Critical Pedagogy in a Time of Uncertainty:

Forging a New Movement

Antonia Darder

University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign

The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 remain a sobering and demarcating moment in the history of the United States. These attacks on U.S. soil initiated the nation into the bloody reality that times had indeed changed. No longer would U.S. elites, political officials, and businessmen exist unscathed by the vengeance of the "enemies" that their own greed and imperialist visions helped to produce during the latter years of the 20th century.

Hence, there seems little doubt that we are living in a new era, an era of alarmist rhetoric. The fear of *invasion as a clear and present danger* is inspired by xenophobic denunciations of the Muslim world, the poor, and the foreigner. The threat of terrorists, immigrants, and the impoverished now vividly commingle in our psyches. Meanwhile, U.S. war acts of aggression persist and the overwhelming economic, political, and military inequality is rendered invisible by an evangelizing patriotism. It is this patriotic nationalism that not only supported the passage of the Patriot Act, but also condoned the invasion of Afghanistan and then Iraq, orchestrated to protect economic interests and political influence in the Middle East—all in the name of freedom and democracy. It is also this patriotic nationalism that has turned a blind eye to the genocide in Darfur, where the U.S. clearly claims no political or economic interests in the region to defend.

On the domestic scene, the rampant incarceration of the poor is justified through the media's barrage of stereotypes that parade as news, reality cop shows, and criminal documentary programs such as *American Justice* and *Cold Case Files*. Whether at home or in the international arena, U.S. citizens are systematically warned to be afraid of those who are poor and different, both major sectors of the population that are rapidly expanding, given the impact of deepening and hardening structures of economic inequality in this country and abroad.

The uncertainty generated by the tragedy of 9/11 spurred the formation of Homeland Security, changing not only how we perceive our safety on the streets or how Americans travel, but also how we understand our civil liberties, which are quickly being compromised in the name of protecting our borders. Through a variety of politically inspired and media fabrications, U.S. citizens are told in no uncertain terms that we are no longer safe in our own homes. We are now being persuaded to believe that if we accept Christian fundamentalism and conservative economic policies (as our symbolic substitutes) this will somehow magically bring back the good old days of national certainty, a certainty that had always resided outside the landscape of the country's disenfranchised.

Meanwhile, obvious and long-standing producers of inequality and uncertainty, such as the lack of job security, insufficient income(s) to care for one's family, the lack of opportunities for youth employment, the growing poverty and demise of the "middle class," and the increasing incarceration of the deeply impoverished are ignored or dismissed as secondary to issues of national security. As a consequence, trillions of dollars are poured into Homeland Security and military actions around the world, while social justice is conveniently redefined to abdicate the state from responsibility to its citizens. Instead, the free market has been deemed the great

equalizer (or un-equalizer) of the 21st century, leaving those outside its field of participation to fend for themselves or suffer the consequences.

In the midst of this national uncertainty, the U.S. remains the world's wealthiest nation, and yet one of the most economically unequal. "We live in a society in which 1 percent of the population owns 60 percent of stock and 40 percent of total wealth. The top 10 percent of Americans own over 80 percent of the total wealth."[i] At the same time, as Barbara Ehrenreich argues, the poor are "nickel and dimed" into subsistence by the increasing cost of substandard housing; the lack of health care benefits; expensive transportation and commuting costs; too few and often costly child care options; low-wage employment; and increasing job insecurities tied to outsourcing of well-paying jobs and plant shutdowns.[ii]

Critical Pedagogy in a "New" Era

It is in the midst of the current patriotic camouflage of empire-building abroad and the tightening of individual civil liberties at home that we, as educators, are attempting to make sense of the world in our practice and our theoretical constructions. It is in this "new" era of national uncertainty, along with the everyday uncertainties of old, that we look for critical pedagogy to provide us with direction and inspiration to struggle against the growing inequalities and difficulties that our children are facing in schools and society.

Unfortunately, the expectation of critical pedagogy to assist us in our efforts to contend with growing oppressive conditions within schools has fallen short. This has been particularly so when the principles of critical educational theories have been reified into simplistic notions or

fetishized methods that become merely formulas for intervention, leaving unchallenged the inequities and power relations at work in schools today.

More often than not, teachers in poor communities express a sense of uncertainty and powerlessness in their ability to teach their students. In the midst of the current rhetoric of national uncertainty, we see this problem exacerbated in lage urban, as well as rural, centers where the population is increasingly poor and diverse. Issues related to academic failure, student violence, or classroom inattentiveness continue to be addressed in superficial ways that tend to the immediate symptom, but mask the deeper social malaise. Meanwhile, the problems that students are facing within schools and in their private lives are generally ignored.

When efforts are made to "fix" the problems, the issues are often racialized, despite the fact that poor children considered "white" exhibit comparatively similar behaviors in low-income integrated communities or in regions where poor "whites" are the majority. For example, last year, while doing some work in Omaha, Nebraska, a region generally considered predominantly "white," I was watching the evening news. Suddenly, there appeared a news story about local youth criminals, whose dress style and mannerisms echoed the portrayals of Chicano or African American youth of Los Angeles, Chicago or New York. Handcuffed and sprawled against a police car, the poverty and marginalization of their class location was written on their bodies. These impoverished Omaha youth oddly reminded me of pre-civil rights poverty images of the late 1950s that I would see as a child on television—images that seldom flash across nationally syndicated television today. Class differences are more effectively masked and obscured through the racialized criminalization of youth of color.

In contending with the difficult conditions that abound within schools and society, we are repeatedly reminded that times of national uncertainty have historically also portended moments of social possibility. Social and political outcomes during such times have generally been linked to the will of the masses to struggle for change and the counteracting power of the hegemonic forces to block its possibility. Within a democratic society, the masses always carry in their hands the collective potential of launching projects of political transformation. And, no matter what the political concerns of the time, democratic schooling with its critical emancipatory promise has played a central role in the course of community struggles.

Rethinking the Civil Rights Approach of the 1960s

Contemporary ideas of democratic schooling are historically linked to the civil rights struggles of the 1960s. During that era, a liberal politics of rights prevailed as the common orthodoxy of the period, although a small cadre of African American and Latino political activists adamantly argued that the movement should be linked to international, anti-imperialist struggles that both challenged capitalism and embraced a politics of anti-racism. Nevertheless, the decision was made to retain a civil rights approach to organizing, with a predominant focus on legal intervention strategies to impact institutional change. This direction in the movement was to represent a significant political juncture that left unforeseen and untouched the unfettered advancement of globalization in the final decades of the 20th century.

As a result of the court gains made during the civil rights era, movement efforts in schools were driven by repeated demands for a multicultural curriculum, bilingual education, ethnic studies programs, and affirmative action efforts to diversify students and faculty. Social

movements principally anchored in identity politics aggressively pushed against the traditional boundaries of institutional policies and practices. Although such efforts most certainly served to initiate and marshal a new population of "minority" professionals and elites into a variety of fields and professions, it did little to change the structural conditions that reproduce the oppressive inequalities prevalent in poor, working class and racialized communities. And even despite its gains, the civil rights ideal predicated on a "race relations" paradigm failed to challenge the fundamental contradictions at work within schools and society, contradictions that functioned to conserve assymetrical relations of power and racialized class formation.

A major study conducted by Gary Orfield and the Harvard Civil Rights Project illustrates this concern.[iii] The study found that although progress toward school desegregation had peaked in the late 1980s, with the courts concluding that the goals of *Brown v. Board of Education* had largely been achieved, the current trend is moving in the opposite direction. Hence, concerns regarding segregation still hold political significance today, particularly with respect to questions of academic achievement and the failure of U.S. schools to educate Latino, African American and other racialized and working class student populations. In fact, as Latinos became the largest minority population in the U.S., hegemonic forces at work in the reproduction of racialized class inequalities rendered Latino students (dubbed the "new face of segregation") more segregated today than their African American counterparts.

This conclusion points to the inseparability of racism and economic inequality. Accordingly, contemporary theories of segregation, as an outcome of racialized and class reproduction must be firmly tied to the politics of class struggle. This is to say that racism, as an inherent political strategy of exclusion, domination, marginalization, violence, and exploitation cannot be separated from its economic imperative. Thus, it should be no surprise that 90 percent

of segregated African American and Latino neighborhood schools are located in areas of concentrated poverty. Nor would we be shocked to find that students who attend segregated minority schools are 11 times more likely to live in areas of concentrated poverty than students—of all ethnicities—who attend desegregated schools. The point here is that the segregation of children is inextricably tied to the reproduction of racialized class formations.

So, although much good can be attributed to the impact of *Brown v. Board of Education*, there remains much room for reexamination. Given the lessons of the last 50 years, many solutions anchored in the "race relations" paradigm of the civil rights era are being called into question. For instance, there are researchers who argue that the "race relations" paradigm actually functions, unwittingly, to obscure the phenomenon of racism and hence, the hegemonic forces at work within the sociopolitical construction of segregation.[iv] Instead, they contend that the process of racialization, with its reified commonsense notions of "race," fails to challenge fundamental structural inequalities inherent in the mode of production of capitalist relations.

As a consequence, contemporary society has become entrenched in the language of "race" as destiny, with an implicit dictum that membership in particular "races" enacts social processes rather than ideology and material conditions of survival. Accordingly, this approach has effectively fueled identity politics. Today, political discourses of every kind are structured by attaching deterministic meaning to social constructs of physical and cultural characteristics. Simultaneously, the racialized landscape has become more complex. This is why, now more than ever, we need a critical pedagogy that can move us beyond dichotomies of black and white. For, in its absence, the outcome is the racialization of all social and political relations. Every conflict of interest is infused with an ethnic dimension, so "race" becomes a way of explaining

all group conflicts, rather than the malignant ideology of racism that sustains the economic conditions of segregation.[v]

The busing solution of the 1970s serves as a case in point. Busing was one of the predominant solutions utilized for the remedy of school segregation—a solution anchored in the "race relations" paradigm. But to the chagrin of many African American and Latino communities, this solution actually functioned to destroy the strength, cohesion, and coherence of community life. Some would also argue that it was, in fact, the already more economically privileged minorities who made the greatest gains. For almost 40 years later, the class composition of U.S. society based on control of wealth has failed to improve. In fact, this society has become more polarized between the rich and the poor, across all population groups. That is to say, members of the ruling class in this country, of all ethnicities, are wealthier today than they were in the 1960s. Hence, the expansion of an elite, professional class of African American and Latinos ultimately failed to dismantle the economic and racialized policies and practices of the capitalist state.   Instead, practices of economic exploitation and the production of racialized inequality became more camouflaged.

Important to our understanding of racism, here, is the manner in which class and capitalism are inextricably linked, in ways that do not apply to other categories of exclusion. Class inequalities encompass the state's social and political apparatus, which functions systematically to retain widespread control and governance over material wealth and resources. Racism operates in conjunction with these ideologies (whether cultural, political, class, gendered, sexual or racialized) to preserve the hegemony of the modern capitalist state, engendering its capacity to appropriate even revolutionary projects and strip them of their transformative potential.

Such has been the fate of multiculturalism, which, falling prey to both the politics of identity and state appropriation, became an effective vehicle for further depoliticizing the remnants of political efforts against inequality rooted in the civil rights era of the 1960s and 1970s. Notwithstanding its original emancipatory intent, the politics of multiculturalism was from its inception flawed by its adherence to the language of "race relations." Moreover, the well-meaning celebrations of difference and the hard-fought battles of a variety of identity movements for representation failed to generate any real or lasting structural change, beyond liberal proposals such as affirmative action, for instance, that more often than not served the interests of the more privileged. In the final analysis, multiculturalism became an effective mechanism of the state, used to manage and preserve racialized class divisions, while in the marketplace the new multiplicity of identities generated new products for consumption. Arun Kundnani describes the fate of multiculturalism:

Multiculturalism now meant taking black culture off the streets—where it has been politicized and turned into a rebellion against the state—and putting it in the council chamber, in the classroom and on the television, where it could be institutionalized, managed and reified. Black culture was thus turned from a living movement into an object of passive contemplation, something to be "celebrated" rather than acted on. Multiculturalism became an ideology of conservatism, of preserving the status quo intact, in the face of a real desire to move forward. As post-modern theories of "hybridity" became popular in academic, cultural difference came to be seen as an end in itself, rather than an expression of revolt, and the concept of culture became a straitjacket, hindering rather than helping the fight against [racism] and class oppressions.[vi]

While public education today continues to invoke the Jeffersonian ideal of educating citizens for participation in a democratic society, poor, working class and racialized student populations often experience a multitude of difficulties in their relationships with schools that result in their academic demise. As teachers continue to buy into the belief that schooling is a

neutral and benevolent enterprise, students are tested, labeled, sorted and tracked, while boot-strap notions of justice and equality abound within U.S. schools, particularly those that serve poor racialized populations. Moreover, such rhetoric reinforces the basic fact that public schooling functions in the interest of capitalist accumulation and class formations, rather than political and economic democracy.

The construction of knowledge and the control of knowledge are at the heart of this phenomenon. Despite democratic claims, conditions within the public schools are fundamentally authoritarian, deepening a sense of uncertainty by denying most students their freedom and autonomy to be themselves without undue fear of retaliation. Consequently, the difficulties faced by students within the classroom are seldom engaged seriously, while the dissonance which exists between their lives and the culture of schooling is often ignored or dismissed as unimportant.

Unfortunately, even well-crafted programs which claim to be committed to social justice tend to sabotage student autonomy and compel them to adopt constructions of knowledge that ring false within their daily lived experiences.[vii] Here, well-meaning teachers use their authority and privilege to, wittingly or unwittingly, invalidate students when they are involved in constructing their own knowledge, thus reinforcing feelings of uncertainty and self-doubt. Unfortunately, many teachers who are able to recognize injustices within instructional settings are less willing to accept that they themselves might need to make fundamental changes in their own practice.

Critical Educational Practice

There is no question that we are living in a time when we must stretch the boundaries of critical educational principles, in order to infuse social and institutional contexts with its revolutionary potential. It is a moment when our emancipatory theories must be put into action, in an effort to counter a misguided national educational rhetoric that would render teachers, students, parents and communities voiceless and devoid of social agency. Hence, critical ideas and practices in the interest of democratic schooling must be central to our efforts to confront the powerlessness and uncertainty that is so much the reality in many public schools today.

Teachers who labor in precarious conditions characterized by intense concentrations of poverty, with inadequate preparation to meet the needs of their students, find themselves in a most unenviable position. These teachers are besieged daily by the demands of the state to raise student achievement, while they struggle with the social and material realities of widespread inequality. Despite their often-contradictory class location, public school teachers must strive to become transformative intellectuals and political agents in the process of social reconstruction.

Through the willingness to critically interrogate the standard curriculum, teachers can function as cultural workers who with their students "take seriously the identities [and uncertainties] of subordinate cultures."[viii] Public schooling for poor racialized students can thus assume a counter-hegemonic common purpose by becoming a site of cultural politics and the exercise of critical democratic principles. Though too rare, there are examples of effective school efforts within public schools. However, many of these are often short-lived.

The history of Roberto Clemente High School, which serves a large population of poor and working class Latino students in Chicago, is an excellent example of the possibilities and the dangers that can befall efforts to transform schools. Clemente High School in the later 1980s represented a significant example of teacher, student, parent, and community collaboration.

Implementing a critical pedagogy founded on Paulo Freire's seminal work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, the school began to flourish as students excelled both in their academic and civic participation.[ix] However, at the very moment that the alternative approaches began to reach a solid grounding, all hell broke loose. Chicago school officials accused the group active in the school transformation process of improprieties, accusations later discovered by an independent panel to be false. The media's racialized portrayals were effectively used to malign the integrity of the teachers, youth and community members involved in transforming the critical curriculum of the school. Clemente High School today remains only a shadow of those earlier times, as the policies of testing and tracking replaced culturally relevant academic programs and real community control.

The alienating role of the media was significant in determining the outcome at Clemente High School. Richard Brosio identifies the marketing of hegemonic ideology through 1) the media and popular culture; and 2) the enterprise of public schooling, as a major culprit of alienation.[x] This is informed by a hidden curriculum that functions to destroy historical memory and impose an official (often apolitical and ahistorical) public transcript of events that are in concert with the imperatives of capitalism. As such, an important role of critical pedagogy is not only the unveiling of the hidden curriculum in schools and society, but the reinstitution of a multiplicity of historical memories tied to the everyday lives of the disenfranchised.

Racism, sexism, homophobia, disabilitism and all forms of oppression disembody and alienate our daily existence through the violation of our bodies. Hence, the U.S. is a society of the incarcerated body, the schooled body, the enslaved body, the embattled body, the surgically altered body, the starved body, the abused body, the worn and torn body. As our consciousness becomes more and more abstracted, we become more and more detached from our bodies. In

fact, I would argue that one of the functions of every form of oppression is, indeed, to keep us detached from our bodies. This is absolutely necessary for social control and the extraction of surplus labor, since the source of emancipatory possibility and human solidarity resides in the body. For the body is the medium through which we wage political struggle, through which we transform the world.

Terry Eagleton reminds that it is the material body that we share most significantly with the rest of our species. And although we might say that our needs, desires, and suffering are culturally determined, "our material bodies are such that they are, in principle, completely capable of feeling compassion" for all others.[xi] The alienation of capitalist relations blinds us to this fact, since it is precisely upon this capacity for shared subjectivity and knowledge that moral values are founded, that emancipatory knowledge is constructed, and that a practice of human solidarity is established.

Accordingly, a significant task of critical pedagogy is to revive an emancipatory politics of collective self-determination in our teaching, research and politics. But to do so requires that we acknowledge that self-determination requires available free energy that is not committed to paid labor, household problems and our enmeshment with non-fulfilling personal relationships. Inherent in this function is the need for a personal community of colleagues and comrades with whom we labor and struggle in our efforts to establish coherence between our words and our deeds. For "what we say must be rooted in what we actually do—or it will lack [the] force" to transform our lives and our communities.[xii]

Forging a New Struggle

Forging a new struggle is, ultimately, about bringing us all back home to our bodies in a world where every aspect of our daily life—birth, death, marriage, family, school, work, leisure, parenthood, spirituality, and even entertainment—has been colonized.[xiii] Under such a regime of power our bodies are left alienated, disconnected and compartmentalized, leaving us unmercifully at the mercy of capital. Meanwhile, the marketplace fools us into believing that consumption equals happiness. As our consciousness becomes more and more abstracted, we become more and more detached from one another. The consequence is a deep sense of personal and collective dissatisfaction generated by a marketplace that cannot satisfy authentic human needs, human needs that can only be met through relationships that break the alienation and isolation so prevalent in our lives.

As such, it is absolutely imperative in forging a new struggle to acknowledge that the origin of emancipatory possibility and human solidarity resides in the body. For Terry Eagleton reminds us that "it is the moral, fragile, suffering, ecstatic, needy, dependent, desirous, and compassionate body which furnishes the basis for all moral thought."[xiv] And it is moral thought that places our bodies back into the political discourse. Moreover, it is the absence of a truly democratic moral language and practice that stifles our capacity for social struggle today.   For example, I would argue that a weakness of the Democratic Party during the 2004 presidential campaign was the failure to communicate a clear and coherent moral political message to challenge the simplistic conservative moralism of George Bush. More importantly, this was the case because of the campaign's own alienated complicity with the structure of economic inequality and the contradictions inherent in its liberal politics.

Efforts to forge a new struggle require the development of a moral political language that can safeguard the dignity and integrity of all human differences, intrinsic to a pluralistic nation.

This entails a language that begins with the needs of the body. For without our bodies to enact the principles we embrace, any notion of an emancipatory democracy is meaningless. And this goes way beyond the notion of *voices*; for genuine democracy is about the body's interaction with the world. Thus, it must exist as a practice in which human beings interact as equals in order to contribute to the world the best of what they have to offer. And this practice must take place in the field of fluid human interaction, which is the place in which we construct culture.

Oppression blocks, disrupts and corrupts the fluid participation of subordinated bodies within the world, reifying exclusionary human relations in the interest of economic imperative, without regard for the destructive impact of violated bodies left behind. When human needs such as food, shelter, meaningful livelihood, healthcare, education and the intimacy of a community are not met, bodies are violated. Violated bodies easily gravitate to whatever can provide a quick fix to ease the pain and isolation of an alienated existence. We need, instead, fully integral bodies, expressing our humanity from a place of wholeness and love, rather than fear and uncertainty.

In creating anew a movement for social transformation, a revolutionary love compels us to become part of a new decolonizing culture that cultivates human connection, intimacy, trust and honesty, from the body out into the world. Love, here, also means to comprehend that the moral and the material are inextricably linked. And as such, our politics must recognize love as an essential ingredient of a just society. Love as a political principle motivates the struggle to create mutually life-enhancing opportunities for all people. It is a love that is grounded in the mutuality and interdependence of our human existence—that which we share, as much as that which we do not. This is a love nurtured by the act of relationship itself. It cultivates relationships across our differences, without undue fear. Such an emancipatory love allows us to

realize our nature, in a way that allows others to do so as well. Inherent in such a love is the understanding that we are never at liberty to be violent, authoritarian, or exploitive.

So, where do we begin? Freire repeatedly argued that ethics is a significant place of departure, for both our private and public lives.[xv] As an activist committed to democratic principles of everyday life, ethics constitutes for me a political question, which in the final analysis is also a moral one. For without morality our politics becomes an instrument of oppression. But please do not mistake here morality for moralism. Being moral means exploring the texture and quality of our sensations, ideas and practices—a process that we cannot surely accomplish by abstracting life from our social surroundings, from our cultures, or from our histories of survival. This requires that we struggle to bring together the moral and political, the particular and universal, acknowledging that nothing exists in isolation.

Moreover, it is through such collective struggle that consciousness is born. The poet Muriel Rukeyser reminds us that "a true consciousness is the confession to ourselves of our feelings; a false consciousness disowns them." [xvi] This disowning leads to the corruption of the mind and the body. Often, it is the outcome of seductive resounding images—via a celluloid screen, a third grade history lesson, a doctor's diagnosis and treatment, a "beauty" magazine, the evening news—colonizing images in disguise that tell us our lives, as they exist, are worthless. Consciousness distracted by the false yearning and desires of the marketplace corrupts our political will. With promises of an easier life, we are rendered passive citizens of the empire.

In these times of uncertainty, great moral courage is required to voice our dissent. If we do not, we shamefully leave the great task of dissent to our brothers and sisters around the world who suffer daily greater conditions of social, political and economic impoverishment than we will ever know. For how long will our teaching and politics fail to address the relevant and

concrete issues that impact people's daily lives? How many more children have to be doomed to

meaningless education? How many more youth need to be incarcerated? How many more

people need to suffer the ravages of war and poverty? How much suffering must we witness

before we finally remove the blinders of complacency and embrace a truly revolutionary struggle

grounded in shared kinship, political self-determination, and economic justice? It is a struggle

that holds no guarantees or promises—yet finds in our collective power the seeds of our

liberation.

---

[i]A. J. Noury and N. C. Smith, "Bye, Bye American Dream," *Political Affairs* (December 2004): 26.

[ii]See Barbara Ehrenreich, *Nickel and Dimed* (New York: Owl Books, 2002).

[iii]See Gary Orfield, *Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Resegregation* (Boston, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, 2001).

[iv]See Robert Miles, *Racism after Race Relations* (London: Routledge, 1993); and Antonia Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres, *After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism* (New York: New York University Press, 2004).

[v]See P. Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Colorline* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

[vi]Arun Kundnani, "The Death of Multiculturalism," Independent Race and Refugee News Network (2002): http://www.irr.org.uk/2002/april/ak000001.html.

[vii]R. Butson, "Teaching as a Practice of Social Injustice: Perspective from a Teacher," *Radical Pedagogy* (2003): http:radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/ Issue 5_1/10_butson.html.

[viii]Henry Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1983): 154.

[ix]See Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum Press, 1970).

[x]See Richard Brosio, *A Radical Critique of Capitalist Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994).

[xi]Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (New York: Basic Books, 2003): 198.

[xii]Eagleton: 198.

[xiii]See Henri Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World* (London: The Penguin Press, 1971).

[xiv]Eagleton: 198.

[xv]See Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the City* (New York: Continuum,1993); *Pedagogy of Hope* (New York: Continuum, 1996); and *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare to Teach* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1998).

[xvi]Muriel Rukeyser, *The Life of Poetry* (Ashfield, MA: Paris Press, 1996): 49.