

Liberal and Conservative Multiculturalism After 9-11 SEPTEMBER 11

By LESLIE ANTONETTE

In the wake of September 11, the global study of cultures that are not American seems more important than ever before. However, in many institutions of education in the United States, the study of international cultures falls under the rubric of multiculturalism, which has come to represent both the study of international cultures and the study of diverse cultures within the United States. This is a problem because an effective study of cultural issues requires a consideration of those issues in their own sociohistorical context. In the United States, this means a study of the liberal/conservative tension that gives rise to a national identity. When the global study of cultures is used to teach students, at any age level, about the multicultural quality of American society, it reinforces a belief that all ethnic difference comes from somewhere other than the United States and that those who are ethnically different are somehow not-quite-American. This conservative approach to the study of multicultural America has allowed for the acts of violent retribution that have occurred in response to the events of 9/11.

When the liberal/conservative tension in the dialogue on multiculturalism is not addressed through education, social relationships become unbalanced. This tension was designed by the Founding Fathers, perhaps unwittingly, to preserve a sense of national identity that would allow the country to continue to grow and prosper as its boundaries expanded and its cultural demographics shifted. Learning to navigate the tension within the discourse on multiculturalism requires

an understanding of the concept itself, as it applies specifically to the United States.

The Historical Background of Multiculturalism

The term “multiculturalism” was first coined in the United States in the 1920s to describe a “basic concept [that] began when [primary and secondary school] educators started writing about intercultural education and ethnic studies [used to] orient the populace to newly arrived immigrants” (Edwards, 1993, 12). In the 1920s, institutions of public education were charged with providing a means of assimilation for the children of the many immigrants who had poured into the country since the 1880s. In the classroom, however, English-speaking children were assigned stories about the immigrant groups and their cultures so that they would be able to recognize and understand the newcomers’ differences.

Ethnic groups have tended to situate themselves, or to be situated, in identifiable clusters throughout the country, and for that reason multicultural programs have addressed different ethnic groups in different regions. In the Pacific Northwest multiculturalism often focuses on the Asian-American experience; in the Southwest, multiculturalism addresses the Latino/a experience; and in the South and East, multiculturalism tends toward African-American issues (Auerbach, 1994). It seems that this would have led to the development of strategies that address regionally specific multicultures, which has happened in pockets around the

country. However, for the most part, either because of political conservatism in certain parts of the country or because of the need to assimilate such a large number of cultural groups with so many differences among them, another strategy has developed. This strategy offers generalized considerations of “intercultural” or international differences between those cultural groups and “American” (read Western European) culture. This conservative model of multiculturalism dominated until the 1940s, when the word “multiculturalism” virtually disappeared from the academic lexicon.

In the 1960s, multiculturalism was reintroduced into higher education through the establishment of ethnic studies programs. The development of departments of study specific to non-Western European cultures, the opening of the literary canon, and the development of inclusive pedagogies in literature and composition departments were in large part a result of the civil rights activism of the period. These practices, characteristic of liberal multiculturalism, were designed to address the cultural imbalances that a conservative multicultural approach to education had caused.¹ According to Henderson and Henderson (1974), the study of diverse cultural group histories that have contributed to the formation of American culture—ethnic studies or departments or programs dedicated to the study of non—Western European cultures—was developed largely under the concept of pluralism. Pluralists argued that the many cultures making up American culture should be studied in their own sociohistorical contexts.

Traditionalists became alarmed at the possibility that the study of the “Other” cultures would detract from the privileged study of Western European culture and argued to keep such studies out of the curriculum. Those who would soon come to be called “multiculturalists” argued that the study of these previously marginalized cultural groups must be included in order to present a full understanding of American culture. This liberal response represented a compromise between the two groups, and it allowed for the study of cultures other than Western European to be situated in traditional disciplines, or contained in traditional curriculum (Antonette, 1998).

The nationalist movements that developed in the 1960s and 1970s as an outgrowth of civil rights activism can be viewed as both radical and conservative because those movements have attempted to conserve a history and culture unique to the group represented. For example, Pan African or Africana Studies programs provided a body of knowledge about African cultures so that African Americans could understand the history and heritage of the places from which they were taken. These histories and cultures were unique to African Americans, and African-American groups wanted to preserve that connection. Many also wanted to privilege that history over Western European history. This was a radical idea that could not be tolerated by conservative American educational institutions developed out of a Western European tradition. Like the earlier version of multiculturalism, the introduction of the study of non-Western European cultures was in large part designed to make European-American students in colleges and universities comfortable with the cultural differences accompanying demographic shifts in the student body. However, because this version of multiculturalism was introduced to higher education campuses and not just to K-12 students, it also served to empower those students who considered themselves to be members of marginalized cultural groups. It allowed

them to recognize their historical position in American history and to act on their new knowledge.

During this period many ethnic studies programs and departments emerged as great liberal mechanisms of American multicultural education. These interdisciplinary programs or departments allowed non-European Americans to recognize their historical right to an American identity by considering international or global cultural experience while bringing that experience back—through a consideration of Diaspora or immigration patterns, or economic histories—to the experiences of individuals from those cultures in the United States. This allowed a third-generation Chinese American, for example, to understand herself as an American and yet gain an understanding of the ways in which her cultural history has contributed to a broader American experience. However, this historical right was always subject to the need, perceived by a conservative multiculturalism, to protect the integrity of American identity.

Over the past 20 years, multiculturalism as an academic term has been used to discuss changes in a variety of academic disciplines as well as in the political arena. The following are some of the areas where those changes have been observed (Antonette, 1998):

- (1) canon reformation (Wolf);
- (2) a reformulation of the artistic aesthetic (Levin);
- (3) an alternate knowledge paradigm for the humanities and the soft sciences, which includes notions of pluralism (Buenker and Ratner, Ravitch);
- (4) the development of a pedagogy that is focused on a decentralized source of authority (these arguments often question the traditional formulation of both knowledge and cultural identity) (Lu, Geyer, Coiner);
- (5) egalitarian legislation at the national political level;

- (6) the development of inclusive curricula at the K-12 and university levels (Appleton, Matsuda et al.); and
- (7) debates over “political correctness” or diversity that detract from the traditions of the university (Bernstein, Hirsch)

What all of these definitions share is the notion of multiculturalism as a concept integral to a particularly American educational system. It is a concept that is tied by definition to a national educational philosophy, process, and outcome—one that encompasses multiple subject areas and disciplines. Whether the definition is conservative, such as that advanced by Hirsch (1987), or liberal, such as that of Lu (1994), all of these theorists are talking about American institutions of education and culture. They are all concerned with either the conservation of a Western European model or the inclusion of cultural difference in those institutions.

Conservative and Liberal Multiculturalism and Their Variations: Some Definitions

Conservatism, history has demonstrated, seems to be the greater weight in the liberal/conservative tension. In order to understand the need for an institutionalized balance between liberal and conservative approaches to multicultural education, consider a brief description of the forms of multicultural philosophy that are currently in practice and an explanation of the ways in which they differ from the global study of culture.

Conservative multiculturalism uses teaching strategies and course content to teach the identification of cultural differences through the presentation of information about cultures that are not American. Conservative multiculturalism shuts down the discussion of cultural differences within the national boundaries by focusing on cultural differences that reside outside those boundaries. In this way, a conservative approach to multiculturalism

conveys the idea that all cultural difference exists outside of American identity. Americans who are identifiable as representative of an “outside” culture can then be marked as immutably different from those Americans who cannot be physically identified in such ways (Antoinette, 1998).

This brand of conservative multiculturalism often coalesces around the concept of race. In fact, racial identification is skewed by a superficial and stereotype-ridden knowledge base. McGoldrick, Giordano, and Pearce (1996) write that “[r]ace has always been a major cultural definer and divider in [American] society, since those whose skin color marked them as different always suffered more discrimination than others. They could not ‘pass’ as other immigrants might, leaving them with noticeable ‘obligatory’ ethnic... identification” (15).² Those Americans who “look” like they may have come from somewhere else are always already considered to be different from those Americans who “look” like they belong to the dominant Western European culture. An educational strategy that reinforces this understanding of cultural difference, whether it arises from a Western European or a Pan-Africanist perspective, impedes the possibility that cultural relationships in the United States can change and thus contributes to the production of inequitable and polarizing social relationships.

Liberal multiculturalism is an inclusive strategy of teaching practices and course content that identifies difference, like its conservative counterpart, through visual and physical as well as cultural attributes. Unlike its conservative counterpart, though, liberal multiculturalism situates that difference within the United States, usually through the historical study of immigration but also through the study of assimilation and intermarriage. This model of American multiculturalism also has its drawbacks, because situating people according to physical appearances, in histories that are unlike the histories of those who represent the dominant culture, isolate those “marked” individuals into

groups that are still “somehow” not-quite-American.

Consider briefly the history of Japanese Americans in the not-so-distant past. The internment of Japanese Americans, the loss of their property and the disruption of their lives, is an example of the liberal/conservative tension that defines multiculturalism in America. The belief that Americans of Japanese heritage were, in fact, not completely American because they looked different represented a conservative logic in turn supported by the liberal idea that they had a different history from that of their Western European counterparts. German and Italian (also Axis group members) Americans living in the United States at the same time were not subjected to similar treatment. The liberals argued that Japanese Americans had a right to be in America, so they were not deported, but the conservatives argued that they did not look like Americans, so they were imprisoned.

Liberal and conservative multiculturalisms work in tandem to protect American national identity. However, what often happens is that pockets of conservative practice tend to develop, especially in times of trouble, when the nation perceives itself to be under attack from outside forces. History has shown us that this kind of conservative imbalance is not in the best interest of the country, and the discourse is always trying to put itself back into balance.

Critical multiculturalism is a radical form of multiculturalism that moves away from the process of defining identifiable ethnic differences and toward an examination of economic, gendered, regional, intellectual, social, and historical differences in order to study the ways in which these differences—and the concept of difference itself—are constructed and function in a given culture. The use of the word “critical” refers to the roots of this theoretical model, which are found in the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School. These theorists adapted Marxist economic philosophy to the study of culture (Giroux, 1994). Critical multi-

culturalism offers a set of ideas that can be put into practice, with the results of the practice leading to adjustments in the theory. The changed theory then leads to new practices. Because this dialectic between theory and practice depends on the self-reflexivity of the theorist/practitioner, it is difficult to institutionalize. The fundamental premise of the model is that change is the only constant. Institutions tend to resist change and, therefore, a critical multiculturalism, at this point in American history, effectively exists only in individual classrooms (Antoinette, 1998). Liberal and conservative multiculturalism, on the other hand, can be institutionalized because both support a stable national identity produced through education.

All three forms of multiculturalism—liberal, conservative, and critical—must be considered within a nationally defined boundary in order to be effective. American multiculturalism is concerned with American society, culture, and history. The study of cultures that exist outside of the boundaries of American culture is most effectively done under the rubric of globalism.

Globalism is described by International Professor of Globalism Ruud Lubbers as a set of relationships that exist across geographic and national borders and affect political, cultural, social, and economic relationships in all of the cultures involved in the exchange (Lubbers and Koorevar, 2001). This term has also been defined as “the transnationalization of capital, and the new economic order” (Lowey, 1998, 595); and “a coalescence of varied transnational processes and domestic structures, allowing the economy, politics, culture and ideology of one country to penetrate another” (Mittelman, 1994, 428). All of these definitions illustrate the ways in which cultures and economic entities intersect. Globalism is primarily concerned with the exchange of cash and culture among both national and economic entities. This kind of consideration requires that discrete and recognizable cultural and economic entities partici-

pate in the exchange. This, arguably, differentiates globalism from colonization. Thus, globalism is an appropriate format within which one could identify cultural differences, defined by national boundaries, and study the interactions between and among those cultures. The lesson to be learned from a global study of culture is that if a nation/state or economic entity does not have a clear sense of self-identity, it runs the risk of being assimilated by an entity that does have a strong sense of identity. James Madison made this argument in 1788, and it seems as appropriate today as it did then.

Globalism's Lessons and the Formation of American Identity

In 1788, Madison argued that the American Senate had to be constructed by a group of men who could provide the *appearance* of stability. He wrote:

Independently of the merits of any particular plan or measure, it is desirable on various accounts, that [foreign policy] should *appear* to other nations as the offspring of a wise and honorable policy: [and] second, that in doubtful cases, particularly where the national councils may be warped by some strong passion or momentary interest, the presumed or known opinion of the impartial world, may be the best guide that can be followed. (Madison, 1982, 318; my emphasis)

This argument points to the need for the production of a stable and cohesive image of America that can be reflected back in moments of divisiveness. For Madison this "appearance" or image was of the utmost importance.

Madison asks only for an "appearance" of solidarity because, as he writes in the same letter, "however requisite a sense of national character may be, it is evident that it can never be sufficiently possessed by a numerous

and changeable body" (Madison, 1982, 318). The Senate was to be a microcosmic representation of the "numerous and changeable body" that was, and continues to be, the United States of America. Madison recognizes in this passage that the reality of American culture is heterogeneous and complex, but that the Senate could not reflect that image because it would be too easily divided. The proposed Senate was confirmed, and the effort to produce an American culture with which world powers would interact began. This historical moment is where we can locate the beginning of a dominant American culture based on a Western European model.

The dominant culture was constituted of the original senators, who were primarily educated in Western Europe. As David Theo Goldberg (1990) has argued, an educational system was necessary to continue to reproduce those dominant Western European values. Thomas Jefferson quickly moved to design an American Academy that could continuously reproduce representatives of that dominant culture, and in short time, public universities, common schools, and public K-12 institutions were organized in ways that followed his model. Jefferson wrote in the 1818 "Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia" that the primary "objects of that higher grade of education [are] to develop the reasoning faculties of our youth, enlarge their minds, cultivate their morals, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order" (Jefferson, 1977, 334). Jefferson's model could supply Madison's Senate with conservative cultural representatives who could perpetuate the appearance of a unified and homogeneous population. However, in that same report Jefferson wrote:

It cannot be but that each generation succeeding to the knowledge acquired by all those who preceded it, adding to it their own acquisitions and discoveries, and handing the mass down for successive and

constant accumulation, must advance the knowledge and well-being of mankind, not infinitely, as some have said, but indefinitely, and to a term which no one can fix and foresee. (Jefferson, 1977, 336)

Jefferson's concept of higher education coupled with Madison's recognition of a "numerous and changeable" populace allows for an understanding of American education as an institution charged with protecting the conservative interest of producing a citizenry that can serve as representatives of a unified, homogeneous set of values, through liberal practices that produce a dynamic set of cultural values. The homogeneous body of citizens produced by American institutions of education is charged with providing the *appearance* of a unified national character and with protecting the heterogeneous nature of the populace. This liberal/conservative tension is at the center of American multiculturalism today, and this cultural negotiation occurs in academic discourse because education is the cultural institution charged with producing the representation of American culture (Antonette, 1998). Therefore, an academic institution that does not organize itself around this tension runs the risk of producing a skewed *representation* of American national identity.

The global spread of American culture (economic and ideological) is, in part, due to the strong sense of national identity that the United States possesses. However, as Lubbers and Koorevar (2001) argue, national identities cannot interact in the globalization process without realizing the effects—political, social, cultural, and economic—that the interactions have on their respective cultures. The effects of these interactions must be considered in the context of both multicultural studies (the study of diverse cultures within the nation) and global studies (cultures as they exist throughout the world). To try to study both the domestic effects of these exchanges and the international rela-

tionships that result, under the heading of either multiculturalism or globalism, renders both areas of study ineffective, as demonstrated by recent events.

On September 11, 2001, an unknown entity attacked targets within the United States. Early reports vaguely identified "Middle Eastern terrorist groups." The first American response was to ask, "Why do they hate us?" This question headlined many major periodicals. "They," in this context, was an unclear referent that pointed a finger away from oneself to someone "different." The apparent and logical conclusion was that an American could never have done such a thing.

Unfortunately, a significant number of Americans educated in public education systems have received no multicultural education, or a multicultural education situated in a conservative approach that taught students to recognize cultural difference as inherently un-American. Therefore, if "they" are Muslim, the logic went, then "they" cannot be American. Sadly, the events that have followed September 11 support the inevitable outcome of such an education. Violent acts of retribution have been perpetrated on Americans of Islamic faith and some Americans who just looked as though they might be of Islamic faith. Those violent acts have been attributed to the spontaneous "acting out" of angry individuals. However, they can also be read as the inevitable result of a conservative approach to multicultural education that allows Americans to believe that those who look like they come from somewhere else are somehow not quite American and are, therefore, appropriate targets of retribution.

One might argue the opposite—that the reaction to the September 11 attacks is a proof of the success of the liberal multicultural approach. While reprisals against Muslim Americans and those who "looked" Muslim took place, these were unorganized and sporadic rather than systematic and widespread. In the face of public anger, virtually every national political and religious leader reaffirmed the patriotism and American-ness of Muslims living with-

in the borders of the United States. Periodical articles and, later, books explored the immigrant experiences of Muslims and others from the Middle East and South Asia as well as the contributions of the immigrants and their descendants. In addressing this immigration process, liberal multiculturalists have moved away from the concept of immutable difference toward an understanding of cultural differences that can be changed. They have also moved from an attribution of difference based on physical characteristics of distinct groups to one rooted in the history of each individual. This is exactly why a liberal philosophy and practice of multiculturalism must be present in all American schools—it opens up the possibility for change.

In mainstream American education, there remain significant pockets of K-12 and university-level educators who continue to rely on a conservative approach to multiculturalism to describe practices that are, at this point in history, more appropriate to the global study of international cultural interactions. When multiculturalism was translated into a set of practices for use in the American K-12 public school system, following the liberal reinterpretation of that concept in institutions of higher learning in the 1960s, the focus on American experience tended to be ignored. As the *Encyclopedia of American Education* states:

[M]ulticultural education has been [used to have] children recreate an African, Asian or other cultural environment and spend several hours of each school day pretending to be members of such foreign cultures....The technique has come under considerable criticism

because there is no comparable effort to teach children their own American culture. (Unger, 1996, 631)

Even when leaders take a more liberal multiculturalist approach, their

understanding may be incomplete, as they ignore certain historical realities in the process of acknowledging other ones. For instance, following the September 11 tragedy, First Lady Laura Bush felt the need to remind the nation that "everyone here comes from somewhere else." In this televised statement she reiterated the fundamental logic of a conservative multiculturalism along with a liberal one. Quite simply, everyone *here* does not, necessarily, come from somewhere else. The statement excluded Native American cultures. If we consider the ways in which the exclusion works, we can get an idea of just how detrimental an unchecked conservative multiculturalism can be to the nation.

The First Lady's comments reinforced the history of cultural removal. In attempting to unify Americans, the First Lady seemed to suggest that just because someone looks different does not mean that they are different. However, the exclusion of those Americans who may look different from a Western European American and did not come from anywhere else—Native Americans—suggests that most Americans have learned to discern where a person "comes from" based on what they look like. Furthermore, the experience of coming "from somewhere else" has become the measure of American-ness.

Outside of Native American studies programs or liberal and critical multicultural classrooms, Native American culture is often taught as history. Many Americans consider those cultures extinct. This is because conservative multiculturalism cannot negotiate any cultural difference that resides within the boundaries of the United States. Therefore, Native American cultures appear to exist outside American culture by virtue of their existence only in the past.

How Educators Can Restore the Balance

The K-12 classroom is the place to begin to build a liberal/conservative balance because it is ground zero of the educational process. One way to

begin is to look at the textbooks. Many of them have followed the conservative model. Look through the text of choice and teach the American issues first. Pay attention to the previously marginalized histories and the multiple perspectives offered by various cultural experiences. Then go back and examine specific non-American cultures, teaching the relationships that exist between the national identities. Rather than a section on "Third World views, literature, or history," concentrate on specific cultures; begin to unlock the big chunks of cultural otherness that a conservative approach to multiculturalism has built up for the sake of comparison and convenience. In large survey courses in American, British, or world literature or history, address the marginalized histories that contributed to "the Tradition" and allow students to interrogate the value of both dominant and marginalized traditions.

A shift in pedagogy is the most basic and important shift an American multicultural educator can make. Student-centered, student-directed, and student-led instruction is a powerful tool for interrogating the differences that exist inside American culture because our students bring into our classrooms all those differences we wish to explore. Allow the classroom to function as a microcosm of the larger culture and invite students to experiment within it. If a classroom looks homogeneous, encourage students to consider differences like gender, economic status, and invisible disability. In preservice teacher training, especially, allow students to investigate fully their own responses to cultural differences. This may mean that course content needs to be revised to allow the class time that students need to explore in depth their responses to the ideas a liberal multiculturalism allows them to consider. It will, in the long term, allow them to be more effective in engaging cultural, ethnic, gender, and class differences in their own classrooms. Students need time to examine and consider the effect that cultural difference has on them.

Many multicultural educators have responded to the September 11 attacks

by encouraging students to discuss and examine their own responses to that event. This has allowed students to alleviate some of the stress and anger generated by the event because it has helped them to understand the cultural relationships that exist in the United States and to differentiate those relationships from the global relationships that may have motivated the attack.

The conservation of American culture seems to be of paramount concern in these post-9/11 days. This can most effectively be achieved through a liberal consideration of American culture: what it is, who produces it, and how it affects those who live within it. The liberal/conservative tension within the discussion of American multiculturalism should focus on understanding and valuing American history and culture. This discussion will maintain the tension necessary for the continuous construction of a healthy and productive national identity. For educators, the most effective response to 9/11 is to continue to develop a study of American culture as a rich and diverse culture that intersects with cultures all over the globe. This liberal/conservative, or multicultural/global, tension must be developed in some places and continue to be tended in others. However, if we concentrate on using a multicultural perspective to study American culture, we will not only recuperate from the attacks of 9/11 but also become a more unified and effective member of the global community.

ENDNOTES

¹ According to Henderson and Henderson, even though the number of African Americans enrolled in college doubled between 1960 and 1970, they still comprised only five to six percent of the total college enrollment (55).

² McGoldrick, Giordano, and Pearce also state very succinctly: "Race is an issue of political oppression, not a cultural or genetic matter. As Ignatiev (1995) puts it: 'No biologist has ever been able to provide a satisfactory definition of 'race'—that is, a definition that includes all members of a given

race and excludes all others (p.1)'" (McGoldrick et al., 1996, 14-15).

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WORKS CITED

- Antonette, L. (1998). *The rhetoric of diversity and the traditions of American literary study: Critical multiculturalism in English*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Appleton, N. (1978). *Multiculturalism and the courts*. Los Angeles: National Dissemination and Assessment Center.
- Auerbach, S., ed. (1994). *Encyclopedia of multiculturalism, Volume 1*. New York: Marshall Cavendish.
- Buenker, J. D. and Ratner, L. A., eds. (1992). *Multiculturalism in the United States: A comparative guide to acculturation and ethnicity*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Coiner, C. (1992). Is multiculturalism enough? *Women's Studies* 20(3-4): 209-215.
- Edwards, R. G. (1993). Multiculturalism and its links to quality education and democracy. *MultiCultural Review* 2(2), June: 12-16, 19.
- Gates, H. L., Jr. (1991). Good-bye Columbus? Notes on the culture of criticism. *American Literary History* 3(4), Winter: 711-727.
- Geyer, M. (1993). Multiculturalism and the politics of general education. *Critical Inquiry* 19(3), Spring: 499-533.
- Giroux, H. (1994). Living dangerously: Identity politics and the new cultural racism. In H. Giroux and P. McLaren, eds., *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1990). The social formation of racist discourse. In D. T. Goldberg, ed., *Anatomy of racism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gunew, S. and Longley, K. O., eds. (1992). *Striking chords: Multicultural literary interpretations*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Henderson, A. D. and Henderson, J. G. (1974). *Higher education in America: Problems, priorities and prospects*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Horton, J. (1993). *Liberalism, multiculturalism and toleration*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kanpol, B. and McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical multiculturalism*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Jefferson, T. (1977). Report of the Commissioners for the University of Virginia. In Merrill D. Peterson, ed., *The portable Jefferson*. New York: Penguin.

Levin, K., ed. (1992). *Beyond wall and wars: Art, politics, and multiculturalism*. New York: Midmarch Arts Press.

Lowey, R. F. (1998). Development theory, globalism and the new world order. *Journal of Black Studies* 28(5), May: 594-616.

Lubbers, R. and Koorevar, J. (2001). Primary globalisation, secondary globalisation and the sustained development paradigm-opposing forces for the 21st century. *Globus*, June. <http://cwis.kub.nl/globus/Lubpdfs/Governan/Gover114.pdf>.

Lu, M. (1994). Professing multiculturalism: The politics of style in the contact zone. *College Composition and Communication* 45(4), December: 442-458.

Madison, J. (1982). Federalist Paper Number 63, March 1, 1788. In Garry Wills, ed., *The Federalist Papers*. New York: Bantam.

Matsuda, M. J.; Lawrence, C. R., III; Delgado, R.; and Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the First Amendment*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

McGoldrick, M.; Giordano, J.; and Pearce, J. K., eds. (1996). *Ethnicity and family therapy*. New York: Guilford Press.

Mittelman, J. H. (1994). The globalisation challenge: Surviving at the margins. *Third World Quarterly* 15(3), September: 427-444.

Ravitch, D. (1990). Multiculturalism: E pluribus plures. *American Scholar* 59(3), Summer: 337-352.

Rizvi, F. (1986). *Ethnicity, class and multicultural education*. Victoria, Canada: Deakin University Press.

Unger, H. G., ed. (1996). *Encyclopedia of American Education*. New York: Facts on File.

Wolf, B. (1991). Firing the canon. *American Literary History* 3(4), Winter: 707-710.

Leslie Antonette is a professor in the Department of English at East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and a regular reviewer for *MultiCultural Review*.

Long Dumb Voices:

Reading Historical Fiction to Hear Silenced Women Speak

By Patricia Goldblatt

"Long dumb voices...absences and silences that are as much a part of our history as the articulate voices."

—Maxine Greene (1993,14)

In a sixth grade social studies classroom in New Zealand, a teacher describes the colonization of New York City (Alton-Lee and Densem, 1993). During the lesson, "97.6% of the teacher's references to historical figures [are] to white European men"; the women being mentioned are either prostitutes or belong to devalued or marginalized groups. Interestingly in a class evenly divided between 14 girls and 15 boys, it is the boys who participate in the discussion that ensues from the presentation.

Is it the topic that makes the girls reticent to respond, or are they receiving a culturally transmitted message: that those of lowered status, like women, deserve little or no voice in history or even in the classroom? Is it the mention of the word "prostitute" that embarrasses and silences the girls, for do they sense that their place should be one of compliance and background to their male counterparts? Perhaps they intuitively know that their input will not be valued and, like the female Maori scientists cited in Elizabeth McKinley's research (April 2001), walk a tightrope, feeling silenced and torn between their personal goals and repressive societal expectations. McKinley's work reveals the isolation and alienation that occur when women, or young girls, demonstrate scholastic success. Indeed, "[s]ome educationalists argue that to be intellectual is to not be part of the people or the *subaltern* (tribal grouping made up of a number of related family groups)" (see Spivak in McKinley, 2001, 6).

Schools are places of socialization where children are readied for adulthood in a changing world. One would like to believe that schools provide the locales for liberating and empowering students in order to change society for the better. Paolo Freire has spoken of the tools that students can acquire to "remake [the world] into a better place," taking action against repressive structures that limit freedom (1970, 17). "Contradictorily, one of society's aims for its educational system is to transmit 'norms' to the next generation" (McKinley, 2001, 10). Therefore, identities, aspirations, and relationships are tried out, tested, accepted, or rejected in the context of peer and teacher approval and disapproval. And yet, this portrayal of a classroom in New Zealand in the later part of the twentieth century is disheartening. How ironic it is that Barth (1990, 5) describes schools as "four walls surrounding the future."

Schools should be the place where pupils are supported in claiming responsibility for seeking out their destinies and shaping the kind of world they will inherit (Reed and Learmonth, 2001), yet a multitude of taught and untaught lessons reinforce established routines that maintain ritualistic and repressive hierarchies. Established school patterns become accepted through ceaseless repetition, lived out over and over again, with those challenging the status quo finding themselves the butt of teachers' jokes and marginalized by their peers as well. One can only hope that the picture created of silenced girls is not endemic of schooling around the entire globe.

In order to counteract the plight of girls in mixed-sex classrooms, private girls' schools brag that all-girl classes promote venues for young women to