theorists.

DISCUSSION

Like the other three fields discussed in this chapter, multicultural education emerged as an intellectual and activist movement to transform social institutions. In its inception, its primary focus was challenging racism, but it became transmuted as it filtered through schools and mainstream discourses. Although multicultural education today has taken on a wide range of meanings and practices, there are many within the field who have continued to develop it consistently with its original conceptual moorings. This chapter has attempted to act as a corrective to superficial and depoliticized versions of multicultural education by connecting the field to critical intellectual work. This chapter has also sought to develop the field by pointing out conceptual tools that can enrich and deepen its analyses.

What seems to distinguish critical traditions is their insistence on grounding practice in ideological clarity that explicitly critiques at least one form of collective oppression. Multicultural education that is critical, then, is not simply practice, but very explicitly politically guided practice. Multicultural education writings, however, with their focus on classroom practice, too often assume that educators bring ideological clarity and a sophisticated understanding of oppression, culture, and difference, and that they will change practice accordingly with guidance. But subsequent practice too often remains grounded in dominant discourses of individualism, implicit Eurocentrism, and naivete about embedded power relations. In that context, multicultural education is enacted as strategies for sharing information about lifestyles, learning to get along, and examining the other. Critical race theory, antiracist education, and critical pedagogy writings generally spend more time examining the nature of oppression and culture in depth in order to develop ideological clarity, even though they may have less to say about teaching practice. This chapter suggests drawing from these fields, as well as additional fields such as multicultural feminism, to steer the course of transforming education more strongly.
At this point, one might reasonably ask to what extent it is possible and useful to attempt to synthesize multicultural education, critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education. After considering this question, we concluded that it is more useful to expand the dialogue between these fields. All four fields emerged as oppositional discourses to dominant discourses about education. Each came about through specific histories to address social justice from specific vantage points. As such, each illuminates some issues and strategies while occluding others, and each speaks to realities of some communities more than others. Conceptually, theoretical differences among the fields can provide overlapping but still distinct lenses for viewing schooling, each revealing somewhat different issues and possibilities. Politically, the fields themselves represent overlapping but distinct groups of people, embedded within histories of power conflicts. It is helpful to think of the differences as creative tensions that are grounded in the theoretical, practical, and political realities of each field.

At a theoretical level, literature in multicultural education, critical pedagogy, antiracist education, and critical race theory provide somewhat different insights. Let us consider creative tensions around how each views the concept of culture and how each addresses structure and agency, since these concepts directly involve the nature of oppression, social change, and shared ways of making sense of the world. Critical pedagogy, antiracist education, and critical race theory situate culture within relations of power more explicitly than does much of the multicultural education literature. Yet even these three do not necessarily agree entirely on the relationship between culture and structures of power. Even though multicultural education attends actively to ethnic culture that is transmitted from generation to generation, critical pedagogy focuses mostly on oppressive structures and racist practices such as tracking, school funding, school (de)segregation, and the media. Critical pedagogy attempts to link the structure-agency dichotomy, but with a focus on class more than on the intersections of multiple oppressions.

Rather than suggesting a grand theory, we find it more useful to ask what insights each perspective can offer, and how these insights might overlap and complement each other. For example, White Americans can be described as being preoccupied with measuring and organizing time, viewing time as linear, tangible, and scarce. Historically, one might trace the roots of this practice, in part, to German culture (ethnic cultural transmission perspective with an emphasis on agency); one can also connect this practice to industrialization and the construction of factories (institutional perspective with an emphasis on structure; Alred, 1997). Current intensification of work due to economic shifts has intensified the scheduling of lives (culture within social class relations structured by capitalism). In addition, one can view the clock as a tool of racism that the monochronic dominant society uses to regulate subordinate groups (racism perspective with an emphasis on structure). Monochronic White Americans (who tend to see individual agency and not culture or structure) judge polychronic uses of time—in which time is conceptualized as circular, overlapping, and flexible—as disorganized. At an institutional level, this matters when organizations such as schools operate in a highly monochronic manner, penalizing communities that construct time more flexibly (racism and culture conflict perspective with an emphasis on structure). Which conception of culture is most helpful and how to address the relationship of structure to agency depends on one’s question.

Thompson (1997) cautioned that attempting to create one grand narrative from the left would end up pushing aside too many very significant issues. Therefore, our discussion of the four bodies of literature attempts to illustrate creative tensions and clarify what each field brings to bear on schooling, so that depending on one’s question and focus, educators can benefit from the unique insights of multiple frameworks. Learning to use multiple frameworks can help us avoid the dangers of one grand narrative while examining significant issues related to schools, students, and their community contexts. At a practical and political level, tensions surround the historic and contemporary discourse communities represented by each of the four fields. Each was created by and speaks to a group of people, and these groups do not necessarily blend easily or readily. For example, since critical pedagogy has its conceptual basis in a social class analysis and its theorists speak to class issues, it appeals more than the other three fields to a White leftist constituency. Critical race theory, on the other hand, developed as an oppositional discourse to critical theory; as scholars of color sought to place race rather than class at the center of analysis. As such, its discourse community is largely scholars of color. Multicultural education speaks largely to practicing teachers, a community that is not at the center of critical race theory. Each field has historic roots; connecting fields means addressing tensions that are based on historic as well as contemporary power.
struggles among the people who have created them. If historically the White working class participated in the subjugation of African Americans, to what extent does the historical baggage of racism accompany critical theory? If K-12 teachers tend to be marginalized in the process of constructing academic theory, to what extent would attempts to merge the fields reproduce this marginalization?

At the same time, there is a need to continue trying to connect various forms of oppression and various communities struggling for justice. Over the past several years, significant attempts have been made to connect an analysis of racism with an analysis of sexism and class oppression; our chapter is only one additional effort. Struggles to define the nature of oppression are often couched in terms of binaries: White versus people of color, men versus women, gay/lesbian versus heterosexual, working-class and impoverished versus wealthy, and so forth. Binaries help to define power relations and demarcate conflict and struggle; but historically binaries have also been used as a means of control. Okirio (2001) provides an excellent example of using the vantage point of Asian American history to challenge the binaries of East-West, Black-White, male-female, and heterosexual-homosexual. He showed how each of these was socially constructed within specific historic circumstances, and how each breaks apart when viewed from an angle within Asian American history. For example, 18th– and 19th-century White Americans constructed images of Chinese men as asexual but Chinese women as prostitutes, as a way of controlling the sexuality of White women and making both White women and women of color available to White men. Attempts to connect multiple forms of oppression and multiple diversities end up challenging binaries. Okirio pointed out that “binaries resist change, perhaps, because they offer coherence” (p. 125). Binaries may work as conceptual tools, but they also impose simplistic solutions and serve as means of controlling some Other. Practice uninfomed by a critical reanalysis of how one understands social relations may end up reproducing the status quo.

As critical traditions attempt to connect analyses of various forms of oppression, they work to dislodge existing binaries while retaining a critical analysis of power, struggle, oppression, and social change. This is complicated work, both theoretically and practically. Since practice is often uninformed by a complex understanding of oppression, culture, and power, one might ask if it is truly possible to use oppositional discourses in mainstream schools. Is it likely that critical theories, as they interact with practice, will be altered or diluted to meet the everyday practical needs of educators? It seems that although multicultural education, critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiblack education emerged as oppositional discourses, there remains a strong possibility for their transmutation in practice. This seems to be especially true if dialogue among the different discourse communities is limited or restrained.
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