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ABSTRACT

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY, POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

AND THE MEDIA

This thesis is a critical analysis of current debates over "political correctness" and pedagogical reform. Employing a theoretical framework informed by critical pedagogy, this document outlines the historical, political, economic, social and cultural context in which these recent debates have emerged.

Beginning with the assumption that the educational and cultural domains are contested terrains mediated by class, race and gender configurations, it is argued that the discourse of critical pedagogy provides a puissant challenge to both conservative and liberal approaches to education. The current debates within the realm of social theory are also taken up by addressing the various trajectories (resistant postmodernism, post-colonialism, feminism, cultural studies, critical theory, Marxism) which have influenced the development of critical pedagogy.

A criticalist perspective therefore undergirds the subsequent analysis of recent debates over canon revision, curriculum changes and the mainstream media's coverage of these events.
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INTRODUCTION

Sometimes you have to follow the opposite course: Distrust agreement and find in dissent the confirmation of your own intuitions. There is no rule: there is only the risk of contradiction. But sometimes you have to speak because you feel the moral obligation to say something, not because you have the "scientific" certainty that you are saying it in an unassailable way. (Eco, 1990:xii)

The above quote is an apt expression of the context from which this thesis proceeds for it does not purport to provide definitive answers, irrefutable, "scientific" proof or tidy solutions to theoretical foibles and political woes. Nor does it claim to be taking an incontrovertible stance. Rather, it offers a politically and morally motivated, provisional engagement with some of the theoretical and practical issues raised in the contemporary debates over educational reform and "political correctness".

Despite the fact that many of my arguments emerge from the context of schooling, I will argue for the extension of the notion of a pedagogy of possibility to a wide variety of sites of cultural practice. In other words, this project attempts to speak to broader issues and concerns, for the crisis in society at large continues to escalate. The problems of racism, sexism, homophobia, class exploitation, ecological disaster and violence engulf us and are constantly fortified by the oppressive tendencies of Western capitalism. Democracy and social justice are under siege as corporate profiteers forsake humanitarian concerns and manufacture consent to a repressive social order. Progressive pedagogical initiatives are being undermined by corporate funded
ideological assaults emanating from the new Right and led by neoconservative intellectuals who wield the charge of "political correctness" as a reactionary bludgeon used to silence oppositional voices and smother radical dissent.

Indeed, demands made by feminists, blacks, gays and lesbians, ethnic minorities and progressive white activists for pedagogical reform have been met with vehement resistance by the self-proclaimed guardians of Western civilization. From the garishness of Rush Limbaugh, the egomania of Camille Paglia to the intellectual dishonesty of Allan Bloom, Dinesh D’Souza and Roger Kimball, the new Right has seized the airwaves and the best-seller lists by promoting a rather brutish brand of reactionist politics and offering a return to a mythical pre-60s Shangri-la - a retreat into nostalgia and social amnesia.

Despite this sobering context and the urgent need to establish a viable theoretical and political counter-offensive, we are instead being inundated by a proliferation of discourses all declaring the arrival of "post-al" society. That which is loosely referred to as the academic Left, speaking in tongues, has plunged into an abysmal, postmodern cul-de-sac in which visions of social transformation have been constructed as obsolete narratives. Idealistic dreams, utopian hopes, and desires for social renovation appear to be out of fashion; indeed, they are regarded with postmodern suspicion as potentially dangerous illusions which evoke the memories of totalitarian disasters. Postmodern prophets have abandoned the principle of hope and, instead, embraced a doctrine of despair. Such a position, epitomized in the works of ludic theorists like Jean Baudrillard (1983; 1987; 1989) exhibit little or no sense
of the passionate fervour for the need for change, nor for that matter, any hope that social transformation is a conceivable alternative. In response to this context of dolour and disillusionment, this thesis represents an effort to resuscitate the misplaced spirit of optimism and hope while evading the scepticism currently fashionable in academe.

Beginning with the assumption that education and culture in general, are contested terrains, that is, that they are sites of struggle between various social constituencies mediated by class, race and gender configurations, the goals of this thesis are manifold as is evident in the chapter overviews detailed below. However, before providing these overviews, it is first necessary to situate the various elements and aspirations of this thesis and to illuminate the fundamental purpose which informs them.

The purpose or "pattern which connects" the diverse strands of this thesis is, to draw attention to the need for progressive Leftist intellectuals to reassess their role in political struggle and more importantly, to rethink the relationship between theory and practice. Marcuse (1969:61) reminds us that the

...groundwork for building the bridge between the "ought" and the "is", between theory and practice, is laid within theory itself...

In essence, Marcuse speaks to the need for a radical re-assessment of the contemporary historical juncture and the ways in which intellectuals committed to democratic existence may contribute to charting out a theoretical course for its realization. The effort to develop a progressive theoretical project
or "way of seeing", while not the only kind of political "work" necessary today, is vitally imperative as a form of radical political engagement. As Lenin (1968:69) reminds us "without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement." The task of articulating a revolutionary theoretical and political project is, at this historical moment, one of pivotal import and must be taken up not only by insurgent intellectuals but by grassroots activists. In his classic text The Wretched Of The Earth, Frantz Fanon (1961:200-201) claims that

if the building of a bridge does not enrich the awareness of those who work on it, then that bridge ought not to be built...The bridge should not be "parachuted down" from above; it should not be imposed by a 'deus ex machina' upon the social scene; on the contrary it should come from the muscles and brains of the citizens.

If one were to interpret the "bridge" Fanon discusses as a metaphor for theory it could be argued that any theory which does not serve the interest of the "people", which does not illuminate the materiality and lived realities of the oppressed and the potential for their transformation, ought not to be constructed for as Grossberg (1992:13) states, theory is of "little use if it does not help us imagine and then realize better futures."

The academy, although circumscribed by its socio-economic context nonetheless, remains one of the principal locations in advanced capitalist society for the construction of radically oppositional knowledge and could possibly serve as locus for the cultivation of such a theory. Far from being an "ivory tower" disconnected from the real world, it is on the contrary, an urgent
site for radical political intervention. The university as a critical space therefore needs to be engaged, head-on, extensively and unrelentingly especially at a time when conservative forces are using the charge of "political correctness" to undermine and subvert progressive agendas. Such a task requires the dedication of academic activists willing to work at the edges - at the borders in connection with extra-academic groups and social movements.

While the discourse of critical pedagogy serves as the guiding theoretical beacon in this thesis it is not posited as the answer or as the definitive paradigm. Rather, it is employed as a provisional, situational trajectory whose recent engagements with multiculturalism, feminist and third world cultural theorists offer an entry point - a critical space - from which to begin imagining what a revolutionary theory might look like. Illuminating the urgent political task of crossing intellectual and institutional borders and building theoretical and political bridges is then, the ultimate goal of this thesis.

To achieve this goal, I do not avoid polemic, but in fact make it part of the process of "knowing". Such an approach as Zavarzadeh and Morton (1991) explain, does not follow the usual pattern of merely providing the reader with (neutral) accounts of theories, issues and events. Rather it places the reader in a position from which he cannot help but take a stand on the issue and go beyond the narrative of neutrality. (Zavarzadeh & Morton, 1991:2)

Thus, readers of this text should not expect it to be objective, that is, "above" contemporary contestations; nor comprehensive, in the sense of covering all the issues in recent theoretical as well as, educational debates.
In *Talking Back*, bell hooks maintains that the idea of finding one's voice in talk, discourse, writing and action is a "metaphor for self-transformation" and is especially relevant for women who have previously "never had a public voice" and who may be "speaking and writing for the first time." (1988:12) She also illustrates the way in which unequal power relations, especially in academic settings, work to undermine, co-opt and even silence radical and/or marginal voices. Hooks asserts that it is easier to speak in a language or style compatible with existing images and ways of knowing - those which have been constructed within social frameworks that reinforce domination, than it is to speak in a liberatory voice. A liberatory voice is therefore, characterized by opposition and resistance - it demands that paradigms shift, that patriarchal codes of "acceptable" speech be negated, that people learn "to talk, to listen, to hear in a new way." (hooks, 1988:15) As such it should be understood that the liberatory voice will necessarily confront, disturb, demand that listeners even alter ways of hearing and being...When we dare to speak in a liberatory voice, we threaten even those who may initially claim to want our words. (hooks, 1988:16-18)

This text is mediated by this conception of the politics of voice and is, in essence, an expression of my "voice" as a "political writer".

Cherrie Moraga (1983:i) describes the political writer as the "ultimate optimist" who believing that "people are capable of change" use words as a form of critical intervention and a way of overcoming the "privatism" which she claims "renders us politically useless". Bernice Johnson Reagon once said that
education could be either a tool of one’s liberation or the bars behind which one is enslaved. This thesis is both a response to Right-wing attempts to further enslave and marginalize already oppressed groups and an effort to foster a pedagogy of possibility and politics of hope. It is, quite simply, my critical public intervention.

Chapter Overviews

The radical, committed to human liberation...is not afraid to confront, to listen, to see the world unveiled. He is not afraid to meet the people or to enter into dialogue with them. He does not consider himself the proprietor of history or of men, or the liberator of the oppressed; but he does commit himself, within history, to fight at their side.

-Paulo Freire, Pedagogy Of The Oppressed

*************

Chapter One delineates the various theoretical influences which have been instrumental in the formation of critical pedagogical discourse. Since its inception, this tradition has constantly brushed against the grain of mainstream approaches to schooling, including those which boast both liberal and conservative tendencies. In its early beginnings, critical pedagogy was influenced to some extent by the new sociology of knowledge and the work on youth subcultures undertaken by Stuart Hall and others associated with the Birmingham School for cultural studies. In addition, it drew inspiration from the work of John Dewey and the efforts of the social reconstructionists of the 1920s. (McLaren, 1988) The works of Paulo Freire, Antonio Gramsci, Marxst theorists and the Frankfurt School have also had an enduring impact on critical pedagogy. Its subsequent engagements with the research done in the
areas of cultural, feminist and resistant postmodern theory have no doubt, strengthened its trajectory. These influences are taken up in detail in this chapter and while these diverse theoretical paradigms often display conflicting ideas and aspirations, critical pedagogists claim to have appropriated their most emancipatory aspects in the service of enriching a transdisciplinary, dialectical border pedagogy.

Current debates within the realm of critical social theory regarding modernist and postmodernist discourses are also a principal concern in this chapter as are the ramifications which they possess for theoretical formulations and political engagement. More specifically, the contestations within postmodernism itself; that is, between "ludic" or "reactionary" postmodernism and "resistance" postmodernism hold particular relevance for critical pedagogy and critical social theory in general. Resistance postmodernism offers critical pedagogy an avenue for comprehending notions of "difference" and "specificity" historically, relationally and contextually. It also provides the means to critique reductive and essentialist forms of theory which often privilege the experience of white, first world subjects. Ludic postmodernism on the other hand, is both theoretically and politically problematical. Ludic theorists like Baudrillard and Lyotard posit a postmodern rupture and repudiate modernist, Enlightenment epistemology and its inherent dualism. While this would undoubtedly signify a welcome epistemic advancement, ludic postmodernism falls short on its promise of abandoning these binary formulations. Despite the ardent disavowal of binary
modes of thought, postmodernism has in essence, reinscribed those binary either/or constructions, albeit in inverse fashion. In other words, the "other" in binary constructs such as sameness/difference; universality/particularity; unity/fragmentation, has simply been exalted in ludic postmodernism. In their valorization and defense of the devalued member of the binary set (i.e. particularity, difference, fragmentation) postmodernists have merely inverted those binary oppositions rather than subverting or transcending them.

Furthermore, in its objection to "totalizing" forms of thought and theorizing, ludic postmodernism rarely interrogates broader, material and historical relations of capitalist social organization as critique is often limited to discursive domains and language games. Bannerji (1991:82) points out that through this framework "we can't 'see' the overall social relations and common sense which organize" experience.

This distinction between ludic and resistance postmodernism has been a central focus for critical pedagogists who argue that the notion of totality, by which they mean a form of global understanding of capitalist social relations, must be salvaged in any attempt to cultivate oppositional forms of knowledge and counterhegemonic political praxis.(McLaren,1994; in press) In contradistinction to forms of ludic theory, critical pedagogy is best described as a dialectical, emergent epistemological project, which, while still in progress, seeks to view theories, events and issues from a wide historical and political lens. Hence, one of the primary aims of this chapter is to advance the
progressive agenda of critical border pedagogy as a provisional, conceptual and political ground from which to launch a politics of refusal against the reactionary proclivities of the new Right and the cynicism inherent in many of the trajectories which masquerade as "leftist" scholarship. While to some degree still marginal within academe, the transdisciplinary nature of critical pedagogy provides a conceptual framework for examining contemporary educational and cultural formations. It is therefore significant not only to pedagogical theory but to critical social theory in general.

**Chapter Two**

The evaluation of "political correctness" and contemporary educational debates offered in this text is therefore, mediated by this theoretical framework and its political project. In this thesis it is argued that the dispute over "political correctness" in the academy is merely another illustration of the contestatory character of pedagogical terrains. Indeed, the issues surrounding "p.c." are pertinent to progressive educators since the crux of the anti-p.c. crusade suggests that the moral and political vocabulary of critical pedagogy and critical theory in general, be dismissed as leftist, anti-Western propaganda.

Chapter Two provides a brief genealogy of the phrase "political correctness" from its early use by Leftists to its current appropriation by Right-wing ideologues. Once a phrase used by radicals as a sarcastic reference to those on the Left whose political activity showed a greater concern for the forms rather than the substance of oppression, in its Right-wing appropriation
p.c. has assumed an entourage of defining characteristics. In the latest phase of the culture war, educational and progressive political activists have been labelled p.c. and charged with forms of ideological indoctrination and academic fascism. Conservatives have effectively defined themselves as the "new victims" of these p.c. thought police. By associating inclusive, multicultural education with "McCarthyism" of the Left, conservative commentators have effectively inverted notions of power - presenting those who have had decades of uninterrupted control over the academy (and to a large extent still do) and its production of ideas as the "silenced" and the "policing", all the while disguising their own virtual stranglehold on institutionalized power.

Moreover, conservative scholars have systematically attempted to undermine the scholarship of women, people of colour, gays and lesbians by claiming that such work threatens the very foundations of society and "tradition". In other words, the Right opposes inclusive curricula by adhering to the notion that Eurocentric culture and thought represent "truth", intellectual superiority and "civilization" while the discourses and knowledges of the "other" are depicted as "subordinate", "political" (rather than objective) and even "barbaric". New Right mandarins and mainstream media pundits have depicted the p.c. controversy as the simple choice between civilization and barbarism; however, this form of Manichean reductionism masks the complexity of issues involved in the current debates over educational reform. Indeed, the challenges to hegemonic discourses are not restricted to the drive for pedagogical revisions for they manifest themselves in the broader social
context and find their expression in the ongoing struggles for equality, empowerment and social justice. The crux of the p.c. debate therefore involves the crucial question of the relationship between education, intellectuals, knowledge, power and democracy.

The p.c. controversy is then situated within the broader context of the "backlash" against the Sixties and is examined as another phase of the "conservative restoration". Since conservative spokespersons have claimed that p.c. is an outgrowth of sixties radicalism, a brief historical examination of some of the events of that decade and their relation to current campus controversies are also elaborated in the second chapter. The conservative counter-revolution initiated by the new Right in the aftermath of Sixties upheavals is also explored as are the contemporary economic and political factors which have fostered the cultural "backlash" against the progressive gains of the Sixties. Hence, Chapter Two also details the conservative ascendancy in the 1980s and examines the network of corporate funding undergirding the right-wing social and educational agenda. In the late 80s and early 90s, the "crisis" in education emerged as one of the most topical issues of the day. While conservatives had been systematically dismantling democratic initiatives for more than a decade (Hu-DeHart, 1993; Shor, 1992), their strategy to undermine progressive pedagogical reform intensified with the eruption of the p.c. controversy. Inundated by texts proclaiming a decline in academic "standards" and ill-informed media accounts declaring that a coterie of p.c. leftists had sieged campuses, the public received a portrait of
educational "decay" painted mainly by the new Right. The conservative restoration and its large pool of financial resources has undoubtedly infiltrated academic circles as a cabal of conservative scholars have emerged as the organic intellectuals for much of the rightist resurgence. Indeed, a variety of Right-wing think tanks funded mainly by conservative corporations have successfully created an "ideas industry" aimed largely at dismantling and undermining democratic and progressive initiatives in both the political and pedagogical spheres. This backlash, coupled with both the commoditization of history and the warped memory of the Sixties as it is immortalized in our mass media created collective consciousness, has stripped that decade of its historical importance and political relevance.

Given that context, a central concern in this thesis is an analysis and re-evaluation of the significance of Sixties radicalism which is now being blamed by many conservatives for the alleged "epidemic" of p.c. While a cautionary stance must be taken to avoid romanticizing the past, many of the events of that decade offer progressive educators and activists a critical frame of reference for evaluating the various initiatives now being formulated both within and outside of academia. Moreover, that decade was undoubtedly a crucial turning point in the chronicle of leftist politics and therefore provides an important historical context from which to assess the current state, as well as, the future direction of, contemporary leftist discourse. In a sense, the Sixties could conceivably be viewed as a "dangerous memory" and a pedagogy which explores the liberating as well as limiting lessons of that era could
greatly enhance emancipatory political praxis. Moreover, one could also look upon the democratic initiatives of the movements as an unfinished project which would require that we avoid "periodizing" the era in a way which intimates historical "closure". Audre Lorde provides a brilliant example of the potential which using history as a pedagogical tool embodies in her essay "Learning From The Sixties". She is worth quoting at length.

...if there is one thing we can learn from the 60s, it is how infinitely complex any move for liberation must be...Through examining the combination of our triumphs and errors, we can examine the dangers of an incomplete vision. Not to condemn that vision but to alter it, construct templates for possible futures...So often we either ignore the past or romanticize it...We forget that the necessary ingredient needed to make the past work for the future is our energy in the present. (1984:135-136)

While critical pedagogists have articulated the centrality of counter-memory with regards to the suppressed histories and voices of subaltern groups, little attention has been paid to the dangerous memories personified by the coalescence of oppressed groups in the Sixties. Undoubtedly, the 90s present new challenges which necessitate new theoretical conceptualizations as well as, political strategies. Moreover, the proliferation of new terrains of conflict and new social movements pose even greater challenges for the Left since

...these are not easy to organize into any single and cohesive collective political will. The very proliferation of new sites of social antagonism makes the prospect of constructing a unified counter-hegemonic force as the agency of progressive change, if anything, harder rather than easier. (Hall & Jacques, 1990:17)
Nonetheless, the Sixties while invariably problematic, provide a pivotal point of departure for the future of radical left-wing politics. Evoking this "memory" has gained even greater import given the contemporary postmodern penchant for micro or identity politics - a topic which is taken up in the third chapter.

Whereas the intellectual and student radicalism of the Sixties embraced the notion that issues were interrelated - that single-issue groups like the peace movement, the civil rights movement, the environmental movement, the women's movement etc. could be conceptualized as sharing certain 'commonalities', the postmodernist turn and its disdain for the concept of 'totality' subvert the prospects for fostering a unified counterhegemonic strategy for social transformation. Those engaged in critical pedagogy have strived to advance a politics of solidarity and a critical approach to identity - one which interrogates "whiteness" itself as a form of ethnicity. Concepts of 'difference', 'specificity' and 'locality' are crucial, yet the risk of fragmentation on the Left necessitates some kind of 'totalizing' vision which understands how difference is constructed and mediated by broader historical and political power relations and which attempts to bridge the current divisiveness in both theoretical and political praxis. (McLaren, 1988; McLaren & Lankshear, 1993)

In the face of an escalating right-wing offensive, the project of reconciling the Left is indeed, critical.

Chapter Three

Having outlined the structural and financial basis of the New Right's "ideas industry" in the previous chapter, in Chapter Three two of the main
texts which emerged during the "p.c." controversy are critiqued and evaluated. The reactionary legacy initiated by Allan Bloom has without a doubt, been passed on to a new generation of hand-picked, corporate sponsored conservative authors whose "not so Great Books" reiterate the banality of the now well-worn argument which suggests that Marxists, feminists, multiculturalists and other sordid remnants from the Sixties have undermined the sanctity of Western civilization.

Think tanks such as the Madison Centre For Educational Affairs and the American Enterprise Institute, supported by conservative establishments like the Olin and Scaife Foundations were instrumental in propelling books like *The Closing Of The American Mind*, *Illiberal Education* and *Tenured Radicals* to the top of best-seller lists and into mainstream popular consciousness. Indeed, Allan Bloom's best-selling tirade *The Closing Of The American Mind* (for which he received over $3 million in unrestricted "gifts" from the Olin Foundation between 1986-89), was the opening salvo in what became a steady stream of texts attacking progressive education, the Sixties, and multiculturalism. This text examines two recent tracts of the culture war which occupied the influential high-ground in the p.c. controversy - Dinesh D'Souza's *Illiberal Education: The Politics Of Race And Sex On Campus* and Roger Kimball's *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*. Cavalier about facts and often disregarding any pretense of intellectual honesty and balance, these texts purport to describe the p.c. horrors on campuses, yet their underlying purpose is to denigrate progressive
educational initiatives, negate "difference" and promote a one-dimensional, monocultural vision of Western society.

While several critiques of Bloom's work have been written, the recent tirades of D'Souza and Kimball have not, in my view, been subjected to anything resembling a rigorous and systematic critique. Thus, in this chapter I attempt to provide a "radical critique-al" analysis¹ informed theoretically by critical pedagogy. Zavarzadeh & Morton (1991:190-202) delineate their conception of radical ideology critique as a method which rejects hegemonic presuppositions, opposes and displaces established meanings of culture and constitutes an oppositional, political practice geared toward social change. I intend to reveal that these books are not only rife with omissions and distortions, but that the authors' claims of ideological "disinterestedness" are blatantly spurious not merely because they were funded by conservative foundations but also because the notion of

objective inquiry...continues to have significant political effects in censoring certain kinds of voices and obscuring the real political content of others. (Alcoff,1993:74)

Furthermore, this illustrates the ways in which the tyranny of this "value-less" conception of objectivity has invariably had the effect of authorizing those alleged "scientific" voices and disauthorizing those voices that argue with "emotion, passion and open political commitment." (Alcoff,1993:74)

¹This approach is elaborated in greater detail in chapter three.
In the current political correctness debate, the struggle has been framed by the new Right and the mainstream media as a conflict between the (correctly) apolitical and the politically correct wherein the latter group (comprised mainly of scholars with working-class backgrounds, and/or women and/or persons of colour) have been accused of corrupting and "politicizing" the academy. (Alcoff, 1993; Hu-DeHart, 1993) In addition, the conservative plea for a "common culture" and the preservation of Western "civilization" is interrogated here in order to unmask the ideological presuppositions undergirding this position.

Despite the fact that several cultural conservatives have complained about a left-wing takeover, the fervour of the p.c. controversy and the influence of D'Souza's and Kimball's texts has brought to light both the scope and strength of conservative hegemony. Nonetheless, the invectives of these two authors are particularly significant for they do illustrate, to some degree, the "detached" intellectual elitism of many on the so-called Left. This is yet another concern addressed in chapter three.

While the right is obviously motivated to exaggerate the power of its enemies for rhetorical effect, one cannot underestimate the relative ineffectuality of the Left in the public sphere. Writing, largely for themselves in unintelligible journals, the academic left has become precisely "an academic left." (Robbins, 1991:155) This is not to suggest that intellectuals relegate themselves to what Peter McLaren calls the realm of "plainspeak", rather it
implores Left-wing scholars to assume their role as "insurgent" or "transformative" intellectuals and cultural workers.

Although Russell Jacoby's (1987) treatise on the demise of public intellectuals often reads like a sentimental journey and a longing for a Golden Age of intellectual vitality, he was fairly accurate in his assessment of the status of leftist discourse. At a time when the Right has aggressively promoted and supported the growth of its intellectual base, his initial testament that leftist scholars have retreated into the comfort of the ivory tower and abandoned the public sphere is difficult, if not impossible, to dispute. One cannot however, underestimate the forces which circumscribe the "bounds of the expressible" and yet, the current state of the Left certainly cannot be condoned. Moreover, many on the left have fallen prey to the allure of "difference" politics and forms of liberal and left-liberal multiculturalism. The problems, both political and pedagogical, inherent in the discourse of identity politics is a major focus in this chapter. While identity politics originally provided a puissant challenge to the universalizing tendencies in some movements (i.e. the women's movement) and was instrumental in pointing to the multiplicity of sites and mechanisms of power and domination, it is argued that identity or "difference" politics represents an impasse in Leftist politics for there has been little attempt, in both the theoretical and practical domains, to amalgamate forces and cross borders in the interest of social transformation. The emergence of identity politics, which enabled many "formerly silenced and displaced groups to emerge from the margins of power and dominant culture
to reassert and reclaim suppressed identities and experiences", while undoubtedly a welcome and necessary development, is not one that "has not moved unproblematically from resistance to a broader politics of democratic struggle." (Giroux, 1994:31) As Bannerji explains:

The refined particularism and individualism of the politics of "difference" not only avoids naming and mapping out the general organization of social relations...Lacking an analysis of forms of consciousness and social relations, theories of "difference" lack the potential for a revolutionary politics.(1991:84-86)

In the pedagogical realm, rather than struggling for genuine educational and social transformation, left-liberals and advocates of difference politics often satisfy themselves with multicultural add-ons to existing hierarchies of knowledge and power. That is to say that the occasional addition of a course taught by a token affirmative action candidate or the incorporation of "new" texts into the curriculum, while important starting points, do not in and of themselves, constitute radical reform.

Chandra Mohanty (1993) points out that the existence of black, ethnic, women's, and gay and lesbian studies can be traced to the oppositional social movements of the 1960s and while such programs do create the possibility of counterhegemonic discourse and oppositional analytical spaces within universities, they are most often located within the boundaries of conservative or liberal white-male dominated institutions and as such continuously face questions of co-optation and accommodation. As a result, the definition of multiculturalism in "terms of an apolitical, ahistorical cultural pluralism needs
to be challenged." (Mohanty, 1993:53) Mohanty's suggestion is taken up in this third chapter and it is argued that the recent developments in critical pedagogy, drawing from feminist and third world theoretical trajectories, provide a significant intervention in the debates between conservative "common culture" proponents and left-liberals who celebrate "difference" as an end in itself devoid of any kind of political commitment. Therefore, the co-optation of multiculturalism is addressed in this chapter as is the need to cultivate a critical multiculturalist discourse since I agree with Kobena Mercer's (1992:447) assertion that the way in which we theorize multiculture and difference "may decide whether it deepens and extends" a critical project or whether "it merely becomes just another item on the shopping list of the postmodern consumer and merely another option for business as usual in academia."

Chapter Four

In 1990 and 1991 a noteworthy array of national magazines ran cover stories denouncing the p.c. thought police. Scoop-hungry journalists, fed mainly by new Right spokespersons and drawing upon the texts of D'Souza and Kimball collectively brought p.c. to national attention. In chapter four I examine the mainstream media coverage of the p.c. debate and demonstrate the ways in which publications like Newsweek and Maclean's, promulgated the anti-p.c. agenda of the conservative Right. For the most part, the mainstream media fostered the p.c. hysteria through its framing of the images and discourses of the alleged campus crises. Thus, an analysis of the various
strategies adopted by the media in their coverage is a central component of this chapter. While the anti-p.c. assault has involved namecalling and the irresponsible use of anecdotes, perhaps the most stupefying tactic has been the use of McCarthyite rhetoric. It will be argued that the characterization of p.c. as the "new" McCarthyism has been used to circumvent debate and limit discourse about important educational and social issues. Moreover, such assertions not only profoundly distort the documented horrors of the "real" McCarthyism, they also demonstrate the "historical" amnesia of the mainstream media. The use of epithets such as "Stalin's reign of terror", "rampant Marxism", "Hitler youth" and the "new McCarthyism" to describe campus events not only disguises the fact that many faculty of colour, feminists and progressive-minded scholars continue to be marginalized in the academy (Thompson & Tyagi, 1993), but also serves as a vivid example of the effective use of what Herman and Chomsky (1988) deem the filter of anti-communist ideology. This particular strategy was especially effective given the fact that the p.c. controversy erupted shortly after the Gulf War "victory" - at a time when many were still strangling themselves with yellow ribbons and drowning in a sea of new world order jingoism. Indeed, several have pointed to the fact that the timing of the mainstream media's attack on p.c. and multiculturalism could possibly be related to the attempt of creating a unidimensional national identity. Thompson and Tyagi (1993:xvii) suggest that

The ideology of a unified nation was most vividly exemplified in the Gulf War rhetoric, which sought
to generate a seamless patriotic nationalism. This rhetoric was at its zenith during roughly the same months that public condemnation of multicultural contributions was also at its height.

Given that the early stages of media coverage and mainstream public awareness of p.c. were mediated by these circumstances thus demands a contextual interpretation. In sum, chapter four represents an attempt to dispel some of the myths which were propagated by the mainstream media and seeks to illuminate the hegemonic role which the media fulfilled during the height of the p.c. controversy.

Conclusion

The malaise of the Left is that the old is dying but the new cannot yet be born. We are searching for a new political language. We can imagine it resounding in our ears. But it is not yet on the tips or our tongues. Embarking on this search is risky. But it is inescapable.

-Beatrice Campbell et al., New Times

There is no doubt that the well-funded Right-wing backlash against progressive educational and social reform and media’s role in promulgating its agenda pose a serious challenge to the Left. The proliferation of new terrains of struggle and contestation and the corresponding development of identity politics is yet another barrier in creating an effective counter-hegemonic discourse. However, critical multiculturalism as a form of pedagogical and cultural praxis opens up new spaces for theorizing difference in ways which do not depoliticize the subversive elements of alterity. Moreover, the attempt to foreground issues of class, history and capitalist social relations is, without
a doubt, central to any political project for social change. While the global transformation of capitalism has posed a significant challenge to conventional ways of imagining social movements and socialist democracy. I agree with Kanpol and McLaren (in press) that this need not sound the death knell for the idea of socialist struggle. As Bannerji claims, such a struggle is irrevocably connected with efforts to transcend the oppressive conditions of racism, sexism, colonialism and class exploitation.

A socialist revolution is obviously not to the taste of everybody...but if the fundamental need for a just, equitable and humane society is to be granted any legitimacy at all, we cannot but seek the eradication of the social organization that produces alienation and domination. This eradication cannot truly be achieved through spontaneous insurrections, visions and uncensored expression. We need a social analysis whose theory and practice involve political actors who both produce this knowledge and make it organizationally actionable.[1991:99]

Any hope for change demands that we embark on the search for theoretical formulations capable of informing radical political praxis. It necessitates that we cultivate what McLaren calls an "arch of social dreaming". Embarking on this search is as Campbell et al. claim, risky but nonetheless inescapable.
CHAPTER ONE

Critical Pedagogy And Its Influences

Education has fundamental connections with the idea of human emancipation, though it is constantly in danger of being captured for other interests. In a society disfigured by class exploitation, sexual and racial oppression, and in chronic danger of war and environmental destruction, the only education worth the name is one that forms people capable of taking part in their own liberation...In the most basic sense, the process of education and the process of liberation are the same.

-R.W. Connell et al., 1982

The notion that education can be part of the process of liberation is one of the central tenets of the critical pedagogical approach put forth by Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, Stanley Aronowitz, feminists of colour and others. It is their work in this area which serves as the epistemological foundation for the current undertaking.

Broadly defined as a "critical theory of education", critical pedagogy analyzes institutions of learning both in their "historical context and as part of the existing social and political fabric that characterizes the dominant society." (McLaren, 1989:159) However, critical pedagogy cannot in essence, be conflated with other 'approaches' to teaching for it is a far more comprehensive project. Aronowitz (1994:219) points out that "pedagogy" is more than a "teaching" method, it is rather "a philosophy or a social theory."

And while critical pedagogy does not constitute a monolithic and homogenous
set of ideas, those in the critical tradition are united in their aim to empower
the oppressed and transform existing conditions of injustice and inequality.

Critical theorists tie their investigations to a concern for social justice and democracy. Critical theorists work from the assumption that the world is marked by enormous suffering and injustice...The aim of critical theory is to understand the oppressive aspects of society so that those features may be transformed by those who are oppressed. (Tierney, 1991:41)

The spirit of critical pedagogy is rooted in an aversion to all forms of oppression and domination and cites as its objective the development of modes of critique "fashioned in a theoretical discourse that mediates the possibility for social action and emancipatory transformation." (Giroux, 1983:2)

A critical or radical pedagogical approach does not refer to a discipline or a body of knowledge but rather points to a kind of "practice and a particular posture of questioning received institutions and received assumptions." (Giroux, 1992:10) For Giroux, radical education has four distinguishing traits.²

...it is interdisciplinary in nature, it questions the fundamental categories of all disciplines, and it has a public mission of making society more democratic, and...radical education joins theory and praxis. (1992:10)

The challenge of critical pedagogy resides in the moral choice put before us not only as educators, but as citizens. The choice entails a distinction which John Dewey made between education as a function of society and society as a

²It should be stated here that these four axioms within the critical pedagogical tradition will be elaborated throughout this treatise.
function of education. It is a choice between education as a force for freedom and growth or for bondage and stagnation. (Murphey, 1983:xx) As such it is a decision which requires serious deliberation, for it is a question which has a fundamental affinity to democracy itself.

Yet, the language of educational reform has been dominated for the most part by the conservative Right, as Aronowitz and Giroux (1985, 1991) and McLaren (1989, 1991) have revealed. The Right-wing treatise on educational reform has vilified democracy and freedom and dissolved their meanings into glossy aphorisms one finds in television soundbites. The function of education has been reduced to the manufacturing of robot-like commodities capable of selling their skills to the highest bidder; efficient, vapid servants equipped to preserve the vast and odious technological machine known as Western civilization.

However, after nearly two decades of benign neglect, pedagogical practices are once again being fervently and intensely debated, both within the academy and in the popular media in the form of the political correctness (p.c.) controversy. Yet, despite the urgent need to cultivate a politics of refusal--one

3Critical pedagogists such as McLaren and Giroux while being indebted to Dewey's thought, attempt to extend his democratic project. According to Giroux and McLaren, (1986) Dewey's struggle for democracy was essentially pedagogical and largely failed to generate a broader analysis of class relations and historically conditioned inequalities in society. Critical pedagogy as espoused by Giroux and McLaren accentuates "the idea that schools represent only one important site in the struggle for democracy...critical pedagogy is but one intervention - albeit a crucial one - in the struggle to restructure the ideological and material conditions of everyday life."(1986:233)

4Hereafter, political correctness will be referred to as p.c.
which calls into question the oppressive and exclusionary nature of dominant academic discourse--we are instead witnessing the entrenchment of neo-conservatism and the status quo. Significantly, of late, this has been accomplished through the labelling of the p.c. and anti-p.c. rhetoric on campuses which has been fostered in the mainstream media. While this is an issue taken up in greater detail in a subsequent chapter of this thesis, it is important to note that a "backlash" against progressive faculty and students who advocate educational reform with the intention of developing an inclusive curriculum embodying voices, histories and experiences of marginalized people (women, blacks, ethnic minorities, gays and lesbians) is evident. Ironically enough, this backlash is occurring at a time when racial unrest, anti-feminist sentiment and gay bashing have reached a precarious state.5

5See for example Susan Faludi's Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women (1991), as well as countless columns and articles written in Newsweek, The Village Voice, The Nation, and Mother Jones about disintegrating race relations and increasing violence against gays and lesbians. One thorough account of the rise of gay-bashing, for example appeared in Newsweek, Sept.14, 1992. This article cites a study undertaken by the National Gay And Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute which found that anti-gay harassment and violence increased 31% in 1991 in five major U.S. Cities(New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston and Minneapolis-St.Paul). While this statistic is alarming itself, there is no doubt that a great many incidents remain unreported. Thus, it may be safe to assume that the actual statistic may even be higher than the study's findings. The backlash against people of colour is pervasive both here and in the United States as the attacks on multiculturalism and immigration policies escalate. Indeed, it is ironic that here in Canada where "multiculturalism" has been part of official political rhetoric since 1971 that we are now witnessing, with the recent election into official opposition of the Bloc Quebecois and the Reform parties, the development of political discourses in which the malaise of Canadian society is conveniently attributed to open immigration policies, affirmative action and the like. The right-ward shift in Canada as well as in the United States are undoubtedly disconcerting to those working towards social justice and greater equality.
Feminists, blacks, ethnic minorities, gays and lesbians have launched a number of challenges to the debilitating label of "p.c.". These challenges however are not restricted to the drive for educational reform, for they manifest themselves in the wider social context and find their expression in the ongoing struggle for equality, empowerment and social justice. Such a situation warrants a re-evaluation of the link between education and democracy. Central to the issues raised by p.c. then, is the crucial question of the relationship between educators, intellectuals, knowledge, power and democracy. While these questions have, for the most part been absent from the language of educational reform, a group of radical scholars often associated with critical pedagogy has attempted to re-articulate the centrality of these concerns. Critical pedagogy may therefore, be described as a counter-hegemonic mode of critique and praxis.\(^6\)

It is my intention to demonstrate that the central concerns and aspirations of critical pedagogy have assumed even greater import in light of this "backlash". Furthermore, I will argue that critical border pedagogy provides the most viable alternative to the neo-conservative approach to

\(^6\)By counterhegemonic, I am referring to the fact that critical pedagogy emerged as both a form of critique and praxis. Critical pedagogy not only calls into question the epistemological assumptions of dominant educational discourse, it also attempts to develop a counter-discourse capable of revealing the feigned harmony of dominant ideology. It does this by beginning with the problems of the oppressed and incorporating a politics of difference in which diverse forms of oppression and the attendant social movements that deal with them could be perceived as part of a liberatory political undertaking. From its inception, critical pedagogists have advanced the development of a politics of alliance among various oppressed groups with the aim of social transformation.
educational reform. Border pedagogy contests the disciplinary boundaries which serve as an obstacle to radical pedagogical practice as well as, the boundaries which have been erected between the academy and the community. Border pedagogy supplants the "ivory tower" approach and seeks to link the academy and the community and intellectuals and activists in counterhegemonic struggle. In other words, it argues for a "return of intellectuals from ivory-towered departments to the public sphere." (Giroux et al., 1988:145) Border pedagogy defines the role of the public intellectual as that of a cultural worker. Cultural workers are "dedicated to reforming all spheres of education as part of a wider revitalization of public life" and attempt to raise important questions regarding the relationship between "knowledge and power, learning and possibility, social criticism and human dignity" and how these elements may be understood in relation to those "practices of domination, privilege, and resistance at work in wider social and political formations." (Giroux, 1992:242)

The underlying commitment to democracy is particularly significant in light of the fact that Right-wing and corporate fix-it approaches to educational reform have subverted the notion that schools could potentially be conceptualized as democratizing institutions.

...within the language of educational reform advocated by the Right, democracy loses its once dynamic nature...students rarely find themselves introduced to modes of knowledge that celebrate democratic forms of public life or that provide them with the knowledge and skills they will need to engage in a critical examination of the society in
which they live and work. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:187)

Indeed, we find ourselves in an historical moment spawned in a temper of mistrust, disillusionment and misery. In an epoch which has given birth to a crisis of democracy yet, or: which nonetheless, may breed the kind of revolutionary spirit needed to conquer those invidious forces which have relinquished liberty and freedom to the basement of history. It is within this context of despair that critical pedagogy has attained greater import, for it proffers a discourse of hope and promise. In this sense, border pedagogy also offers progressive intellectuals a viable option to the pessimism and scepticism symptomatic of the ludic postmodern discourse now in vogue. In glaring contrast to the despondency of postmodernism, critical border pedagogy proposes a multiperspectival, transdisciplinary theoretical trajectory committed to social justice and democracy.

Since its inception, the tradition of social thought loosely referred to as critical pedagogy has constantly brushed against the grain of mainstream approaches to schooling, including those which boast liberal and conservative tendencies. Critical education theory emerged as a challenge to the dominant assumption that schools "function as one of the major mechanisms for the development of the democratic and egalitarian social order." (McLaren, 1988:x)

In its early beginnings, critical pedagogy was influenced to some extent by the new sociology of knowledge that grew out of the work of Michael Young and Basil Bernstein in England, by the writings of Raymond Williams and by the prominent and innovative work on youth subcultures undertaken by
Stuart Hall, Paul Willis, Richard Johnson and others associated with the Centre For Contemporary Cultural Studies. In addition, critical pedagogy also drew inspiration from the American progressive movements of John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick and the more radical efforts of social reconstructionists of the 1920s including George Counts and John Childs. Since a number of excellent accounts of the origins of critical education theory have already been written (cf. Giroux, 1983; Giroux & McLaren, 1991; McLaren, 1988, 1989), it is not my intent to provide yet another historical synopsis. Rather I will attempt to provide an overview of critical pedagogy's subsequent theoretical engagements with the work of Paulo Freire, the Frankfurt School and Antonio Gramsci, for these influences have undoubtedly had an immutable impact on critical pedagogical discourse in North America. Moreover, I will discuss some of the more recent trends within critical pedagogy as theorists working in this tradition have begun to explore the research done in the areas of contemporary cultural studies, feminism and resistance postmodernist theory. While an exhaustive survey of these various influences is impossible here, I will endeavour to outline the ways in which critical pedagogists have attempted to construct a multitheoretical, transdisciplinary perspective by appropriating the most salient aspects of these diverse social theories by raising the question of how they reinforce and deepen the prospects for the advancement of a radical pedagogy committed to a political project which aims at "reconstructing democratic public life so as to extend the principles of freedom, justice, and
equality to all spheres of society." (Giroux, 1992:73) What follows is a brief overview of these approaches.

**Paulo Freire**

Brazilian educator Paulo Freire is perhaps the best-known educator of the Third World, his name has reached near iconic proportions in North America, Latin America and many parts of Europe and his work has provided inspiration to a whole generation of progressive teachers. (Aronowitz, 1993; hooks, 1993; Shor, 1993) Freire's work constitutes an important contribution to critical pedagogy not simply because of its theoretical elegance, but because of Freire's ability to put theory into practice. Indeed, Freire's grassroots efforts have helped liberate the lives of thousands of disenfranchised peoples. The legacy of Freire's life work is deeply embedded in the discourse of critical pedagogy and his work continues to mould and shape the direction of critical education theory. His thought has not only endured the test of time but has also gained prominence as the struggles over curriculum and the crisis in education escalates. For Freire, education is not reducible to a mechanical transmission of "information" and "facts", learning is not merely the transfer of "skills" from teachers to students, rather a Freirian approach invites students "to think critically about subject matter, doctrines, the learning process itself, and their society." (Shor, 1993:25) According to Freire, education is politics. While traditional education orients students to conformity and passivity, Freirian critical education summons students to be active participants in the learning process, to question the status quo and conditions
of inequality. The ultimate goal of Freirian pedagogy is the development of "conscientizacao" - conscientization or critical consciousness.

In his seminal text Pedagogy Of The Oppressed, Freire articulates the foundations of a theory of "democratic" schooling which defines the fundamental purpose of education as liberatory. Such an emancipatory objective is integrally tied to an educational philosophy which argues that knowledge is dialectical, contextual and historical. In Pedagogy Of The Oppressed, Freire intimately links the discussion of education with questions of domination and oppression. Freire however, argues that repression cannot be reduced solely to a form of class domination. In this sense, Freire steps outside "standard Marxist analyses" and claims that "society contains a multiplicity of contradictory social relations." (Giroux, 1988:109)

For Freire, the pedagogical is political since students are not educated in a political, social, economic and cultural vacuum. The primary goal of his theory is to "embrace everyday living" as a point of reference for pedagogical praxis. (Shor & Freire, 1987:3) As such, Freire rejects the ideas of "objectivity" and "value-neutrality".

There is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the

---

7 As a form of critique, dialectical thought articulates the link between knowledge, power and domination. As such the ultimate purpose of critique should be critical thinking in the interest of social change. For an elaboration of the importance and aim of dialectical thought see Marcuse's Reason and Revolution (1960) and An Essay On Liberation (1969); Giroux's Ideology, Culture And The Process Of Schooling (1981) and Theory And Resistance In Education (1983).
of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the "practice of freedom," the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (Shaull, 1972:15)

Since education is never neutral but is instead contextually mediated by culture, politics and economics, it is ideologically based. Freire's pedagogy embraces several concepts and theoretical insights that offer the fundamental building blocks for a radical pedagogy. Rather than relying heavily upon the positivist tradition that pervades the social sciences in North America, Freire draws upon a variety of radical sources in history, philosophy, sociology, and neo-Marxism. The legacy of Freire's thoughts on positivism has been especially important to the development of critical pedagogy. In his discussion on the culture of positivism, Giroux (1981) discusses the failure of positivistic pedagogy as its unwillingness to acknowledge its own ideological underpinnings as well as the relationship between knowledge and social control.

The claim of objectivism and certainty are themselves ideological and can be most clearly revealed in the prevailing view of school knowledge and classroom social relationships. The way knowledge is viewed...rests on a number of assumptions that reveal its positivist ideological underpinnings...In this view, knowledge is objective, bounded and 'out there'...From this perspective, objective knowledge is viewed as independent of time and place; it becomes universalized, ahistorical knowledge...That is, knowledge is divorced from the political and cultural traditions that give it meaning...By resigning itself to the registering of 'facts', the positive view of knowledge not only
represents a false mode of reasoning that undermines reflective thinking, it does this and more. It is also a form of legitimation that obscures the relationship between 'valued' knowledge and the constellation of economic, political and social interests that such knowledge supports. Knowledge will tend to be that knowledge which provides formal justification for, and legitimation of, prevailing institutional arrangements, and forms of conduct and beliefs. (Giroux, 1981:52)

While Freire (1971) argues against the claims of "objectivity", he emphasizes that an understanding of "objective" reality is absolutely imperative to revolutionary praxis. By "objective" reality however, Freire means the oppressive relations which characterize society - those of capitalism, colonialism and imperialism which impinge upon the "subjective" everyday lives of people. Hence, "one cannot conceive of objectivity without subjectivity...but rather subjectivity and objectivity in constant dialectical relationship."(Freire, 1971:35)

Freire also suggests that critical discourse and a theory of resistance and counterhegemony (while not articulated in these terms) are essential to the practice of an emancipatory educational process.

...a pedagogy...must be forged with, not for, the oppressed...in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity. This pedagogy makes oppression and its causes objects of reflection by the oppressed, and from that reflection will come their necessary engagement in the struggle for their liberation. (Freire, 1971:33)

Finally, Freire's approach emphasizes the need for a democratic educational practice to reflect a dialogical praxis in which students discover
themselves as historical subjects with the capacity to transform their world.

Human existence cannot be silent...To exist, humanly, is to name the world, to change it...Because dialogue is an encounter among men who name the world, it must not be a situation where some men name on behalf of others. It is an act of creation: it must not serve as a crafty instrument for the domination of one man by another...it is conquest of the world for the liberation of men.(Freire,1971:76-77)

As McLaren (1992) elucidates, dialogical knowing interprets as problematic an individual's or group's existential dilemma in relation to the larger sociopolitical context. While it is accurate to say that Freire's work concerns itself with self transformation, there is an ultimate preoccupation with social transformation, "assuming as a central referent the reconstruction of structural arrangements of the existing social order." (McLaren,1992:35) Given this dialectical formation, one can easily discern that from a Freirian perspective, critical reflection cannot occur in "antiseptic isolation from the world of others." (McLaren,1992:35) Critical reflection ultimately takes place within the public realm and as such must be linked to collective social empowerment.

A Freirian pedagogy embraces the notion of inclusion, the idea that a truly democratic pedagogy incorporate the lived realities and subjectivities of peoples who are systematically excluded from mainstream educational discourse by virtue of their race, class, gender or sexual orientation. However,
Freire insists that the notion of subjectivity should not subvert the reality of the conditions of everyday life.

...the radical is never a subjectivist. For him the subjective aspect exists only in relation to the objective aspect (the concrete reality which is the object of his analysis). Subjectivity and objectivity thus join in a dialectical unity producing knowledge in solidarity with action, and vice versa. (Freire, 1972:22)

This is a point which deserves special attention in light of postmodernism's claim that all notions of a real world are but metaphysical tales and its privileging of the local and the specific. This position belies any possibility of understanding "real" existing relations and seems to render futile any attempts for political engagement and social change. Dialectical thought on the other hand, in which "world and action are intimately interdependent" (Freire, 1971:38) reveals the potency of human enterprise and human knowledge as both products of, and forces in shaping, social reality.

---

5This perspective is epitomized in the work of postmodern guru Jean Baudrillard. In Baudrillard's approach, the antagonism between what things look like and what is actually happening dissolve into the "hyperreality" of the media age. (Baudrillard, 1983) One of his recent and most disturbing forays was his interpretation of events in the Persian Gulf. A few days prior to the outbreak of hostility, Baudrillard (1991), writing in The Guardian maintained that the threat of war existed only as a "figment of mass media simulation". Yet, his comments after the cessation of combat are far more indicative his moral and political nihilism. Baudrillard argued that any hope of acquiring practical knowledge of the war was out of the question and suggested that we should at least "have the sceptical intelligence to reject the probability of all information, of all images whatever their source." (cited in Norris, 1992:193-194) For Baudrillard, the war was a "mass-hallucination, a 'virtual' engagement played out in the absence of anything that corresponded to a genuine 'war' as hitherto known or experienced." (Norris, 1992:192) The Gulf War figured as one more illustration in Baudrillard's vast and varied roster of postmodern hyperreality. More on Baudrillard follows in the section of postmodernism.
The importance of critique as a fundamental dimension of the dialectic rests with its ability to peel away the layers of meaning that give shape to our everyday lives; moreover, it serves as a guide to action designed to alter those life forces that embody the power of an oppressive reality. (Giroux, 1981:117)

Moreover, Freire's position advocates, in "postmodern" terms, a politics of difference, but stresses the articulation of differences within a contextual framework. Such a pedagogical approach in North American terms would require that any dialogue about educational practice take place within a broader discourse of capitalist political, economic and social relations. Freire's demand for contextual interpretation reflects the dialectical character of his pedagogical approach for "totality" as Giroux (1981) reiterates one of the central categories of the dialectic. Freire contributes to an understanding of pedagogy that refocuses our gaze, that is inclusive, and which calls for the development of a discourse of possibility. Freire's legacy is distinguished by his passion for emancipatory political praxis in the name of freedom and democracy. His trajectory also identifies critical education as both a theory of pedagogy as well as a pedagogy of theory.

It constitutes a theory of pedagogy in that students are taught to analyze critically how culture functions within asymmetrical relations of power to give certain groups an advantage over others on the basis of race, class, and gender. It serves as a pedagogy of theory because it recognizes that only when theory transforms itself into praxis and engages in a project of possibility does it truly enter the world of emancipatory teaching. That is, only when theory becomes transformed into a political act can it realize its socially transformative potential. (McLaren, 1988:302)
Marxian Theory

Marxian discourses have had a major influence on radical theories of schooling and as such their relevance cannot be overlooked in any dialogue regarding the current state of educational practice in North America. Marxism becomes an important lens through which educational practice can be analyzed, especially at a time when corporations and universities are strengthening their ties. Educational reform is almost always discussed within the context of capitalist imperatives and the drive for "efficiency" defined in terms of market processes. The infiltration of corporate, consumer ideology into schools and universities is enjoying an unprecedented influence.⁹

Furthermore, it is important to note that the academy is one of the principal sites engaged in the production of knowledge - knowledge which is

⁹Chris Whittle and his Channel One, which produces news segments interspersed with commercial messages, is only one example. Students are being socialized into a culture of consumerism at a young age. Locally, the Youth News Network, an advertising-supported educational television program is currently being used at Cardinal Carter High School in Leamington and the Essex County Roman Catholic Separate School is gearing up to include it in their curriculum. That the needs of capitalist enterprise are subverting the need for 'democratic' education is particularly disturbing. The corporate marketing in schools implicitly sanctions the present role capitalism plays in democracy as well as privileging image over content and context. What is ignored as McLaren (1992) suggests is how news stories and commercials get created and what constitutes their ideological imperative. Reality gets served up to students under the corporate banner of show business and profits. Howard Zinn (1991) among others has illustrated the corporate nature of academic institutions. He points out the military, government and corporate links which are evident in most universities and suggests that it is not a small band of "politically correct" scholars who are endangering academic freedom but the large powerful institutions who are undermining democracy and freedom in the academy. James Carey notes that universities are run more and more as corporate enterprises and are increasingly "dominated by colleges of engineering and business, really Colleges of Capitalism." (1991:166)
often used to secure and preserve the capitalist social order. However, in addition to this "reproduction" function, it also provides a space and embodies the potential to produce oppositional knowledge. In this sense, a resolute adherence to a "reproduction" theory which suggests that schools merely reproduce capitalism and class inequalities is problematical. Hence, neo-Marxian approaches which analyze the "function" of schools as the mere reproduction of inequalities are not without their foibles.

Several critical social theorists have articulated the "crisis of Marxism", including Henry Giroux, Stanley Aronowitz, Douglas Kellner, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. In *Education Under Siege*, Aronowitz and Giroux (1985:115) argue that the nature of this crisis has been defined by two different but related issues. Primarily, there has been an attempt by intellectuals of various Marxist persuasions to challenge the shifting social, economic and political conditions of the twentieth century by "either revising Marxist thought or by 'returning to Marx' in order to unravel a new insight or undiscovered truth for understanding the existing social reality." These approaches draw extensively from "critical" revisionist Marxist theory such as that espoused by Georg Lukacs, Antonio Gramsci, the Frankfurt School and others. The objective of such approaches is characterized, at least ostensibly, by the attempt to generate a perspective on struggle and emancipation which stays within the framework of Marxist discourse. Simply stated, the theory of Marxism serves as the epistemological foundation for a new critical social theory. Aronowitz and Giroux claim that the task of radical theory, especially
radical educational theory, is to see Marxism not as a "doctrine valid for all times under all historical conditions, but as a critical way of seeing." (1985:116) Hence, critical pedagogists have taken offence over various vulgarized interpretations of Marx and not to Marx's writings in and of themselves - a distinction which is crucially important to make. In a sense, such a stance appears to re-affirm Marcuse's claim that those who dismiss Marxism and repudiate it as inept at describing temporal social relations disregard that

...concepts used to analyze 19th and early 20th century capitalism cannot simply be applied to its present stage: being historical concepts, they carry in themselves historical indices, and the structure they analyze is a historical structure." (1972:33)

Aronowitz and Giroux assert that there is a failure on the part of staunch Marxists to recognize that the basis for the creation of a new radical theory demands a new theoretical discourse which is informed by the legacy of critical Marxism but which will ultimately rework some of its fundamental assumptions. They argue, for example that the central Marxist categories of class and economy "fail to address or change the new social antagonisms that exist in society." (1985:116) While such a critique could be disputed, this detachment from orthodox Marxism stems from the recognition that the proletariat as a social class has failed to assume its revolutionary role in the struggle for liberation and equality, perhaps due in part to the overwhelming influence of consumerism and its inherent alienating characteristics (Fromm, 1955; Ellul, 1964; Marcuse, 1964; Ewen, 1982). The alienated labourer
of Marx's era has given way to the contemporary alienated consumer--one who suffers the malaise of the "Happy Consciousness" and who retreats into the world of "things". Aronowitz and Giroux point out that the diverse nature of social antagonisms provides the rationale for both "indicting Marxism while simultaneously arguing for a radical discourse that supports the rise of a number of new social movements." (1985:128) Such a stance is clearly articulated in the work of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe who basically argue against the lack of understanding in Marxist theory about the nature of ideology and the way in which people are constituted as subjects. (Laclau and Mouffe, 1982:91) The prevailing conception that all subjects are class subjects is viewed as problematic by Laclau and Mouffe who argue that this form of reductionism has had disastrous consequences for socialist politics.

Instead of trying to create a popular socialist movement on the basis of transforming the actual consciousness of the people by articulating in a socialist project their real struggles and demands, the latter have been neglected as reformist, or expressions of "false consciousness". (Laclau and Mouffe, 1982:94)

Laclau and Mouffe maintain that the reductionist character of the concept of class be abandoned in favour of viewing class as only one of the terrains where conflicts exist and on which "collectivities in struggle can organize themselves."

---

10 In An Essay On Liberation (1969) Marcuse argues that the radical change necessary to transform the existing society into a free society must reach into a dimension which is not considered in Marxian theory. He contends that the radicalization of the working classes has been counteracted "by a socially engineered arrest of consciousness" which perpetuates the servitude of the oppressed and exploited through the "development and satisfaction of needs." (p.16)
(Laclau and Mouffe, 1982:108) In sum, it is argued that classical Marxism has not adequately articulated the categories of culture, ideology and the lived experiences of everyday life. However, Laclau and Mouffe have been critiqued extensively for what has been deemed as "essentialist" and monistic reading of the complexity which characterize Marx's work. Wood (1986) and Geras (1987, 1988) claim that in Laclau and Mouffe's account Marx's own positions are conflated with the distortions of his thought by theorists in the Second and Third International. Best and Kellner (1991:201) argue that one of Marx's central contributions was to "destroy the ahistorical and technicist concept of the economy" by theorizing the "capitalist mode of production from historical and political perspectives", a point which Laclau and Mouffe do not adequately elaborate in their analysis. It is interesting to note however, that in recent work Laclau (1992) appears to be rethinking his position on notions of universality and totality - notions which he and Chantal Mouffe argued were "essentialist" in earlier works.\(^\text{11}\)

Moreover, a number of critical cultural theorists are currently contesting claims that Marx did not develop a comprehensive theory of culture. For example Davies (in press) argues that Marx articulates his theory of culture early on in The Grundisse while others like Bannerji (1991) contend that many

\(^{11}\text{In a recent article, Laclau (1992) argues that an appeal to pure particularism is no solution to the problems we encounter in contemporary society. He maintains that the assertion of pure particularism, independent of any context and of any appeal to the "totality" of objective, material conditions of social organization is a self-defeating enterprise incapable of contributing to a radical political project for social change.}\)
critiques of Marx are flawed since many are rooted in positivist readings of Marxism which do not fully grasp the subjective aspects of Marx's revolutionary texts. Furthermore, she suggests that these positivistic readings, especially of Capital, "disattends Marx's analysis of capital as a social relation" and denies a full appreciation of "seemingly ideological-cultural factors such as race and ethnicity" which fail to recognize that racism and sexism are necessary for "the organization of colonial or modern imperialist capitalism in the West." (Bannerji, 1991:87) Whether one subscribes to the various indictments of Marxist theory or sympathizes with its defenders is however, not the issue here. Rather, it is necessary to point out that Marxism still remains an integral element in the development of critical pedagogy. Although the limitations imposed by a resolute adherence to classical Marxist categories such as class (to the exclusion of others) should be avoided, any theorizing about the nature of social reality and social institutions must not entirely forsake the categories of class and history, for as McLaren points out such an abandonment would run the risk of "falling prey to new postmodernist or post-Marxian manifestations of positivism." (1989:201) Moreover, the dialectic so central in Marxian thought is an important tool for investigating the totality of social relations and allows us to comprehend issues contextually and
As Giroux (1992:13) maintains, in order to engage in radical educational discourse one must be engaged in the Marxist tradition.

Similarly, Douglas Kellner argues against those on the Left and the Right who maintain that the concept of class is no longer integrally important to the development of social theory and radical politics. He contends that in a peculiar way, "the concept of class has become even more central for radical social theory." (Kellner, 1989:228) Yet he maintains that a return to an older class politics at the expense of ignoring the new social movements would be a grave error. Kellner declares that critical theory should investigate today the possibilities of a new class politics, the radicalization of the new social movements and the possibilities of fusing a class and cultural politics with the new social movements. (1989:229)

So while critical pedagogists have been acutely aware of the limits of orthodox Marxism, they have nonetheless, appropriated those aspects of Marxism which are relevant to the present historical juncture and have attempted to develop it as a part of a new radical social theory.

The Frankfurt School

Critical pedagogy owes a great debt to the body of social thought commonly referred to as "critical theory" which is often associated with a

---

12 Bottomore (1991:143) points out that the most common emphases of the concept of the dialectic are delineated in three different ways. First, as a scientific method; secondly as a set of "laws or principles" governing some part or the whole of reality and finally the dialectic is often conceived of as "the movement of history, relational dialectics. It is this latter formulation which is of relevance to this discussion.
tradition of theoretical work developed by certain members of what is loosely referred to as the "Frankfurt School".\textsuperscript{13} The term "critical theory" itself was first coined in 1934 after a majority of members from the Institute of Social Research had emigrated to the United States. The Institute had been established as the first formally unaffiliated Marxist oriented institute in Europe. in Frankfurt, Germany in 1923. For many years, "critical theory" stood as a

...code word for the Institute's Marxism and for its attempt to found a radical supradisciplinary social theory rooted in Hegelian-Marxist dialectics, historical materialism and the Marxist critique of political economy and theory of revolution. (Kellner,1990:20)

Despite the fact that it has been almost seventy years since critical theory emerged, it "still retains its ability to disrupt and challenge the status quo." (Kincheloe & McLaren,1994) While one cannot articulate a clear cut and unified version of critical theory, much of the members' works strived to "revise both the Marxian critique of political economy and theory of revolution." (Bronner & Kellner,1989:1) In general, critical theory attempts to provide both a

...substantive social theory of the present age and a meta-theory concerning theory and method...as well as a methodological orientation for doing social theory and research for relating theoretical work to radical politics. (Kellner,1989:44)

\textsuperscript{13}The Frankfurt School was the name given to the Institute for Social Research, which opened in 1924. Their project was to modernize Marxism and understand modernity. (Osborne,1992:166)
In other words, critical theory refers to both a school of thought and a process of critique.

The critique of positivism and the indictment of capitalism characteristic of much of the Frankfurt School’s work is particularly relevant to the discourse of critical pedagogy and an understanding of ideology.\(^\text{14}\)

In contrast to mainstream social scientists, critical theorists have made much of the concept of ideology. The first well-developed post-war American critique of the notion that social science was value-free arose in the 1960’s as part of what came to be called the "end of ideology" debate. The critique emerged out of the political ferment of the era, stimulated by the perceived failure of New Deal/Cold War social policies. The limits of a positivist, empirical social science were elaborated in great detail, and alternatives were sought out. Scholars and students interested in ideology turned to the ideas of Marx, European critical theorists, often those of the Frankfurt School, neo-Marxists, and...to Antonio Gramsci. (Slaughter,1991:62)

\(^\text{14}\)Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer were among the first to present a critique of science and technology from a Left, radical perspective. The Frankfurt School viewed positivism as a composite of assorted traditions which supported the development of a social science based on the pattern of inquiry used in the natural sciences and based on the methodological tenets of observation and quantification. According to Horkheimer(1972), positivism presented a view of knowledge and science that stripped both of their critical possibilities. For Adorno, Marcuse, Horkheimer and C. Wright Mills, the fetishism of facts and the belief in value neutrality represented more than an epistemological error. Such an epistemological framework also served as a form of ideological hegemony and imbued positivistic rationality with a form of political conservatism which made it an ideological reinforcement for the status quo. In sum, according to the Frankfurt School and other Marxist scholars such as Mills, the positivist, empirical framework avoids the real task of social analysis. For further discussion of the Frankfurt School’s critique of positivism see Giroux’s *Theory And Resistance In Education*, 1983, pp.13-17.
Ideology is perhaps one of the most elusive concepts in the social sciences since it questions the bases and validity of our most fundamental ideas. While there is no single definition of "ideology", as Eagleton suggests, the most common answer is to claim that

...ideology has to do with legitimating the power of a dominant social group or class...A dominant power may legitimate itself by promoting beliefs and values congenial to it, naturalizing and universalizing such beliefs so as to render them self-evident and apparently inevitable; denigrating ideas which might challenge it; excluding rival forms of thought, perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic; and obscuring social reality in ways convenient to itself. (1991:5)

The dominant ideology which permeates our social institutions including the university is one which values capitalism, individualism, competition, scientific and technological rationality. It also reflects a very narrow white Eurocentric account of social reality. Nonetheless, there is some degree of resistance to the predominance of this ideology, as the current debate over "political correctness" demonstrates. In this sense, dominant ideology may also be fraught with contradictory elements. This necessitates a dialectical interpretation of ideology as Giroux (1983) and Kellner (1978) assert.15 For Giroux, ideology

15In *Ideology, Culture And The Process Of Schooling* (1981), Giroux argues that a "political" education demands a dialectical notion of ideology, one which emphasizes it as a mode of consciousness and practice which is related to specific social formations and movements. Rather than viewing schools merely as sites that impose dominant hegemonic values and beliefs upon students and educators, Giroux suggests that a notion of ideology has to be developed which provides an analysis of "how schools sustain and produce ideologies as well as how individuals and groups in concrete relationships negotiate, resist, or accept them." (1981:22)
...functions not only to limit human action but also to enable it. That is, ideology both promotes human agency and at the same time exerts force over individuals and groups...ideology works on and through individuals to secure their consent to the basic ethos and practices of the dominant society...[but at the same time] ideology functions in the interest of social transformation. (1983:145)

According to Giroux, ideology creates the "terrain for self-reflection and transformative action." (1983:145) This dialectical conception of ideology has also been articulated by Kellner, who writes

...the concept [of ideology] commonly refers both to those ideas, images, and theories that mystify social reality and block social change, and to those programs of social reconstruction that mobilize people for social activism. (1978:38)

Thus, the concept of ideology is central to critically evaluating the role of higher education. Slaughter (1991:59) argues that ideology allows for the interrogation of belief systems which enable educators to become better cognizant of the ways in which ideas are used to legitimate structures of privilege and power which lend themselves to inequity and injustice. Furthermore, such an approach contributes to critical pedagogy since it counters much of the research that has been done on the topic thus far. As Tierney points out, "most of the previous research in higher education...has been grounded in the basic tenets of logical positivism." (1991:4)

---

16The term "positivism" was used first by Henri Saint-Simon to denote scientific method and its extension to philosophy. Adopted by Auguste Comte, it came to designate a great philosophical movement in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century. The characteristic thesis of positivism is that science is the only valid knowledge and facts the only viable objects of knowledge. Positivism denies the existence or intelligibility of forces or substances
Giroux refers to the positivist mode of rationality as the great false consciousness of our time, fostering an undialectical and one-dimensional view of the world which denies the world of politics, which lacks a vision of the future and which denies the possibility that human beings can constitute and alter their own reality in the face of domination. Moreover, the fragmentation and specialization characteristic of positivist rationality deters comprehending the world holistically, as a network of interconnections.

The central failing of this mode of thinking is that it creates a form of tunnel vision in which only a small segment of social reality is open to examination...it leaves unquestioned those economic, political and social structures that shape our daily lives. (Giroux, 1981:46)

In the rejection of the positivist framework, critical pedagogists have sought out a radical alternative informed by critical theory and some strands of postmodern thought, with empowerment as its central concern.¹⁷

that go beyond facts and the laws ascertained by science. It opposes any kind of metaphysics and, in general, any procedure of investigation that is not reducible to scientific method. (Encyclopedia Of Philosophy, vol.5&6) The many transformations which the term "positivism" has undergone since its early usage by Saint-Simon and Comte renders inconceivable the possibility of identifying it with a particular school of thought. Nonetheless, it is possible to speak of the "culture of positivism" as the legacy of "positivistic thought, a legacy which includes those convictions, attitudes, techniques, and concepts that still exercise a powerful and pervasive influence on modern thought." (Giroux, 1981:42) Giroux suggests that within such a context, the culture of positivism is used to make a distinction between a "specific philosophic movement and a form of cultural hegemony." The hegemony of positivism is further exacerbated by the scientific and technological rationality pervasive in our society. The distinction then, made between "positivism" and a "culture of positivism" shifts the locus of debate about the principles of positivism from the "terrain of philosophy to the field of ideology." (Giroux, 1981:42)

¹⁷In this context, empowerment refers to the ability to think and act critically. In Giroux's conception, empowerment has a dialectical character, it refers both to the
Empowerment occupies a pivotal position in the collective struggle for a life free of exploitation and oppression. Critical pedagogy takes the dialectical celebration of the languages of critique and possibility as its starting point, an approach which integrates critique and praxis with the goal of social transformation.

Antonio Gramsci

The work of Antonio Gramsci has also made a significant contribution to the area of critical pedagogy and critical social theory in general. The Prison Notebooks, written between 1929 and 1936 are indisputably, Gramsci’s major theoretical achievement. Written amidst economic upheavals, the rise of fascism and revolutionary struggles in early twentieth century Italy, Gramsci attempted to redefine and redirect some of the central principles of Marxist theory. (Giroux, 1981) In contrast to the fatalistic Marxism of the Second International, Gramsci reclaimed the subjective, creative, humanistic thought individual and to society. In Border Crossings (1992:11) he suggests that while the freedom and human capacities of the individual need to be developed they must be linked to democracy in the sense that social betterment be the ultimate consequence of individual flourishing.

For the most part, Gramsci repudiated the vulgar Marxist faith in objective economic forces and scientific laws and argued that the domination of capital could not be explained solely by pointing to the rule of force exerted by the capitalist state. (Giroux, 1981) Moreover, Gramsci did not subscribe to the belief in the inevitable breakdown of capitalism rather, he advocated that serious attention be given to the notion of consciousness. For Gramsci (1971:377), people became political actors as they move through the “terrain on which men move and acquire consciousness of their position, struggle.” As Leonard (1993:161) points out, Gramsci “supported the voluntarist side of Marxism rather than the fatalistic, determinist side, arguing that revolution comes not primarily from the breakdown of the capitalist economy in accordance with objective laws, but as a result of struggle.”
of Marx. Moreover, he accentuated the political dimensions of Marxism and the relevance of "ideological struggle in the process of socialist transformation." (McLellan, 1979:175)

Two of the major themes which emerged out of his prison writings which hold profound relevance for the discourse of critical pedagogy are his analysis of the extended role of the intellectual and the salience of the concept of hegemony. Gramsci normally used the word hegemony to mean the ways in which a "governing power wins consent to its rule from those it subjugates" (Eagleton, 1991:112)\(^{19}\)

While the concepts of ideology and hegemony are intertwined, "hegemony is a broader category than ideology: it includes ideology, but is not reducible to it." (Eagleton, 1991:12)\(^{20}\)

---

\(^{19}\) Gramsci’s notion of hegemony was a significant addition to Marxist philosophy and may have even constituted the end of classical Marxism. (Osborne, 1992) By arguing that sheer economic power wasn’t sufficient in explaining the consent of the masses to the dominant ideology, he made the role of culture and ideas central to the analyses of various historical moments.

\(^{20}\) Laclau and Mouffe have argued that the concept of hegemony has been misunderstood by many Marxists. They claim that one of the most common misleading interpretations of Gramsci’s concept reduces the concept of hegemony to that of the dominant ideology. According to such a view, a class is hegemonic when it is able to impose its own paradigmmatic ideology on the whole of society. Hegemony therefore augments domination through ideological means. In "Recasting Marxism: Hegemony And New Political Movements", Laclau and Mouffe claim that such an interpretation misses the radical novelty of Gramsci’s concept and fails to expand its potential for a non-economic articulation of social reality. According to Laclau and Mouffe, hegemony for Gramsci is the imposition of an articulating postulate upon an ensemble of social relations and practices which do not in themselves have a necessary class belonging prior to their articulation to the "hegemonic principle" of a fundamental class. That is to say, a Gramscian perspective, according to Laclau & Mouffe refuses the economic a sole causal primacy and his view of ideology moves beyond the notions that each class has its own fixed and closed ideological paradigm.
According to Gramsci (1971:324) ideology provides the "cement" upon which hegemony is built - it is the "terrain" upon which people "move, acquire, consciousness of their position, struggle."

Gramsci distinguished between "force" and "consent" as two ways in which the ruling class exercises power and maintains social control. Hegemony refers to the successful attempt of a dominant class to exercise its control over the resources of state and civil society, particularly "through the use of the mass media and the educational system." (Gitlin, 1979:32)

Hegemonic ideology attempts to legitimate the existing society, its institutions and its ways of life. Ideology becomes hegemonic when it is widely accepted as describing 'the way things are', inducing people to consent to the institutions and practices dominant in their society and its way of life. Hegemony thus involves the social transmission of certain preconceptions, assumptions, notions and beliefs that structure the view of the world among certain groups in a specific society. (Kellner, 1990:17)

Through the use of both force and consent, with consent more prevalent, the dominant class uses its political, social and intellectual leadership to define and consolidate the "taken-for-granted" views, needs and beliefs of subordinate groups. In other words, the dominant class is able to shape what constitutes "common sense". By doing this, the dominant class is able not only to

and that all ideology is class related.

21Gramsci however, also maintains that the realm of common sense is a primary site of ideological struggle. As common sense is open and receptive to a range of thought, that is, always in a state of becoming, those involved in ideological work or pedagogical praxis can intervene in popular thinking either to further reduce its capacity for liberating thought and practice or to recompose its elements and add
influence the views of such groups but is also able to repress dissenting voices by placing limits on oppositional discourse and practice.

The pivotal role intellectuals played in the production and reproduction of social life was one of Gramsci's most important formulations regarding the political nature of culture. For Gramsci, "all men are intellectuals... but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals." (1971:9) Gramsci defines intellectuals according to their "functions in dominance", that is, in the formation of the state, the constitution of classes, and the organization of spontaneous consent to the dominant interests that structure the social formation. (Platone, 1949) Accordingly, intellectuals are divided into two groups: traditional and organic. It is the latter group which in Gramsci's conceptualization, performs the function of giving to a fundamental class to which they are organic an awareness of itself in economic, social, cultural and political fields. (Gramsci, 1971:5) Thus, in the broadest sense, Gramsci strives to locate the political and social function of intellectuals through his examination of the role of conservative and radical organic intellectuals. Conservative organic intellectuals supply the dominant class with forms of moral and intellectual leadership. They are what Chomsky refers to as the "intelligentsia", those agents of the status quo who identify with the dominant relations of power and who propagate the dominant ideology and its values. In the case of p.c., to be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent chapter,

______________________________

new ones as a movement towards liberation. (Hall, Lumley and McLennan, 1979:50)
several conservative spokespersons have assumed the posture of hegemonic intellectuals and their place within the "intelligentsia."

Radical organic intellectuals, on the other hand, have the potential to play a vital role in counterhegemonic struggle. A radical organic intellectual then could not absolve him/herself from the responsibility "of transmitting those ideas, that knowledge, through the intellectual function, to those who do not belong, professionally in the intellectual class." (Hall, 1992:281) In other words, the radical organic intellectual has the obligation to link with other groups and engage in political activity. For Gramsci, radical pedagogy is historical, dialectical and critical for one cannot ignore the issue of how the imposition of meanings and values disseminated by schools are "dialectically related to the mechanisms of economic and political control in the dominant society." (Giroux, 1988:201) Furthermore, the ability to transcend oppressive circumstances emerges only after individuals acquire a thorough understanding of the established order. In other words, the dominant culture has to be critically understood before it can be transformed.

Giroux (1989:135) argues that many educational theorists who have appropriated Gramsci's thought have not sufficiently advanced Gramsci's project of theorizing intellectuals not only as "elaborators of dominant culture but also as a vital fundamental social and political force in any counterhegemonic struggle." Critical pedagogists emphasize the role that transformative intellectuals can play in political struggle and much of this is
derived from the educational writings of Gramsci who stressed the "democratic character of the intellectual function" (Hoare & Smith, 1971:3)

In appropriating the Gramscian notion of hegemony, Giroux has accentuated the necessity to avoid the misinterpretation of this concept. For Giroux, domination in schools is not total and the assumption of such complete control not only misconstrues the notion of hegemony but also undermines the "ability of people to resist domination." (1988:202)

Kellner has pointed out the effectiveness of using a "hegemony model" when analyzing societal institutions because it

...reveals dominant ideology formations and discourses as a shifting terrain of consensus, struggle, and compromise, rather than as an instrument of a monolithic, uni-dimensional ideology that is forced on the underlying population from above by a unified ruling class. (1990:16)

Adopting the notion of hegemony is especially effectual when evaluating the educational system, since it is both a hegemonic mechanism and yet also a site of contested terrain "fraught with internal contradictions". (Davidson, 1990:14)

The controversy surrounding the issue of "political correctness" may be viewed as one of these contradictions since the conservative hegemonic ideology which underlies the curriculum and the university itself is undergoing a rigorous articulation by progressive students and educators who have become the targets of anti-p.c. rhetoric.

In order to grasp the significance of the p.c. debate on campuses, one need only comprehend the depth of Marcuse's statement when he said that
...the general demands for educational reforms are only the immediate expression of wider and more fundamental aims...the struggle for a free and critical education becomes a vital part in the larger struggle for change. (Marcuse, 1969:59-61)

Marcuse's assertion is as accurate today as it was more than twenty years ago. for the struggle over curriculum reform and the university's mission far transcends the perimeters of academia. It is a struggle rooted in a vision of a society liberated from the oppressive and exploitative proclivities which manifest themselves in practices of racism, sexism and homophobia.

**Cultural Studies**

Cultural studies theorists analyze culture from critical and multidisciplinary perspectives which were developed in England by a number of cultural theorists and the Centre of Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). It must be stated here however, that what is now called British Cultural Studies is and never was a singular, coherent body of thought. Grossberg (1992:17) claims that accounts of cultural studies which fail to acknowledge its heterogeneity "radically misrepresent the practice and history of British cultural studies." We are also reminded that the development of cultural theory in Britain did not "begin" with the establishment of the CCCS. As Stuart Hall (1990:12) explains.

We...came from a tradition entirely marginal to the centers of English academic life, and our engagement in the questions of cultural change...we first reckoned within the dirty outside world. The Centre of Contemporary Cultural Studies was the locus to which we retreated when that conversation in the open world could no longer be continued; it was politics by other means. Some of us - me,
especially, had always planned never to return to the university, indeed never to darken its doors again. But then, one always has to make pragmatic adjustments to where real work, important work, can be done.

Furthermore, Grossberg (1994:3) points out that all the founding figures of cultural studies including Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, E.P. Thompson and Stuart Hall started their careers, and their intellectual projects, in the "field of education, outside of the university, in extramural departments and adult working-class courses." These founding fathers of cultural studies were very much influenced by Marx, Marxist scholars such as Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser and by a variety of discourses which emerged in the 1960's and 1970's including structuralism, feminism, semiotics and postmodernism.

In the last decade, cultural studies has become an integral part of the curriculum in several universities all over North America and Europe and yet it is important to note that unlike its early beginnings in Britain, little of what is called cultural studies in the United States actually deals with education. (Grossberg, 1994) This irony is compounded by the fact that much of what is called cultural studies is often times nothing more than analyses of popular cultural texts without any connection to issues of politics, economics and history.

Many critics (Kellner, 1991; Scholle, 1990; Benn, 1990) however, have suggested that the institutionalization of cultural studies in the American context has strayed far from the original intentions of CCCS which always maintained connections to the wider social sphere. British cultural studies
almost always demonstrated an affinity to working-class activism and political struggle.

...throughout the late 1960s and the 1970s, the analysis of culture in Britain was firmly anchored in a strategy of political struggle...its priorities were those of an elaboration of the cultural problems facing the Left at the time. (Davies, 1993:117)

This critical Marxian component and the concepts of history and class however, have been absent in many of the uncritical renditions of cultural studies now in circulation in the U.S. As Benn (1990) claims, the theory hasn't travelled well.

The work being done in this country has, to a great extent, abandoned the study of specific groups of people for a kind of hip populism that finds subversion of mass culture everywhere and that erases the problems of history and class. Lately, the people who practice what has come to be known as American cultural studies have developed an irritating habit of referring to any theory other than their own as elitist...Fiske's work, in particular, comes perilously close to suggesting that critical inquiry isn't really necessary anymore. (Benn, 1990:15-16)

Similarly, Kellner (1991) argues that much of the work done in U.S. cultural studies has subverted or ignored the issue of class. Kellner points to the fact that cultural studies in England was "particularly sensitive to class differences" while attention to class in various Americanized versions of cultural studies have downplayed or disregarded class altogether. Kellner (1991) is quick to point out the dangers however of exaggerating the constitutive force of class at the expense of other variables such as gender or ethnicity. In this regard Kellner's position on Marx and issues of class is
similar to those found in Giroux. McLaren and Aronowitz, yet he acknowledges as they do, that this category cannot be abandoned.

Kellner describes some of the redeeming qualities which the theoretical tradition of British cultural studies embodies for critical social theory. Cultural studies is transdisciplinary in that it has tended to cut across academic boundaries and as such offers a way to "overcome the disciplinary fragmentation that is an endemic result of the academic division of labour characteristic of technocapitalist societies." (Kellner, 1991:6) According to Kellner, cultural studies may be able to link social theory, cultural analysis and critique, and politics in a project directed at democratic social transformation.

Similarly, Giroux (1992[b]:200) argues that cultural studies needs to be reconstructed as part of a progressive discourse of difference and pedagogical transformation, one which is "forged in the dialectic of critique and possibility". Giroux contends that cultural studies offers a theoretical discourse for a new cultural politics of difference, pedagogy, and democratic public life. Giroux, therefore, embraces cultural studies as yet another language of transformation and hope available to radical educators. Giroux posits cultural studies as both a political and pedagogical project that allows teachers to rethink schooling as a type of cultural politics.

In his article, "Adult Education And Social Change", Raymond Williams points to the pedagogical purpose within the framework of cultural studies which is the "desire to make learning part of the process of social change".
Cultural studies provides valuable insights into the development of critical pedagogy since it provides a set of categories which are capable of deepening the radical democratic project of schooling while "theoretically advancing the discourse and practice of critical pedagogy as a form of cultural politics." (Giroux, 1992[b]:201) This attempt to advance critical pedagogy as a form of cultural politics is most recently evident in the collection of essays *Between Borders: Pedagogy And The Politics Of Cultural Studies* (1994) edited by Giroux and McLaren. In this text the necessary redefinition of critical pedagogy as a form of engaged cultural praxis is articulated by a variety of cultural theorists, feminists of colour and third world theorists. Moreover, the intersections of race, class and gender formations and their relations found in critical cultural studies provide an important foundation for pedagogical theory.

Cultural studies compels critical educators to examine the role of language as an important theoretical category by making it "constitutive of the conditions for producing meaning as part of the knowledge/power relationship." (Giroux, 1992[b]:201) Knowledge and power are reconceptualized in this context by "reasserting not merely the indeterminacy of language but also the historical and social construction of knowledge itself." (Giroux, 1992[b]:201)

Critical cultural studies also offers educators the opportunity for going beyond cultural analyses which uncritically celebrate the "popular", romanticize everyday life and overestimate resistance, by viewing culture in the
Gramscian sense, as a contested terrain. A critical version of cultural studies may foster inquiry into notions of the margin and the centre, with particular reference to categories of race, class and gender. In this sense, cultural studies may provide methods of reading history oppositionally in order to better comprehend the ways in which subordinate groups have been historically marginalized and in some cases, completely excluded from the dominant academic discourse. Cultural studies also raises the possibility of rethinking the relationship between the issue of difference as it is "constituted within subjectivities and between social groups," which suggests understanding more clearly how "questions of subjectivity can be taken up so as not to erase the possibility for individual and social agency." (Giroux, 1992[b]:202)

Finally, cultural studies provides the foundation for conceptualizing pedagogy as a form of cultural production rather than as the mere transmission of a particular set of skills, values, or specific body of knowledge.

As a form of cultural production, critical pedagogy becomes a critical referent for understanding how various practices in the circuit of power inscribe institutions, texts, and lived cultures in particular

---

22Both Giroux and Kellner advocate a "critical" cultural studies. By "critical" they mean an approach which does not downplay the issue of class as a significant variable. There has been a tendency is some cultural studies research to ignore the social, political and economic context in which cultural artifacts are created. In addition, some versions of cultural studies have tended to overstate instances of resistance. (see for example John Fiske Reading The Popular, Understanding The Popular [both 1989]) Indeed, the various ways in which "resistance" has been defined by some cultural theorists has been deemed problematic by critical theorists. As Kellner (1991:20) points out there is a tendency to "celebrate resistance per se without distinguishing between types and forms of resistance".
forms of social and moral regulation which presuppose particular visions of the past, present, and future. (Giroux, 1992[b]:202)

Some of the fundamental concerns of cultural studies therefore become central to critical pedagogy. The role of language, and the notions of voice and difference receive a great deal of consideration and articulation within critical pedagogy and have to some degree been transformed and expanded.

While cultural studies has certainly influenced critical pedagogy, Giroux, McLaren and others have alerted educators to the potential dangers of adopting an uncritical version of cultural studies which busies itself with scrutinizing texts without considering the broader context. Just as they distinguish between a postmodernism of resistance and a postmodernism of reaction, there is a similar distinction made between those versions of cultural studies which merely celebrate the popular and those which critically engage culture. Hence, critical pedagogists take as one of their central themes the notion of resistance. Rather than viewing schools as merely reproducers of the dominant ideology and downplaying the importance of human agency, schools are considered political, cultural and ideological sites that are somewhat independent from the "market" and dominant ideological value systems.\(^{23}\) The notion of resistance then restores the critical notion of agency and restores the concept of individuals as active subjects.

\(^{23}\) As Aronowitz and Giroux (1985:72) assert, schools "are not solely determined by the logic of the workplace or the dominant society: they are not merely economic institutions but are also political, cultural, and ideological sites that exist somewhat independently of the capitalist market economy. Of course, schools operate within limits, whether they be economic, ideological, or political.
However, Aronowitz and Giroux (1985:104) claim that the current use of the concept of resistance "suggests a lack of intellectual rigor and an overdose of theoretical sloppiness." They maintain that educators must be more precise about what resistance actually is and what it is not. In *Education Under Siege* (1985:96-104), they provide an extensive critique of various theories of resistance. They provide a number of penetrating analyses of resistance theory and argue that resistance theories have lacked a historical dimension in that little attention has been paid to the development of conditions which promote and reinforce contradictory modes of resistance and struggle. Furthermore, they argue that what is often deemed as resistant or oppositional does not have any radical significance nor is all oppositional behaviour a clear-cut response to domination (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). Moreover, theories of resistance rarely take into account issues of gender and race as a number of feminist analyses have demonstrated. (cf. McRobbie, 1980)

In addition, theories of resistance often misconstrue the political value of overt resistance, fail to acknowledge that some students although cognizant of the repressive dominant ideology do not translate this wisdom into forms of rebellion, and have not acknowledged the extent to which domination reaches into the structure of personality - that is how dominant ideological assumptions become internalized and unconsciously adopted. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985:99-104)

Giroux (1983:108-109) argues for a radical notion of resistance which embodies an
...expressed hope, an element of transcendence, for radical transformation...resistance must have a revealing function, one that contains a critique of domination and provides theoretical opportunities for self-reflection and for struggle in the interest of self-emancipation and social emancipation.

Of course, critical pedagogists have not been alone in interrogating the notion of, and degrees of, resistance. Recently, a number of critical communications scholars have put forth biting critiques, mostly in response to the uncritical appropriation of the concept of resistance in U.S. cultural studies. Moreover, many of these critiques have emphasized the limits of polysemy and underscored the ways in which pleasurable encounters with texts do not herald radical opposition and political resistance. (Scholle, 1988; Condit, 1989; Budd et al., 1990)

Giroux and McLaren (1987) are careful about the uncritical appropriation of the term "resistance" and they discuss "resistance" as distinct from "counterhegemony." For Giroux and McLaren (1987) counterhegemony better specifies the political project that they define as the creation of counterpublic spheres.

As it is often used in the educational literature, the term 'resistance' refers to a type of autonomous 'gap' between the widespread forces of domination and the state of being dominated. Viewed as such, resistance functions as a type of negation or affirmation placed before ruling discourses and practices. Of course, resistance often lacks a political project and often reflects social practices that are informal, disorganized, apolitical and atheoretical in nature. The concept of counterhegemony, on the other hand, implies a more political, theoretical and critical understanding of both the nature of domination and the type of
active opposition it should engender... the concept of counterhegemony expresses not simply the logic of critique but the creation of new social relations and public spaces that constitute counter-institutions, lived relations and ideologies that embody alternative forms of experience and struggle. (Giroux & McLaren, 1987:271-272)

Critical pedagogy has attempted to avoid the shallow conception of resistance embodied in some versions of cultural studies and attempt to rearticulate the notion of resistance within and through the concept of counterhegemony. Moreover, Giroux et al.(1988) argue that cultural studies needs to define the role of the intellectual as a counter-hegemonic practice which advances counter-disciplinary praxis in public spheres.

...the call for the development of counterpublic spheres outside of the university points to the need to reconstruct a cultural politics in which critical educators and other intellectuals can become part of any one of a number of social movements in which they use their theoretical and pedagogical skills in the building of historical blocs capable of emancipatory social change... by combining the language of critique with a language of possibility educators can develop a political project that broadens the social and political contexts in which pedagogical activity can function as part of a counterhegemonic strategy. (Giroux, 1988:213)

Since cultural studies' institutionalization in the U.S. the discourse of cultural change has remain isolated from the broader social sphere - a development which contradicts and undermines the original intentions of early British cultural studies. This plea then, for the development of counterpublic spheres outside the university follows the need
to bring "back home", as Grossberg (1994) suggests, the radical, "public" character of cultural studies and politics.

The Postmodern Influence

It is hard to deny, or avoid, the influence that postmodern thought has had on almost every field of human practice. It has left an indelible stamp on everything from architecture to media, from philosophy to politics. Postmodern vocabulary and consciousness has insinuated itself into popular as well as intellectual discourse. It must, however, also be said that delineating and defining the meaning of postmodernism is no easy task.24 "Its meaning is at best elusive and at worse, utterly incoherent." (Shapiro, in press)

Some of the issues raised by postmodernism are significant to the discourse of critical pedagogy, yet a great deal has been written about the tensions between modernism and postmodernism.25 While I do not pretend to

24Charles Bernstein (1987:45) contends that "no consensus exists as to whether the umbrella term applies to a particular historical period or can be characterized by any delineable stylistic features...There is no agreement on whether postmodernism is a period, a tendency within a period, an aestheticphilosophical category transcending, indeed deploring, periodization, much less exactly who or what would constitute the definition of the term even if one of these options were elected."

25It is necessary here to distinguish between "modernism" and "postmodernism". While some observers like Bernstein (1987:46) contend that the intensifying discussions about postmodernism have brought attention to the fact that there is little consensus about what modernism itself means, Best and Kellner (1991:4) provide both a clear and concise distinction between the two concepts with respect to theory. "Modern theory - ranging from the philosophical project of Descartes, through the Enlightenment, to the social theory of Comte, Marx, Weber and others - is criticized for its search for a foundation of knowledge, for its universalizing and totalizing claims, for its hubris to supply apodeictic truth, and for its allegedly fallacious rationalism...Postmodern theory provides a critique of representation and the modern belief that theory mirrors reality, taking instead 'perspectivist' and 'relativist' positions that theories at best provide partial perspectives on their
exhaust the controversies involved in the debate, a clarification of my own position on the subject is necessary. While one cannot ignore the contributions of postmodernist insight, I would argue, as have Aronowitz, Giroux, McLaren and Kellner, that the adoption of the cynicism and nihilism embodied in much of postmodern theory serves as a barrier and is a detriment to the construction of a radical social theory and forms of radical politics. In this context, the distinction made by Hal Foster (1983) between a "postmodernism of resistance" and a "postmodernism of reaction" is especially useful.

26 A number of left-wing critics have argued that postmodernism reflects a flight from politics and praxis. See for example Anderson, 1984; Eagleton, 1985; and Kaplan, 1992. Svi Shapiro (in press) contends that versions of postmodernism such as that espoused by Baudrillard have stalled the critical interrogation of culture at the gate. He claims that the cynicism of Baudrillard's work undermines any attempt at developing a liberatory educational theory and that Baudrillard's postmodern world offers no radical political exit. Rather, politics becomes a "textual practice (e.g., parody, pastiche, fragmentation) that unsettles, decenters and disrupts rather than transforms the totalizing circulation of meanings." (McLaren, 1993, in print) Quite simply, reactionary postmodernism although claiming to be "radical" embodies a cosmetic radicalism - a way of being radical without leaving one's desk!

27 Hal Foster argues for a distinction between a complacent, essentially reactionary postmodernism and an emancipatory "resistant" version. In his preface to The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture (pp.ix-xvi), Foster distinguishes between a postmodernism of resistance which seeks to deconstruct modernism and the status quo from a critical perspective and a postmodernism of reaction which in the course of repudiating modernism and celebrating postmodernism takes on an apolitical, ahistorical and uncritical character which in fact returns to the "verities of tradition". In a similar vein, Aronowitz & Giroux (1991); Giroux (1992); McLaren (1993,1994) and Kellner (1991) claim that a "critical" postmodernist interrogation of social reality which does not succumb to the apolitical extremities of some versions of postmodernism, may assist in the creation of a radical social theory committed to the
Postmodern theory appears to be polarized around two differing constellations. Baudrillard, Lyotard and others champion an extreme postmodern position which renounces modern theory and politics while proclaiming a postmodern rupture in history. By contrast, Laclau, Mouffe and Jameson espouse postmodern positions while underscoring connections between the present epoch and modernity. These two distinct strands may be viewed as different reactions to the failure of the radical political movements of the 1960's. In response to this collapse, Best and Kellner (1991:181) argue that:

...some theorists...worked to develop new forms of radical politics; others returned to an old liberal politics refurbished with new labels (Lyotard); while still others (Baudrillard) eventually gave up on politics altogether and declared the end of society, politics, the masses, and history.

________________________

ideals of democracy, empowerment, equality and freedom.
Reactionary or ludic\textsuperscript{28} postmodernism is the self-expression of those who have abandoned the sense of hope and possibility of altering the world and is eloquently delineated in a recent essay by Marshall Berman. Berman (1989) contends that the postmodernism established by Parisian academics in the past two decades grew out of the collapse of May, 1968 and the subsequent denial to confront it.\textsuperscript{29} Evading a concern with political issues in the "real"

\textsuperscript{28}McLaren incorporates Teresa Ebert's conception of "ludic postmodernism" defined as "an approach to social theory that is decidedly limited in its ability to transform oppressive social and political regimes of power." (McLaren:1993,in press) McLaren makes the distinction between ludic and resistance postmodernism and argues that critical educators assume a cautionary stance towards ludic postmodernism for it merely reinscribes the status quo and diminishes historical memory to the "supplementarity of signification or the free-floating trace of textuality." (Ebert,1991:115) In ludic postmodernism, the analysis of inequitable relations and notions of "difference" and "inclusion" are often limited to the discursive domain. In response to this, McLaren valorizes a form of resistance postmodernism in which "difference" is politicized by being situated in real social and historical conflicts and which takes into account both the macropolitical level of structural organization and the micropolitical level of different and contradictory manifestations of oppression as a means of analyzing global relations of oppression. Hence, resistance postmodernism may be characterized as an extension of ludic postmodernism because it brings a form of materialist intervention into critique. (Kincheloe & McLaren,1994)

\textsuperscript{29}The events of the French uprising in May 1968 are especially significant for the insurrections which emerged paralyzed the entire country. Dramatic student strikes in May were followed by the largest general workers strike in French history. Student radicals called for "all power to the imagination" and for a very brief spell everything seemed possible and the slogan suggested that imagination might seize power. (Best & Kellner,1991; Singer,1993) Of course this was not the case and the movement was subsequently defeated. However, the influence of this particular historical juncture had a profound impact on leftist politics for they heralded a new form of micropolitics. Berman (1988:9) points out that the discourse of postmodernism began to emanate from France in the late 1970s, largely from disillusioned rebels of 1968. The May 1968 upheaval contributed significantly to developments within postmodern theory since many postmodern theorists began to identify with the new social movements and micropolitics and consequently abandoned Marxism. The events of May 1968 led many to conclude that "Marxism - particularly the version of the French Communist Party - was too dogmatic and narrow a framework to adequately
world, they ultimately deny that such a thing as a "real" world exists. Furthermore, Berman suggests that the most devout disciples of French postmodernism are those who came of age in the 1970's, who had inherited all the bitterness of the Sixties Left without having any of the experiences of protracted struggle leading to limited but significant change in the world. It was a generation which, according to Berman (1989), appropriated and deepened the radical negations of Sixties activists but ignored the radical hopes.

Despite the fact that the trajectory of postmodernism has had a profound influence on a wide variety of fields including sociology, music, art, architecture, media studies and literary criticism, there is no agreed upon definition or meaning for the term.\(^{30}\) Because the postmodernist position celebrates the idea of difference and diversity, it is not surprising that the term has been subjected to varying interpretations and assorted ideological appropriations. The various renditions of postmodernism are clearly exemplified by briefly analyzing the different views of postmodernism espoused

\[\text{ theorize contemporary society and its diverse modes of power. Postmodern theorists were instead drawn to political movements such as feminism, ecology groups, and gay and lesbian formations...they proposed decentered political alliances.} \] (Best & Kellner, 1991:24-25)

\(^{30}\)In "Postmodernism and 'the Other Side'" (1986) and more recently in *Hiding In The Light* (1988), Dick Hebdige attempts to provide a sense of the range of meanings, objects and contexts which can be associated or construed as postmodern. In *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations* (1991) Best and Kellner provide us with an archaeology of the term postmodern.

In *The Postmodern Condition* (1984), Jean-Francois Lyotard introduced the term "postmodern" to a broad public and described postmodernism as a "rejection of grand narratives, metaphysical philosophies, and any other form of totalizing thought." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:60) Perhaps more than any other postmodern theorist, Lyotard has advocated a break from modernist assumptions, theories and methods, while espousing and disseminating postmodern alternatives. Lyotard valorizes and privileges the notions of diversity, specificity, locality and the contingent against what he calls the totalizing discourses of modernity.

We have paid a high enough price for the nostalgia of the whole and the one...Let us wage war on totality; let us be witnesses to the unrepresentable; let us activate the differences and save the honour of the name. (Lyotard, 1984:81-82)

Lyotard then contests the development of a unifying theory and instead champions a plurality of positions and discourses. *The Postmodern Condition* subtitled as a *Report On Knowledge* was commissioned by the Canadian government to study the condition of knowledge in developed societies and is essentially Lyotard's attempt to cultivate a postmodern epistemology which breaks with Western Enlightenment thought. However, Lyotard fails to adequately develop a "new" epistemological framework and his work, as well as that of other postmodernists, merely reinscribe the dualist modes of interpretation. Western thought has operated from a set of binary oppositions
like man/woman; sameness/difference; universal/particular; etc. in which the primary term has been valorized while the secondary term has been constructed as the subordinate "other". In its celebration of heterogeneity, difference etc. postmodernism has inverted this relation of domination by privileging the "other" within the binary relation. As such, Lyotard still works within the confines of Enlightenment dualism and has not in effect transcended or subverted those binary oppositions. Hence, the various assertions made by some theorists which suggest that postmodernism offers a radically new epistemology need to be critically interrogated.

For Lyotard, postmodern knowledge emphasizes heterogeneity, plurality, and dissensus and rejects all grand narratives and forms of macrotheory - an approach which therefore lends itself to the development of micropolitics or identity politics. However, several critics have accused Lyotard's work of being both theoretically and politically disabling. His rejection of all macrotheory and all critiques of systemic structures like patriarchy, racism and class exploitation undermines the struggles of women and oppressed groups who need to grasp the systemic nature of their oppression. (Fraser & Nicholson, 1990)

Similar\textsuperscript{31} to Lyotard, Baudrillard (1983; 1988) claims that the postmodern condition symbolizes a break with modernism's boundaries. He

\textsuperscript{31}In discussing some of the perceived similarities in Baudrillard's and Lyotard's approaches, I am not suggesting there are no differences. Indeed volumes could be written on the dissimilarities and while I have chosen not to elaborate them here it seems appropriate to acknowledge that they do in fact exist.

74
views the postmodern society as one which is heterogeneous and fragmented and which is best characterized as a form of "hyperreality", an endless expansion of meanings and discourses in which all boundaries break down into models of simulation.

Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being or a substance. It is the generation by models of a real without origins or reality: a hyperreal. (Baudrillard, 1983:2)

According to Baudrillard, the hyperreal is a situation in which "ideal" models displace the real. Hyperreality denotes the blurring of distinctions between the real and the unreal. For Baudrillard the hyperreal is not the unreal but the more than real. In Simulations, Disneyland provides an example of Baudrillard's difficult concept of hyperreality. He argues that the models of the United States in Disneyland are more real than their instantiations in the social world as the United States becomes more like Disneyland. He writes,

Disneyland is a perfect model of all the entangled orders of simulation. To begin with it is a play of illusions and phantasms...This imaginary is supposed to be what makes the operation successful. But what draws the crowds is undoubtedly much more the social microcosm, the miniaturised and religious reveling in real America...The objective profile of America, then, may be traced throughout Disneyland...Disneyland is there to conceal the fact that it is the "real" country, all of "real" America, which is Disneyland. (Baudrillard, 1983:23-25)

Moreover, Baudrillard's various works suggest that the era of modernity characterized by production and industrial capitalism has been replaced by an era of postmodernity comprised of "simulations". In this era of simulations
...computerization, information processing, media, cybernetic control systems, and the organization of society according to simulation codes and models replace reproduction as the organizing principle of society. (Best & Kellner, 1991:118)

This type of commercial or co-opted postmodernism is linked to a new stage of multinational consumer capitalism and to all the newest technologies which have arisen. Technologies, marketing and consumption have created a uni-dimensional universe from which there is no escape and in which no hope for critical interrogations or resistance exists. While Baudrillard's work provides some provocative concepts for the study of media and technological developments, it appears in Baudrillard's world all possibility for political resistance vanishes in a bubbling vat of hyperreality, textuality and ironic self-parody.

Indeed, over the years his works became increasingly pessimistic. The cynicism characteristic of his later work is somewhat different from many of the ideas put forth in an earlier works, especially The Mirror Of Production (1975). This text represents Baudrillard's ultimate break with Marxism and

---

\[32\] In general, critical pedagogists have argued that the type of uni-dimensionality and pessimism typical of much of the postmodernist discourse leaves no room for utopian vision or for the advancement of a discourse of possibility. In Baudrillard's work, there is something of a return to the one-dimensional view of social life delineated by Herbert Marcuse. However, the postmodern version of this one-dimensional world lacks Marcuse's ardent commitment to the search for emancipation and hope for liberation. Peter McLaren began writing on postmodernism in 1986 in an attempt to counter what he saw as the cynicism that was associated with certain postmodern schools of thought. His intent was to defer.d Freire's utopian thinking against such theoretical cynicism. Giroux and McLaren have tried to expand on the idea in cultural studies about a "resistance postmodernism" or "critical postmodernism"--a concept which Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) and Giroux (1992) have most recently advanced.
dialectical approaches which according to Baudrillard, fail to appreciate the "specificity" of the postmodern condition. In this text; however, he advocates a politics of pluralism and links his ideas to the concerns of marginalized groups such as blacks, women, gays and lesbians, but never explains how an effective counterhegemonic revolution could take place in light of the hegemony of the dominant codes he describes. Similar to Lyotard, the early Baudrillard champions micropolitics -- a form of micropolitics that would centre on the practices of everyday life and that would involve revolutionary change in lifestyle, communication, culture and discourse which would in turn serve as the preconditions for a "new" society that would liberate and empower individuals from social repression and domination. (Best & Kellner, 1991)

Baudrillard's ideas about "change" however, do not address issues of revolutionary class struggle and socialism for he maintains that such struggles are hopelessly out of date. In essence, Baudrillard rules out the possibility for social transformation by claiming that in a world of hyperreality, the very concept of cohesive class struggle vanishes. In, In The Shadow Of The Silent Majorities...Or The End Of The Social; And Other Essays(1983[b]), Baudrillard states that

The social will never lead to socialism, it will have been short-circuited by the hypersocial, by the hyperreality of the social. In a world of undifferentiated individuals, the concept of class will have dissolved. (Baudrillard,1983[b]:85-86)

In a recent interview Baudrillard's sombre and pessimistic perspective is plainly evident. He claims that
...hope is a rather unimportant value... I realize that utopias are very active... the green movement, the feminist movement and so on. These are the so-called hope-bearing movements that aspire to be revolutionary but in actual fact... [in the hyperreality] they are part of the same publicity game. (Baudrillard, 1989:54)

Baudrillard's cynicism is further amplified in his analysis of the Sixties. In "The Politics of Seduction", he claims that the radicalism of the Sixties has passed into "major events like the stock exchange crash" and the "advent of AIDS" which he claims to be representative of American radicalism and in which the "intellectual has no place". (Baudrillard, 1989:55) His statements exhibit little or no sense of passionate fervour about the need for change nor any hope that social transformation is a possibility. Postmodern discourse then raises concerns that strike at the heart of critical pedagogy and questions the relevance of radical political praxis.

Yet several critical theorists have argued that the cynicism inherent in much ludic postmodernism could be more accurately described as a guise of its underlying conservatism. For example, Douglas Kellner (1989:216) elucidates Baudrillard's politics or more accurately his lack of politics when he suggests that Baudrillard is the

...latest example of critical criticism which criticizes everything, but rarely affirms anything of much danger to the status quo. Ultimately, Baudrillard is both safe and harmless. A court jester of the society he mocks, he safely simulates criticism.

Zavarzadeh and Morton (1991) posit an even more biting critique of various forms of ludic theory. In their account, ludic postmodernism gained
ascendancy in the academy among so-called "left" intellectuals just at the time when capitalism became deterritorialized and multinational. They argue that as a result, ludic postmodern critique subverted forms of knowledge that could "explain multinational capitalism's trans-territoriality and its affiliated phenomena." (Zavarzadeh & Morton, 1991:163) In other words, as ludic postmodernism has moved into the "center," it has relegated to the "margins" more radical theoretical formulations. Hence, Baudrillard and other postmodern thinkers while illuminating certain aspects of contemporary society, have, at the same time, sabotaged intensive critiques of other areas.

While there is little doubt that we live in an era of manufactured consent (Herman & Chomsky, 1988), in an age where entertainment as the supra-discourse has led us to the brink of amusing ourselves to death as Postman (1985) so poignantly argues, a social theory which interrogates the oppressive tendencies of capitalism cannot be abandoned. Nor should we forsake the utopian vision of critical pedagogy for the type of sobering message characteristic of a "reactionary" postmodernism. Rather, such cynicism must be averted for it is possible to establish terrains of resistance where knowledge assumes a liberating purpose. Despite the insidious and repressing effects of the dominant culture, there exists the potential for fostering veritable acts of intellectual resistance in schools and other social spheres.

Frederic Jameson's contribution to the postmodern discourse is not quite as bleak, in that to some extent, it challenges the nihilistic, cynical and apolitical character implicit in the work of many theorists deemed
"postmodern". Prior to Jameson's interventions into the postmodern debates he had established himself as one of the foremost Marxist literary critics of our time. For the most part, Jameson's writings on postmodernism have defended Marxism and have sought to illustrate how a "reconstructed Marxian theory can provide the most comprehensive and penetrating theory of postmodernism itself." (Kellner, 1989:2)

Jameson argues that postmodernism and late capitalism must be conceptualized dialectically, as both "catastrophe and progress" (1984:86) This follows Marxian theory and as such demonstrates Jameson's commitment to privileging Marxism over all other theoretical epistemologies. Theorists such as Jameson, Laclau and Mouffe adopt postmodern positions while stressing continuities between the present age and modernity. While Jameson (1984) appears to place Marxism above all other theoretical discourses,33 Laclau and Mouffe incorporate a post-structuralist critique of Marxism while suggesting

33 Jameson argues against postmodern thinkers such as Lyotard, Baudrillard and Foucault who dispute Marxian assumptions by claiming that they are reductive and as such sustain the allegedly oppressive tendencies of the Enlightenment tradition. Against these critiques, Jameson claims that Marxism can adequately embody and integrate competing postmodern positions. Yet Best and Kellner have pointed to some of the tensions in Jameson's work, due in part to his attempt to combine postmodernism and Marxist theory. They assert that some of the postmodern positions which he adopts are "sometimes incompatible with or detract from his Marxist positions...Jameson sometimes privileges a postmodern culturalist analysis over a Marxian political economy analysis and thereby obscures the economic and class determination of culture that he otherwise wants to foreground." (1991:192)
as discussed previously, that Marxism suffers theoretically and politically from a reductionist logic.\footnote{34}

In *The Political Unconscious*, Jameson argues that the political goal of the Left must be to build alliances between diverse groups of people (1981:54). Politically, Jameson considers the concept of totality to be of primary importance. He asserts that "without a conception of the social totality, no socialist politics is possible." (Jameson, 1988:355) While Laclau and Mouffe tie their theoretical investigations to the development of a radical democratic politics which emphasizes "plurality", they reject the notion of totality as essentialist (Best & Kellner, 1991).\footnote{35} By "plural", Laclau and Mouffe mean the diversity of political identities which are in existence and which characterize the "new social movements".\footnote{36} While these political identities are different and

\footnote{34See the discussion in the section on Marx for a critique of Laclau and Mouffe's reading of Marx.}

\footnote{35Just as there are numerous differences between the work of Lyotard and Baudrillard, there are also several points of divergence between the theories of Jameson and Laclau and Mouffe. While it is not my intention here to elaborate these differences, acknowledging them is imperative. There are however important similarities in their advocacy of alliance politics. It is however, both ironic and discouraging to note that theorists on the Left who champion a politics of alliance cannot themselves avoid perpetuating the "differences" that separate them, which in turn prevents them from developing a comprehensive and effective theory and critique of contemporary society.}

\footnote{36Laclau and Mouffe break with the principal tenets of the Marxist tradition and attempt to critically approach the Marxist tradition by appropriating the concept of hegemony in the interest of developing a radical democratic politics. In *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Toward a Radical Democratic Politics* they claim that hegemony is a "fundamental tool for political analysis on the left." (1985:193) They view hegemony as a crucial category for comprehending the nature of social reality as complex and diffuse and the new social movements as independent from class antagonisms. This however, is a position which Jameson critiques. In}
autonomous, they become "radical" when they are linked in alliance. The potential for cultivating a politics of alliance is the subject of a subsequent chapter. The issue here is to make clear the distinction between a postmodernism of resistance, exemplified in the work of Jameson, Laclau and Mouffe and the postmodernism of reaction represented in the work of Lyotard, Baudrillard and others.

For the most part, critical pedagogists such as Giroux, McLaren and Aronowitz have adopted some of the central notions of "resistance" postmodernism and have sought to explore the ways in which postmodern theory may contribute to the development of a critical pedagogical project.

The notion of "inclusion" and "otherness" so pervasive in the language of postmodernism is crucial to the discourse of educational reform advocated by critical pedagogists for it advances the idea that the voices of those individuals and groups thus far excluded by virtue of their class, gender, race, ethnic origin, sexual orientation or radical politics, be incorporated into the curriculum. While postmodernism provides some valuable insights, there are a number of shortcomings in relying solely on this approach.

---

*Postmodernism Or, The Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism*, Jameson argues that the "emergence of the 'new social movements' is an extraordinary historical phenomenon that is mystified by the explanation so many postmodernist ideologues feel themselves able to propose; namely, that the new small groups arise in the void left by the disappearance of social classes and in the rubble of the political movements organized around those. How classes could be expected to disappear, save in the unique special-case scenario of socialism, has never been clear to me". (1992:319) This of course clearly exemplifies Jameson's commitment to Marxism and demonstrates at least one of the significant differences between Jameson and the work of Laclau and Mouffe.

82
...postmodernism is inadequate to the task of rewriting the emancipatory possibilities of the language and practice of a revitalized democratic public life...postmodernism must extend and broaden the most democratic claims of modernism. When linked with modernist language of public life, the notions of difference, power and specificity can be understood as part of a public philosophy that broadens and deepens individual liberties and rights through rather than against a radical notion of democracy. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:81)

Postmodernism therefore provides a resource for the pluralist perspective toward culture which is needed to remedy class, race, and gender exclusions in education but is at the same time, inadequate for radical political intervention. Hence, it is necessary to mine the paradoxical and antagonistic insights of postmodernism for potential use "in the service of a radical cultural politics and a critical theory of pedagogy." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:62)\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\)Critical pedagogists have attempted to incorporate postmodernism into their work and have argued that their theoretical trajectory has been enhanced by various postmodern insights, yet important questions need to be raised about the validity of those who claim that what postmodernism offers is "new". There appears to be a significant ironic element to such claims for the newness and novelty which postmodernists boast was already present in earlier versions of critical theory. For one example, one need only examine Marcuse's (1969) assertions to discover that the notion of "inclusion" was not "invented" by postmodernists. Marcuse writes, "What appears as extraneous 'politicization' of the university by disrupting radical...is today the 'logical', internal dynamic of education: translation of knowledge into reality, of humanistic values into humane conditions of existence. This dynamic, arrested by the pseudo-neutral features of academia, would, for example, be released by the inclusion [emphasis mine] into the curriculum of courses giving adequate treatment to the great nonconformist movements in civilization and to the critical analysis of contemporary society." (Marcuse, 1969:61-62)

Therefore while postmodern theory purports to provide unique insights, I would argue that only the "image" of its newness is "real". The question then becomes why have critical pedagogists engaged postmodernism when it appears that the roots of many of the issues being raised today have their basis in earlier versions of critical theory? This inquiry in and of itself is fodder for an entire thesis and therefore cannot be addressed in detail here, however, I find it necessary to raise the query while suggesting that a re-evaluation
Giroux (1992) argues that modernist as well as postmodernist discourses are important theoretical trajectories for developing a critical pedagogical practice able to extend and theoretically advance a radical political praxis. While he acknowledges the internal incongruities of each perspective as well as their disparate ideological concerns, he suggests that a variety of theoretical frameworks can contribute significantly to critical pedagogy if posited in terms of the "interconnections between both their differences and the common ground they share for being mutually correcting". (Giroux, 1992:42)

**Feminism**

Feminism is not a monolithic discourse. In fact, there are a number of different "feminisms" which vary in their focus and ideological considerations. As such, the subject of feminist discourse is itself fodder for an entire thesis.

---

of critical theory is absolutely essential to the emancipatory project put forth by critical pedagogy. Furthermore, I would argue that the legacy of Marcusean thought needs to be resuscitated for many of his ideas are both relevant and applicable to current societal and historical conditions. While critical pedagogists credit the Frankfurt School as a major influence, their incorporation of Marcuse's thought has often been based on his early writings, especially *One Dimensional Man* (1964) which was one of his more pessimistic works. The later, more utopian Marcuse has been downplayed and sometimes neglected in the discourse of critical pedagogy. Marcuse's thoughts in *An Essay On Liberation* (1969) and *Counterrevolution And Revolt* (1972) offer profound insights into the potential of the student movement, intellectuals and the university as a site of counterhegemonic struggle. Moreover, his work could possibly serve as the basis for a thorough critique of the languid, reactionary forms of postmodernism now fashionable in the academy. Douglas Kellner posits a Marcusean Renaissance and argues that Marcuse addresses issues that continue to be of relevance to contemporary radical theory. Kellner bases his assertions, in part, on his findings in the unpublished manuscripts of Marcuse. (Kellner:1993, unpublished)
Therefore, I address only some of the more general underpinnings of feminist thought as it relates to critical pedagogy.

Feminism is premised on the acknowledgment that gender has an enormous impact on shaping our society. For the most part, feminists maintain that women are situated unequally in the social formation and that they are often exploited, oppressed and degraded by virtue of their sex. Social institutions such as media reinforce stereotypical and denigrating images and lend themselves to the "objectification" of women. Educational systems and the knowledge which is imparted through them often reflect a patriarchal, Eurocentric tradition. Indeed, feminist educators and students have been among the most vocal in the debate over "political correctness", arguing that a rich history of literature and theory has been ignored because of the adherence to an exclusionary core "canon". (Frankenberg, 1993) The educational system, then has played a complicitous role in the oppression of women. At the same time, feminists have become one of the major targets of conservative p.c. critics such as Bloom (1987); Kimball (1990) and D'Souza (1991).\(^{38}\)

In general feminists share a devotion to a form of politics aimed at transforming the social arrangements which lend themselves not only to the collective oppression of women but also to the definition of women as the

\(^{38}\)On the first page of *Tenured Radicals*, Roger Kimball indicts the women's movement by saying that radical feminism is the single biggest challenge to the canon, while D'Souza who obviously hasn't read the books he criticizes (a point which I will elaborate in chapter three) suggests that no one dares to question feminist ideology in the politically correct climate on campuses.
"other". In *Border Crossings* (1992), Giroux points to the dialectical relationship which has existed between modernism and feminism. Indeed, the notion that the "personal is political" not only speaks to the relationship between the self and political reality, it illuminates the dialectical character of much of feminist thought.

While feminist thought has emphasized such modernist concerns as equality, social justice and freedom from oppression, recent feminist theory has engaged postmodern discourse and as a result has repudiated those dimensions of modernism which champion the universal at the expense of specificity and contingency. Throughout the 1980s and into the present, work predominantly by women of colour has been transforming feminist analysis, drawing attention to the white-centredness and more generally to the false universalizing claims of much feminist discourse. Ethnocentrism based on the racial specificity of white women's lives limits feminist analysis and strategy. (Bannerji, 1991; Morago & Anzuldua, 1983; Carby, 1981)

When Giroux discusses "postmodern feminism" he is referring to that discourse which repudiates the popular mainstream feminism espoused primarily by "Western white, middle-class women".39 For Giroux, this type of feminism which posits patriarchy as the ultimate form of domination tends to ignore or downplay the vital issues of race, class and sexuality. It has been

39For the most part, critical pedagogists have drawn extensively from the work of feminists of colour. However, it must be stated here that many feminists of colour who Giroux deems postmodern, do not appropriate that label to describe their own work. Indeed, women of colour had been discussing notions of "difference" long before "postmodernism" assumed academic acceptance.
women of colour and lesbian feminists who have engaged these crucial elements in their work. Frankenberg (1993:8) asserts:

In the realm of theory, women of colour were the first to advance frameworks for understanding the intersection of women's lives of gender, sexuality, race and class as well as visions and concepts of multiracial coalition work.

Giroux also points out that recent feminist theory has denied the simplistic dichotomy between modernism and postmodernism. Rather than subscribing to such a binary opposition, feminist theory has critically appropriated elements of both modernism and postmodernism in the interest of advancing a broader theoretical discourse which situates "both discourses critically within a feminist political project" (Giroux, 1992:61) Similarly, yet in a different context, Aronowitz and Giroux maintain that the formulation of a pedagogical strategy need not base itself on a "choice between modernism and postmodernism." (1991:59) Giroux's conceptualization of a "border" pedagogy seeks to incorporate the strengths of feminism in addition to other theoretical frameworks. In this sense, Giroux attempts to devise what Steven Best and Douglas Kellner (1991) refer to as a multiperspectival epistemology.40 In a

---

40Douglas Kellner has espoused the development of a multidimensional and multiperspectival social theory in many of his recent works. Kellner argues that the most valuable insights from a variety of theoretical perspectives and academic disciplines need to be appropriated for the project of elaborating a critical social theory committed to radical democratic principles. While Kellner tends to limit himself to the domain of media, the type of border pedagogy which Giroux envisions extends Kellner's project to the educational realm. A well-informed citizenry capable of actively participating in their society has long been viewed as a necessary prerequisite for a healthy and vital democracy. However, both the educational system and the mainstream media have, in many respects, had their democratic purpose subverted by capitalist imperatives. The crisis of democracy is dreadfully apparent
similar vein, Linda Alcoff (1993:79) advocates a liberatory agenda in epistemology which she defines as one that seeks to "maximize both the number and the diversity of persons who have discursive possibilities." She provides a penetrating and insightful analysis of the political character of epistemology and delineates three principal ways in which epistemology has political ramifications. First, she discusses the conditions of production and illustrates the way in which epistemology production is a social practice engaged in by specific kinds of participants in prescribed situations.

...thinking about thinking itself goes on among professional philosophers, at least in its formalized and published manifestations. And it goes on in academic institutions that are themselves constrained and determined by their embeddedness within larger socioeconomic institutions...The conclusion to which we are thus compelled is that the political relationships of power and privilege in any given society have determinate effects of the conditions in which epistemology is practised. (Alcoff, 1993:67)

Alcoff (1993) also suggests that the knowledges produced by epistemologies reflect the social locatedness of the particular theorist and that epistemologies have political effects insofar as they may have the effect of authorizing or

in both of these crucial institutions - a situation which not only warrants serious attention but political action as well as theoretical articulation. Hence, intellectuals contemplating the development of a radical democratic project must sufficiently confront the plight of both the media and educational systems. If critical scholars hope to eradicate racism, sexism, classism and homophobia and advance the notion of inclusion, they must be sure to address the exclusionary nature of both the media and the educational system since these are perhaps two of the most influential societal institutions.
disauthorizing certain kinds of voices and may legitimate or delegitimate given
discursive hierarchies and arrangements of speaking.

While her advocacy of cultivating a liberatory epistemology which would
open up discursive spaces to thus far excluded or marginalized people is
important, one must be cautious for such a project could potentially create a
scenario which reinscribes the banality of liberal pluralism. That is, a
quantitative increase in the number of voices "allowed" into the privileged
realm of epistemology production would not necessarily guarantee a qualitative
change in the kind of knowledge that is produced. Hence, the advancement
of a liberatory, radical epistemology must be grounded in the commitment to
change existing relations of capitalist power and privilege. Quite simply, we
must take seriously the thesis of Marx which suggests that we must not be
content with interpreting the world in different ways, but rather, be intent on
changing it.

Giroux argues that much of the work done under the rubric of
postmodern feminism has resuscitated the link between the personal and the
political\textsuperscript{41} and has brought to light the necessity of joining theory and praxis.

\textsuperscript{41}The slogan the personal is political has profound significance yet it has also
been confining at some level for it has often been interpreted as indicating that to
name one's personal pain in relation to structures of domination (i.e. patriarchy) was
all that was necessary. In addition, it also weakened the possibilities for
understanding the multifaceted nature of domination in terms of issues of race and
class while simultaneously undermining the creation of a politics of alliance. As
hooks points out, "naming one's personal pain was not sufficiently linked to overall
education for critical consciousness of collective political resistance...This often
happens in a feminist context when race and/or class are not seen as factors
determining the social construction of one's gendered reality and most importantly,
the extent to which one will suffer exploitation and domination." (1988:25) While the
...postmodern feminism makes visible the importance of grounding our visions in a political project, redefines the relationship between the margins and the centre around concrete political struggles, and offers the opportunity for a politics of voice that links rather than severs the relationship between the personal and the political as part of a broader struggle for justice and social transformation. (Giroux, 1992:73)

While Giroux, McLaren and others have written about the significance of postmodern feminism to critical pedagogical discourse, a number of feminist scholars have attacked critical pedagogy as a form of "empowering" education and have attempted to define a discourse of feminist pedagogy.  

---

notion that the personal is political is vital to the discourse of "difference" it is imperative to construct a trajectory about difference which does not simply "reproduce forms of liberal individualism" and which is not "at odds with a politics of solidarity." (Giroux, 1992:68)

---

42See for example "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through The Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy" by Elizabeth Ellsworth in Feminisms And Critical Pedagogy (Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, eds. 1992). In this chapter, Ellsworth claims that concepts in critical pedagogy such as "empowerment", "voice", "dialogue" and even "critical" are repressive myths which serve to perpetuate relations of domination. Ellsworth argues that the practical application of critical pedagogy's central tenets exacerbated the conditions female conditions were striving to work against - mainly Eurocentrism, racism, sexism, classism and "banking education". Furthermore, Ellsworth claims that the discourse of critical pedagogy has remained "abstract" and has stripped discussions of classroom practice of historical context and political position. While some might agree that critical pedagogical discourse has been at times abstract and inaccessible, Ellsworth has obviously chosen to ignore the vast literature within critical pedagogy which addresses the importance of historical memory and context. Indeed this has been a central concern of Giroux's which can be traced back to his early work in 1981 and 1983. The notion of historical context and memory is of paramount importance and should be appropriately dealt with in critical theoretical discourse, since it is precisely the subversive content of memory which the established society is fearful about as Herbert Marcuse so poignantly reminds us in Counterrevolution and Revolt. Furthermore, Ellsworth suggests that separatism is the only cogent political alternative for any type of pedagogical or political action. This is precisely the type of political disengagement and divide and
The debates among left-wing educational theorists have been fierce but have nonetheless provided valuable insights into the obstacles which must be overcome for the successful implementation of critical pedagogical practices. At the same time however, many of these debates have proven to be both hypocritical and counter-productive. Intellectuals on the Left have created their own Cold war scenario - a situation which not only restricts and subverts the possibility for building alliances and "bridges" but which also perpetuates the divide and rule strategy which in turn, creates favourable conditions for the continued Right-wing domination of educational and social reform.43

---

conquer strategy which must be avoided in Left educational discourse. In addition, her penchant for separatist politics further limits the potential for cultural workers to build alliances in the interest of promoting radical democratic principles. For a brief but insightful critique of Ellsworth's assertions see Aronowitz and Giroux (1991:132).

43Throughout this treatise, I have made reference to the conservative right and the fragmented left. For many this demarcation may intimate some kind of binary opposition and as such requires some degree of clarification. I am not suggesting that the Right is homogenous, united and conflict free for that would be a naive assertion. In fact, there are many factions within the new right ranging from the ultra-conservatism of the religious right to the more liberal conservatism characterized by the Clinton administration. However, there is some agreement that the new Right consists of a loose amalgam of "different sets on interests, that its organizing theoretical ideology includes an uneasy blend of many, sometimes contradictory, strands of political thought, and that it demonstrates a ready capacity for developing political rhetoric which both produces and taps contemporary popular concerns and discontents."(Kenway, 1990:168) As such, there is and has always been more a coherent, unifying strategy among right wing conservatives while the left has been distinguished by its incoherency. Marcuse effectively explains the fragmented nature of the Left and claims that this is inevitable because "while the predominant interest in private property and in the preservation of its institutions easily unites the defenders of the status quo, no such tangible common goal unites those who aim at abolishing the status quo. They work under an open horizon of several alternatives and goals, strategy and tactics." (1972:36) The current backlash against progressive scholars and activists could serve as the impetus for developing a politics of alliance but only if a common concern for democratic existence can unite the splintered forces
The observation which Abbie Hoffman made about the Left becomes blatant under such conditions. When asked if there was a conspiracy among himself and others involved in the infamous Chicago Eight Trial, Hoffman responded that "we couldn't agree on lunch". Hoffman's statement might just as well have been in reference to the academic Left. The fragmentation and infighting characteristic of Leftist politics and academic culture have indeed prevented progressive thinkers from "building bridges". Today, the accusation which many critical social theorists have lodged against positivists, namely that they succumb to methodological inhibition and fact fetishism and find themselves "busy-work" by counting more and more about less and less, might very well be applicable to academics on the Left, who instead of striving

on the Left.

44In *We Gotta Get Out Of This Place*, Lawrence Grossberg (1992:366) addresses the struggle over the Left and illustrates how the "politics of identity" has played into "efforts by the Right to marginalize many important struggles over both civil liberties and civil rights as 'special interests'. Yet Grossberg's critique is somewhat problematic in that he suggests that identity politics have given way to a "politics of guilt" which undermines the free and open discussion about the "necessity to put aside differences in the name of common political goals". (368) Grossberg credits this lack of free and open debate to an environment of political correctness. Rather than seeking to analyze the underlying significance of this debate, Grossberg succumbs, as have many on the Right, to a belief in the myth of the existence of "politically correct" monolith on campuses. This "myth" will be elaborated in chapter two. Nonetheless, it is necessary to illuminate the erroneous assumptions which Grossberg makes. Indeed, there are cases in which intransigent p.c. expectations are inflicted upon academics and scholars in the intellectual community, but this has not in and of itself created a politics of guilt. Rather, what Grossberg should have discussed are the dangers inherent in the some of the postmodern separatist versions of identity politics. Furthermore, it appears as if Grossberg has misinterpreted the p.c. debate, for at its core it is a controversy rooted in the political economy of knowledge, as McLaren vehemently argues. For a more detailed analysis of identity politics see chapter two.
to create a theory and politics of alliance. resort to deconstructing their colleagues' text and engaging in "journal" wars. Furthermore, the left has posed its critique in obscure language unintelligible to a broader public which has, according to Graff (1992), led even leftist critics to ponder whether this type of criticism is part of a viable offensive on inequality and injustice or whether it is an escape valve that permits intellectuals to sound off and then go about their business. In large part this may be attributed to a scholastic system which rewards publication in refereed journals which seemingly thrive on cryptic language and obscurity, all the while holding in disdain more popular scholarly publications which both reach and are intelligible to a broader audience. The "publish or perish" phenomenon may be viewed as a culprit in this scenario where quantity has gained ascendency over quality.45

Feminists of colour (Lorde, 1984; Anzaldua, 1990) have eloquently argued that many strands of feminist theory have surrendered to a "separatist" politics and as such have contributed to the fragmentation and hostility so detrimental to building bridges between progressive intellectuals. Moreover, bell hooks (1991) addresses the issue of separation among the Black intellectual community and suggests that scholars engage in a type of "insurgent"

45In Science Under Siege (1988), Beth Savan elaborates on the "publish or perish" phenomenon which has, in her view, become an obsessive epidemic in the academy. Quantity has gained ascendency over quality in that academic success and accomplishment are measured by the "number" of publications a scholar produces. This is the ultimate manifestation of the commodification of knowledge - a concern which bell hooks and Cornel West address in Breaking Bread (1991). hooks claims that traditional academic awards are withheld from transformative or insurgent intellectuals who attempt to appeal to a broad audience and who attempt to link their work in the academy with pressing social and political issues.
intellectualism which lays to rest the trivial and paltry politics among leftist intellectuals that precipitates incoherence and intolerance and that contributes to the failure in creating an effectual counterhegemonic force.

While she posits the need for alliance building, hooks maintains that "white" feminism cannot parade as the "universal" in the theorization of political struggle. In *Ain't I A Woman* (1981); *Feminist Theory: From Margin To Centre* (1984) and *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black* (1989), hooks points out that feminist theory and the feminist movement in North America has itself reflected a white woman's middle class experience and has in and of itself marginalized the voices of women of colour and women of poverty.

Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* is still heralded as having paved the way for the contemporary feminist movement...Friedan's famous phrase, 'the problem that has no name', often quoted to describe the condition of women in this society, actually referred to the plight of a select group of college-educated, middle and upper class, married white women...She ignored the existence of all non-white women and poor white women...She made her plight and the plight of white women like herself synonymous with a condition affecting all American women. In doing so, she deflected attention away from her classism, her racism, her sexist attitudes towards the masses of American women. (hooks, 1984:1-2)

Here hooks demonstrates the inherent exclusionary nature of feminist discourse in North America. When considered within the current so-called "politically correct" environment, her observations are telling. Feminists who accuse the curriculum of being too centred on Dead White European Males
often fail to take into account the voices of others who have been even more marginalized. hooks also rages against those strands of feminist thought which reduce oppression to a single cause - that of gender. She calls into question those strands of feminist thought which ignore women's differences in terms of race and class. As she interrogates the problems inherent in white "mainstream" feminism, hooks also articulates succinctly the dangers of pursuing a separatist politics and instead advocates a politics of solidarity.

Working collectively to confront difference, to expand our awareness of sex, race and class as interlocking systems of domination, of the ways we reinforce and perpetuate these structures is the context in which we learn the true meaning of solidarity...While the struggle to eradicate sexism and sexist oppression is and should be the primary thrust of the feminist movement, to prepare ourselves politically for this effort we must first learn how to be in solidarity, how to struggle with one another. (hooks, 1989:25)

hooks appeal for solidarity is one which is indeed echoed in the work of critical pedagogists and her many and varied insights prove invaluable to the creation of a border pedagogy. So while feminism has great contributions to make to critical pedagogy, those feminisms which valorize gender segregation and others which dismiss the works of progressive white intellectuals must be avoided.

At a time when we are confronted with an environment of political transgression in which democracy and democratic relations are being rolled back and in some cases subverted, we become compelled as educators to cast aside less serious theoretical disputes and minor ideological discrepancies. Rather we must tend to the responsibility of fulfilling the role of the
transformative intellectual who channels his or her energy into altering the oppressive and exploitative conditions which confront us daily.

**Border Pedagogy**

Critical pedagogists have in essence attempted to construct a transdisciplinary and multitheoretical discourse committed to the reconstruction of radical democracy. While rejecting particular conservative and reductionist aspects of modernism, the apolitical and nihilistic character of some strands of postmodernism, separatist tendencies of certain versions of feminist theory, and various shortcomings of other theoretical schools, Giroux and McLaren and others have sought to appropriate their most emancipatory attributes in the interest of developing a liberatory border pedagogy.

Border pedagogy is committed to cultivating a democratic public philosophy that appreciates difference within the context of a common struggle to advance the quality of public life. In this sense, such a stance enables one to see how educational work can be connected to the broader struggle to reclaim democratic public life. In *Border Crossings*, Giroux delineates a variety of theoretical considerations which need to be articulated if the discourse of border pedagogy is to be viable and relevant to the effort of resuscitating "democracy" in the fullest sense.

According to Giroux, border pedagogy acknowledges the "epistemological, political, cultural, and social margins that structure the language of history, power and difference." (1992:28) In other words, it points
to the possibility of examining the barriers which have been erected in
domination and the ways in which they may be contested and redefined. The
various theoretical schools which have criticized not only academic borders but
barriers between the academy and community are precisely those which are
being denigrated by conservative Right-wing scholars in the current "political
correctness" controversy. While this will be fodder for a subsequent chapter,
it is necessary to point out that it is the progressive educators who have
engaged in the critique of dominant academic discourse and practices, who
have come under fire and been charged with being "p.c."

Border pedagogy also emphasizes the importance of creating a
pedagogical environment where individuals may become border crossers and
in which they can begin to comprehend "Otherness". Engaging in border
crossing not only provides the opportunity to reterritorialize and
reconceptualize those boundaries which have served to marginalize and limit
particular identities, it also allows those thus far excluded to come to "voice".
Border pedagogy then posits the need for those labelled "Others" to reclaim
their histories, visions and voices. In Talking Back, bell hooks articulates the
significance of voice within the context of radical educational practice. Coming
to voice represents

...moving from silence into speech as revolutionary
gesture...coming to voice is an act of resistance.
Speaking becomes both a way to engage in active
self-transformation and a rite of passage where one
moves from being object to being subject. Only as
subjects can we speak. As objects, we remain
voiceless - our beings defined and interpreted by
others...Awareness of the need to speak, to give
voice to the varied dimensions of our lives. is one way to begin the process of education for critical consciousness. (hooks, 1988:12-13)

The emphasis in border pedagogy and by hooks, on the notion of voice, reveals once again the dialectical nature of this discourse and its resistance to mainstream social theories which tend to separate subject and object and which are thus inherently oppressive and exclusionary. Furthermore, it points to the necessity of creating a pedagogy which engages in a critical questioning of the "omissions and tensions" which exist between those narratives and hegemonic discourses which constitute the official "canon" or "curriculum" and the "self-representations of subordinate groups as they might appear in 'forgotten' or erased histories, texts, memories, experiences, and community narratives." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:128)

Border pedagogy also makes apparent the ways in which those historically and socially constructed borders which we inherit frame our social relations. Furthermore, as part of a broader politics of difference, border pedagogy stresses the language of the political and the ethical. Within the discourse of border pedagogy, ethics is taken up as

...a struggle against inequality and as a discourse for expanding basic human rights...in pedagogical terms, an ethical discourse needs to be taken up with regard to the relations of power, subject positions, and social practices it activates...It is...grounded in historical struggles and attentive to the construction of social relations free of injustice. (Giroux, 1992:74)
In sum, border pedagogy emphasizes the notion of inclusion, difference, voice, participation and "citizenship" education and also advances the concept that schools be viewed as democratic public spheres. It also strives to link an emancipatory concept of modernism with a postmodernism of resistance. It emphasizes the need for academics to work with dispossessed groups and in conjunction with social movements. In this sense, it stresses the necessity for educators to assume a public and social role; in other words, to become transformative intellectuals.

**Transformative Intellectuals**

Although the academy is circumscribed by its socio-economic context and most often contributes to the manufacturing of an "intelligentsia" which produces knowledge conducive to the maintenance of the status quo (Chomsky, 1981), it nonetheless remains one of the principal locations in advanced capitalist society for the articulation of radically oppositional knowledge. (Chomsky, 1988; Kellner, 1984) Hence, the university as a space for intervention must be engaged, head-on, extensively and unrelentingly. This is no part-time task, it requires the dedication of intellectual activists who are willing to commit themselves to this struggle. These activists must work from within the academy and at the edges - the borders - of its connections with extra-academic institutions. Of course, this plea could easily be deemed as utopian, unrealistic, perhaps even foolish for it requires that intellectuals relinquish their "privileged" positions. Yet, the painful realities and legacies
of oppression pervasive in our society demand that intellectual activists work in solidarity with the oppressed towards change.

The concept of the "transformative" intellectual points to the import of defining academic work within its broader social, political and cultural context. It accentuates the urgent need to link scholarly pursuits with the project of reclaiming and reconstructing "democracy". More than twenty years ago, C. Wright Mills described what he deemed to be the retreat of the intellectual. He critiqued those academics who withdrew from public life and instead indulged in a world of "facts" and statistics. In doing so, academics avoided the real task of social analysis. Throughout his academic career, Mills expressed his disdain for those intellectuals who abstained from political participation and public life. Mills argued eloquently the need for reconstructing a public sphere where intellectuals could assume their societal responsibility. In "The Social Role of the Intellectual", Mills proclaimed that the New Left must act as intellectuals, as "public men". More recently, Russell Jacoby (1987) documented the demise of the public intellectual and despite the fact that Jacoby's claims often echo a nostalgia for the "good old days", he effectively argues that academics have succumbed to professionalization, specialization and the academic division of labour. Mills, Jacoby and a host of other scholars including Gramsci, Innis and Chomsky have argued that the fundamental role of the intellectual is to expose exploitative and oppressive conditions and work towards their transformation.
The notion of the transformative intellectual represents an integral part of critical pedagogical discourse. A transformative intellectual strives to make the pedagogical more political and the political more pedagogical. That is, education and teaching are viewed as part of political life and democratic struggle. A transformative intellectual may be defined as

...someone who knows about his or her field, has a wide breadth of knowledge about other aspects of the world...who has the courage to question authority and who refuses to act counter to his or her own experience and judgement. (Kohl cited in Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985:33)

Educators who assume the role of the "transformative" intellectual and who engage in what hooks and West call "insurgent" intellectualism⁴⁶, treat students as critical active agents, and question epistemological presuppositions and the distribution and selection of what constitutes knowledge. Furthermore, they engage students in dialogue and make knowledge and learning relevant, critical and ultimately emancipatory. However, their intellectual work is not confined to the classroom or to the world of academia but also permeates the community. Transformative

⁴⁶In Breaking Bread, bell hooks and Cornel West engage in a dialogue about "insurgent intellectualism". Insurgent intellectualism links the academy to the community, joins theory and practice, thought to lived experience, and the personal to the political. In his essay entitled "The Dilemma of the Black Intellectual", West critiques the "star" system within academia. He is extremely critical of what he and hooks deem "bourgeois" models of intellectual life which conceive of the intellectual solely in individualistic terms. West argues that his insurgency model overcomes such individualism and provides the basis upon which collective intellectual work can aspire to resistance and social transformation. He writes, "Instead of the solitary hero...the intellectual as star, celebrity, commodity - this model privileges collective intellectual work that contributes to communal resistance and struggle." (1991:144)
intellectuals attempt to work in solidarity with the oppressed and also extend their work into non-academic publics, all the while remaining cautious about assuming the role of the "cultural expert". 47

For an eloquent statement on the function and necessity of engaging in transformative intellectualism, it is worth quoting McLaren at length.

...teachers must function as more than agents of social critique. They must attempt to fashion a language of hope that points to new forms of social and material relations attentive to the principles of freedom and justice...Critical discourse must be more than simply a form of cultural dissonance, more than a siphoning away of the potency of dominant meanings and social relations. It must function instead to create a democratic community built upon a language of public association and a commitment to social transformation...We must be united in the face of overwhelming odds, and the pedagogy we use must be capable of inflating the human capacity to vie with the forces of domination at a scale that makes us reject despair and refuse capitulation to the status quo...The perilous and immense task ahead of us is to engage the real needs of the oppressed and to foster an unending commitment to their empowerment. (McLaren, 1989:242)

Of late, there has been an enormous amount of dialogue about the role of the public intellectual, as hooks and West(1991) claim, yet they also note that traditional academic rewards are often withheld from transformative or insurgent intellectuals. This is not only because they often attempt to appeal

47 In his discussion regarding the perils of assuming the role of the "cultural expert", McLaren (in press) situates his argument within the politics of "voice". Following Freire (1971), McLaren warns against speaking "for" subaltern groups and instead advocates the notions of speaking "with" and/or speaking "of" members of oppressed groups without assuming any form of Eurocentric arrogance.
to a wider audience, but because they are often deemed subversive and radical and are marginalized in the academy. Despite the fact that the conservative right and the mainstream media would have us believe the academy is being taken over by left-wing radicals, in fact only 4.9% of academics surveyed in the United States identified themselves as leftist. (McLaren, in press)

For the most part, schools and universities are still bastions of conservatism which resist progressive agendas (as the current p.c. debate affirms) and which exalt a view of pedagogical practice which is rooted in technological rationality and corporate imperatives. Those scholars who have engaged in the rigorous articulation of the curriculum and current pedagogical practices with the intention of broadening academic discourse to include those voices and histories of marginalized people have encountered fervent opposition and even oppression.

...educators who work in the public schools and the universities are currently witnessing a well-orchestrated and singularly barbaric assault on efforts by progressive educators to make race, class and gender issues central to the curriculum...The new left literacies that have been influenced by forms of continental social theory, feminist theory and critical social theory in their many forms (postmodernist, post-colonialist, post-structuralist, etc.) are being attacked by conservative critics as a subversion of the political neutrality and ideological disinterestedness that they claim the enterprise of education is all about. Of course, the real fear here is that the call among critical social theorists to rewrite the cultural, political, and social codes and privileging norms of the dominant society will threaten the linguistic, academic and racial borders currently in place. (McLaren, in press)
Furthermore, the attempts to address the inherent exclusionary and thus oppressive nature of the academy’s ideological underpinnings have been decontextualized, trivialized and denigrated in the form of the "political correctness" debate. Therefore, sifting through the hyperbole and rhetoric of political correctness - the focus of the following chapters - is a necessary first step in unmasking the fundamental issues involved in the controversy and launching a politics of refusal.
CHAPTER TWO

The Post-Cold War

This country is being systematically communized, perhaps unconsciously, through its educational institutions. These institutions are instruments through which left-wing theories and philosophies may be and are taught to large groups of young people by persons whom they respect and trust - their instructors. That process has been going on for years, in an insidious manner.48

These sentiments were expressed by Representative George Dondero of Michigan in 1946, yet they resound with apodeictic familiarity now in the early 1990's as conservative critics charge so-called "left-wing" educators with forms of political indoctrination and academic fascism. The new Right and their crusading army of Norman Rockwell prototypes have painted the alleged p.c. campus environment like Hieronymus Bosch's vision of hell. Accusations lodged against progressive educators, of politicizing campuses may be construed however, as merely another indication of the way in which the new Right has mastered the art of constructing domestic "enemies" so that issues such as racism, classism, sexism, homophobia and a plethora of other quandaries are no longer addressed in serious terms.

With the Cold War over, the new Right and the mainstream media have announced a new war on the so-called leftists in the academy. It is a war therefore, not of weapons but of ideas. Rather than soldiers, its armies are

48This quote was cited in an article written by Bruce Shapiro for The Nation, May 21, 1990 entitled "Rad-Baiting Comes To Brookline". (p.705-706)
comprised of right-wing ideologues, media pundits, university faculty and students. The enemy is "political correctness".

A confederation comprised of conservative and media cognoscenti has sounded a "red" alert, for if we are to believe them, campuses all across North America are being taken over by a left-wing cabal of Sixties radicals who have now brazenly assumed positions of authority in universities. While the campus and media debacles will be addressed in chapters three and four, I will briefly describe how the new Right and the media have defined the so-called "politically correct".

**Political Correctness**

The term "political correctness" was once a phrase used by the Left as a form of self-mockery and its origins can be traced back to the "mid to late 1960's within the Black Power movement and the New Left." (Perry,1992:71) To the extent that it had any referent prior to its current application, "politically correct" was a "low-level, self-deprecating in-joke among leftists, who sometimes teased one another for confusing radical gestures with radical politics." (Raskin,1992:31) "Politically correct" thus applied, in a delicately chastising way, to people who thought of radical political engagement as the willingness to embrace ascetic language conventions without assuming active political engagement. In this sense, "political correctness" described a frozen politics of hollow gestures.

...the "politically correct" were not being faulted for being too radical, but for being too "liberal", that is, having a surplus of preachy self-righteousness but a deficit of analysis and courage. The term's implicit
critique was that a person's politics were not ethically serious, and therefore not radical enough. (Raskin, 1992:31)

Ironically then, the phrase "p.c." was first used by radicals as a sarcastic reference to those on the left whose political activity showed a greater concern for the form of oppression rather than, its substance. Apart from that esoteric context, "political correctness" had no ecumenical value and did not insinuate any rigid set of political positions. As Raskin points out, political correctness

...has never existed, as a body of political ideas. It is not an ideology, like socialism, liberalism, or nationalism, nor is it an organized (or disorganized) social movement. Nor is it a world view, a moral philosophy, a partisan organization, an intellectual trend, or even an academic faction. (1992:31)

The term however, has since been appropriated by the new Right and has assumed an entourage of defining characteristics. Enforcers of today's fragile status quo now commission the term to describe any political position which

...disputes the soundness of our economic life, the validity of the assertion that racism and sexism no longer influence our society, the infallibility of corporate power, the nobility of right-wing culture, the value of militarism... (Raskin, 1992:31)

Despite the fact that they have helped to create the illusion of a monolithic group of politically correct crusaders, the truth is that criticisms of existing pedagogical practices and assumptions have been launched by countless groups and activists. Yet according to conservative pundits, political correctness is apparently

...the program of a generation of campus radicals who grew up in the 60's and are now achieving
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positions of academic influence. If they no longer talk of taking to the streets, it is because they are now gaining access to the conventional weapons of campus politics: social pressure, academic perks (including tenure) and when they have the administration on their side -- outright coercion. (Newsweek.1990:48)

These and other similar narratives proclaim that North American campuses have been engulfed by p.c. thought police who are conducting witch hunts against people with whom they disagree: conservative students, right-wing lecturers, or professors who uphold the "canon" of Western literature and thought. Once the crusade of far-right crackpots, the attack on political correctness has become one of the centrepieces in the conservative social agenda. Interestingly enough, when p.c. is examined in terms of political power, it is no longer an equal struggle between the left and the right, but rather the dominance of conservative forces. (Gitlin.1991) This of course is not to suggest that everything is false merely because the Right says it is true. In other words it is not to insinuate that marginalized minorities and groups who are critical of the dominant culture are always immune to dogmatism since there is evidence to suggest that at some level, there are many who impose the edicts of political correctness on a superficial plane in that they demand the incorporation of "correct" words and phrases.

In this sense p.c. is a politics of linguistics - people assume "radical" identities that "maintain the hyperindividualism of the 80s." (Tikkun, May/June,1993:62) Of course, this points to a vacuous devotion to formative concerns rather than a commitment to substantive political issues for verbal
uplift does not a revolution make. It is in this sense, a reflection of ludic postmodern concerns with "discursive" practices.

Yet it is precisely these types of obdurate expectations demanded by some, which has made political correctness an effective ploy to recruit "liberals" to the conservative camp. As Goldstein (1991:39) points out, "if you want to capture the liberal elite, give it an Enemy Within." Kellner calls attention to the public relations prose embodied in much of the anti-p.c. rhetoric which seeks to attract liberals to a conservative agenda. (Nov.29,1991) Goldstein reminds us that it was precisely the acquiescence of liberals to form an alliance with the right that facilitated the anticommunist purge of political radicals in the universities during the McCarthy era. Yet it is imperative to recognize that the p.c. controversy is really a misinterpretation of the political economy of knowledge - of the knowledge industry itself - wherein certain knowledges become legitimated over others under the "guise of objectivity and neutrality." (McLaren,in press)

Furthermore, from under the banner of p.c. the new Right has set their sights well beyond curriculum guidelines and academic disputes. Anti-p.c. sentiment is about much more than curriculum for it is being used to justify attacks on affirmative action, multiculturalism and a host of other concerns

---

49 Goldstein (1991:41) claims that the appeal of anti-p.c. verbosity to liberals "reflects the perception that the right is less threatening than radical feminists, queer nationals, black separatists."

50 In Naming Names, Victor S. Navasky describes in dazzling detail, the impact of McCarthyism and liberal acquiescence to strong-arm tactics. A more detailed discussion of McCarthyism is provided in chapter four.
and programs. Political correctness has been used as a label and as a shorthand for many anxieties.

What could be simpler than to detect and denounce the insidious menace of p.c. just as others denounced the Red Menace forty years ago...and the p.c. horror is good soundbite politics, conflating every Left cause imaginable...(Cockburn,1991:685)

In many ways the crusade against political correctness is merely another manifestation of the "backlash" against the significant reforms won by the radical movements of the 1960's and 1970's for as Aronowitz and Giroux point out "running against the 1960's has become nearly a sure-fire prescription for political success." (1991:3)

This type of attack was blatantly obvious during the Republican Convention in August of 1992. While the recent Democratic victory in the United States may help to mediate the impact that this backlash has had, Marilyn Quayle's claims that not everybody during the Sixties "had sex, took drugs and dropped out" was met with resounding applause by her fellow Republicans. Yet it remains to be seen whether or not the recent Democratic victory represents a rejection of the conservatism of the Eighties.51 Although it appears that the economy was the deciding factor in the recent election,

51Michael Apple claims that even with the election of a more moderate Democrat, the Right has had a truly major and damaging impact on social policies and states that there can be no doubt that "this is a time of rightist resurgence in education." (1993:9) In fact, Noam Chomsky asserts that the "Democrats" participated forcefully in the right-ward turn and suggests that the claim that Democrats represent "special interests" is a distorted and fallacious account. Chomsky maintains that the underlying philosophy of the Democratic party does not reflect "special interests" but rather "other elements of the 'national interest"'. (1991:3)
many believe that the ultra-right wing conservatism of the GOP convention may have had an impact on some individuals and groups. While I will not endeavour to analyze these issues in detail they are relevant merely because they bring to mind the political, social, and cultural context of the Fifties which paved the way for the revolts of the Sixties. Indeed several observers have suggested that the Reagan-Bush era represented an effort to turn back the clock to the Fifties.\textsuperscript{52} Whether or not we witness the growth of collective social activism in the 1990's is unknown and dependent on a number of factors including the fragmented nature characteristic of "identity politics" and the new social movements.\textsuperscript{53}

Since one of the main contentions of anti-p.c. crusaders is that the Sixties are the root of all current evil it is necessary to briefly re-evaluate the

\textsuperscript{52}Joe Kincheloe contends that part "of the mythology that the right-wing has created to sustain its power involves the portrayal of a golden age of American education...Ronald Reagan built a career on creating nostalgia for this golden age...Right-wingers make little attempt to hide the fact that it was the reformers of the 'permissive' 1960s that defiled our grand traditions. It was a great story and it worked beautifully. Ward and June Cleaver are under siege, the right wing argued, by the non-traditional destroyers of the family unit - the gays, the liberals, the feminists, and the militant Blacks. To regain Wally and Beaver's utopian childhood in mythical Mayfield, we must support an Ozzie Nelson-like president and his comforting homilies about the American past." (cited in Steinburg, in press)

\textsuperscript{53}The perils embodied within the notion of "identity politics" will be discussed in further detail in the subsequent chapter. It is however important to note that the development of identity politics and the new social movements exude in their extreme manifestations, a kind of militant separatism and an emphasis on the local, the specific and the notion of "difference". While it is imperative to incorporate a politics of difference within radical democratic strategy, solidarity between various minority groups is a necessary prerequisite for collective and efectual counterhegemonic activity.

111
turbulent events which occurred and the historical significance which that
decade holds for the Left today.

The Sixties: Tumultuous Decade

There is often a proclivity to romanticize the past, to crown it with a
nostalgic halo, especially at a time when scepticism, dolour and
disillusionment are vividly represented. Yet, historical memory possesses the
profound potential to navigate the course for the future.

The legacy of the Sixties possesses significant and profound insights for
progressive activists and educators now in the Nineties. Romanticizing the
sixties however, is perilous for they were earmarked by mistakes and illusions,
some inconsequential, some abysmal. Yet one cannot repudiate the fervent
political intensity which symbolized the uprisings and protests of that decade.
For a moment, an intoxicating and unabashedly utopian vision of democracy
was unleashed and flung in the sombre faces of capitalist demagogues. It is
this optimistic, unbridled commitment to democratic existence that can serve
as the guiding light through the portentous and precarious journey upon
which we must embark if our goal is a more humane, egalitarian and
democratic society.

There are undeniably a number of analogies which can be drawn
between campus activities in the Sixties and current social configurations
however, before attempting to delineate similarities and differences it is
imperative to put the Sixties in perspective -- to address that decade
contextually. In other words, in order to comprehend the Sixties and all which
that decade came to mean, one must contextualize it and consider its roots in the Fifties, for as Gitlin points out, "the surprises of the Sixties were planted there." (1987:12)

The Fifties were an era in which the key word had been security. Youth appeared intent on being absorbed into the comfortable, conformist, yet "affluent" life of their elders. The benefits and indulgences of consumer culture and suburbia were available, affordable and desirable. In *The Sixties: Years Of Hope, Days Of Rage*, Todd Gitlin describes the influence which the Fifties' mentality had on the development of the radicalized movements of the Sixties. Gitlin examines the culture and institutions of the Fifties and how they presented themselves to youth and how that youth was eventually motivated to remake history. He claims that this generation

...was formed in the jaws of an extreme and wrenching tension between the assumption of affluence and its opposite, a terror of loss, destruction and failure. Affluence...was assumed to be a national condition, not just a personal standing...affluence was an irresistible economic and psychological fact in a society that made material production and acquisition its central activities. (Gitlin,1987:12)

Consumerism, materialism and individualism were the values most espoused, the quest for the American dream and the pursuit of happiness were all-encompassing activities.

The fifties was an era of tremendous conformity. People thought of little beyond material success. The stereotype was the status seeker...dressed in a certain way and had something of a shopping mall mentality...just about everyone bought this whole vision of America as an empire, which is sort of the
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shopping mall vision on a global scale. (Hoffman, 1989:392)

This generation was dubbed, accordingly as "The Silent Generation". Yet, the affluent fifties was not without its discontents. Despite the belief that conformity was supposed to buy contentment, that freedom could be bought at a bargain basement sale. "satisfaction kept slipping out of reach...the affluent society was awash with the fear of the uncontrollable." (Gitlin, 1987:21)

Hoffman (1989) argues that the Fifties were not only conformist but increasingly repressive as well. Communist witch hunts, covert CIA atrocities and activities abounded on campuses and abroad. The realization that these actions went against everything "democracy" was supposed to mean gave birth to an unprecedented climate of resistance; a resistance not only to the oppression but to the ideals of the affluent society, and to what "education" meant. It was also a resistance which left an indelible and lasting mark in history. Suddenly - or at least it seemed sudden - the silence was broken.

On February 1, 1960, four black students from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College sat in at a segregated lunch counter in Greensboro, and were arrested for trespassing. Within a month, their lead had been followed by students from predominantly black colleges and high schools in the upper South and in Alabama. The sit-in, accompanied by marches, picketing and boycotts of various kinds, became the characteristic tactic of the new movement for integration. More than 300 students were arrested at Southern sit-ins the first month of the new movement. (D. Hoffman, 1990) The struggle for civil rights became the focus of activism in the sixties. Indeed, it
remained one of the most significant protest issues in the early part of that
decade.\textsuperscript{54}

In May of 1960, students from Berkeley and San Francisco State
picketed the HUAC hearings in San Francisco. They challenged the activities
of the HUAC which was suppressing political activity and diversity. Many were
arrested and many more received a kind of "political baptism" when police
cleared the steps of City Hall with the aid of fire hoses. (Kitchell, 1990)

The Free Speech Movement started at Berkeley in 1964 as a protest
against new directives designed to prohibit the use of a twenty-six-foot strip
of university property for "on-campus solicitation of funds and planning and
recruitment of off-campus social and political action." (Lipset &
Wolin, 1965:109) The Free Speech Movement was a groundbreaking event as
students asserted their right to organize politically on campus in the face of
attempts by the university administration to ban such activity. Within three
months, the protest movement which succeeded in promoting boycotts of
classes and a sit-in at the university's administration building, gradually
expanded its demands to insist on the "elimination of all university restrictions
of political activity on campus." (Lipset & Wolin, 1965:341) The FSM,
ostensibly nonpolitical, was the first major campus movement to actually

\textsuperscript{54}This however is not to suggest that the struggle for civil rights in the African-
American community began in the Sixties for the civil rights struggle "really began
following World War Two, culminated in several important events in the mid to late
1950s, then carried over into the 1960s." Ray Davis (1990:29-30) reminds us that
the "sixties marked a time when whites in the U.S., especially the young, became
involved in social activism as a result of the groundwork laid by the African-American
community."
succeed in shutting down a prestige institution. The FSM drew the most radical lessons of the civil rights movement and applied them to campus life at large. (Buhle, 1992:519)

Although student unrest began long before the war in Vietnam ever escalated to massive proportions, there is little doubt that the conflict was a major factor influencing student dissent in the 1960's. The 1965 Bay Area Vietnam Day Committee (VDC) organized one of the largest of the early protests directed at halting the war process or at least constraining active conscription. (Buhle, 1992:519) In many ways the war served as a catalyst for the unification of the New Left.

Vietnam was the first television war, and it was the war, more than any other issue, that radicalized people and spurred them to direct action. (Lee & Shlain, 1985:133)

Protests on campuses also brought about a considerable rethinking of educational practices, especially those which condemned the student to a purely passive role.

During the 1960's and the early 1970's, a volley of challenges were aimed at the accepted order...War, racism, class, nationalism, the environment, sexuality, the nature of consciousness, culture, work, lifestyle - all were radically, substantially, sometimes explosively reconsidered...then came protests against an alienating education system. (Peck, 1985:xiii)

Indeed, critics in the Sixties raged against the hypocrisy of the educational system. While the official rhetoric used in defining what education should entail embodied the notion that the process should be one which fosters the
development of free, autonomous, responsible and active individuals -- the citizen in the best sense of the word -- the educational system with its academic division of labour and its separation of facts from values was failing the expectations of students and faculty alike. As one astute critic observed

Irrelevancy, meaninglessness, boredom, and fragmentation are the kinds of attributes that are becoming more and more applicable to mass education... We are becoming a people required to know more and more about less and less. (Davidson, 1967:9)

Furthermore, the university in the Sixties was being attacked for its increasing reliance on corporate funding and for the invasion of capitalist ideology into the educational system. Analyzing the writings of Chancellor Clark Kerr, who minimized undergraduate education and boasted instead of the university's service to corporations and the state, Hal Draper and other FSM leaders developed an ideology that linked student dissatisfaction at UC to the larger political and economic forces changing the university and American society. Draper voiced the opinion that perhaps academia had sold out to just those materialistic values which it was supposed to hold in contempt when he said

You can decide whether you will act - for justice and for your social and moral imperatives as you see them - or whether you're going to be simply another misguided Organization Man... (1969:324)

Moreover, statements such as those put forth by Clark Kerr, president of the University of California during the 1960's, which described the university as a "knowledge factory" were challenged and critiqued by
progressive students and faculty members. Kerr maintained that the university's principle function was to serve the needs of industry, government and the military. For Kerr, the university or the "knowledge factory" had become a "prime interest of national purpose". (quoted in Draper, 1965:200) In other words, educational institutions had become appendages to, and were transformed by, corporate capitalism. They had become corporations whose purpose was to produce a trained workforce and to produce ideas which were convenient to the status quo. To a great extent it was this type of mentality which served as the inspiration for protest movements and unabashed challenges to the established order.

In 1964, Mario Savio responded to Kerr's conception of the university as a "knowledge factory" as a place "where nobody knows my name". At a mass rally in front of Sproul Hall attended by thousands, Mario Savio denounced the university as a factory for processing students - its raw material - into standardized personnel.

There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes one so sick at heart that you can’t take part, you can’t even tacitly take part, and you have to put your body upon the gears and the wheels, upon all the apparatus, and you’ve got to stop it. You’ve got to indicate to the people who run it, the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working. (cited in Lee & Shlain, 1985:127)

Savio's statement clearly exemplifies the demeanour of Sixties protest. Resistance to bureaucracy and the capitalist apparatus spread as students cringed at the thought of being relegated to the status of cogs in a machine.
or nameless, faceless members of an inhumane technological society. The university was critiqued by many for resembling a factory-like abyss, which served to manufacture vassals for the vicissitudes of corporate capitalism and whose professors/spokespersons imparted a kind of "one-dimensional", misanthropic worldview to students.

In his recent book *Roll Over Beethoven: The Return Of Cultural Strife* (1993), Stanley Aronowitz discusses the significance of the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley for it

...condemned not only Chancellor Clark Kerr's idea of the university as a rationalized, corporate, and military-dominated institution, but offered the rudiments of a critique of curriculum, the academic division of labour, and authoritarian styles of pedagogy...Whatever there specific critiques, the new radicals agreed that they wanted, and expected, that universities would meet their needs for an education that prepared them to participate in the struggle for social change...Instead of education, they were offered training. (1993:49)

Aronowitz discusses the activities of many black as well as, working class students, who became acutely aware of how regnant academic discourses systematically excluded their cultures and histories. Moreover, Aronowitz argues that the originality of the Free Speech Movement was, in retrospect, its challenge to the role of universities as repositories of legitimate intellectual knowledge. He also argues that with this challenge came a fundamental questioning of the role of the intellectual as students began to ask whether the professoriate were "agents or opponents of the bureaucratic state and equally important, in whose interest was the curriculum formed." (Aronowitz,1993:50)
The debates surrounding p.c. and the curriculum reform now in the nineties strike a remarkable similarity to the challenges and demands articulated by sixties radicals although the forms of protest one sees today are hardly on the same scale. Furthermore, in the Sixties the debates about segregation, the Vietnam war and the free speech movement were characterized by the endless questioning of what democracy and freedom had become and who had the power to define what they meant. The recognition that democracy was yet an unrealized ideal -- that it was in Gramscian terms a site of contested terrain -- resulted in a rethinking of what it was that democracy entailed.

One of the most passionate pleas for "democracy" in North American history was epitomized in The Fort Huron Statement. Drafted by Students For A Democratic Society (SDS) under the auspices of Tom Hayden between June 11-15, 1962. The Fort Huron Statement became one of the pivotal documents of the New Left in the Sixties. (Peck:1985) It was an incomparable and eloquent examination of the moral, economic and political deficiencies of the most powerful country in the world. It appealed to the development of consciousness and for political activity against the dominant ideology of the Cold War era. (Buhle,1992:518) This statement helped to popularize the idea of "participatory democracy", an idea which had a profound influence on the radical politics of the decade and which served as the principal idea defining the New Left. Based for the most part on the experience of the civil rights movement, the polyglot radicalism known as the "new" Left made its presence felt on campuses. Its politics, decisively detached from the norms of
communist, socialist and other past "left" movements stressed human rights and participatory democracy. (Buhle,1992:516-517)

Participatory democracy\textsuperscript{55} was defined by a "charge to action" and to "active participation" and "citizenship". Hence, the concepts of political participation and an educated citizenry symbolized the underlying philosophy of the radical student movements of the Sixties and the Port Huron Statement indicted the university, academics and the curriculum.

Our professors and administrators sacrifice controversy to public relations; their curricula change more slowly than the living events of the world; their skills and silence are purchased by investors in the arms race; passion is called unscholastic. The questions we might want raised - what is really important? can we live in a different and better way? if we wanted to change society, how would we do it? - are not thought to be questions of a "fruitful, empirical nature," and thus are brushed aside. (The Port Huron Statement reprinted in The Socialist Review, 1987:109)

This statement not only exudes a disdain for the positivist rationality which permeated the university, it also spoke to the necessity of making the curriculum relevant to temporal practical relations. Furthermore, these movements took seriously the promise of democracy and for the most part,

\textsuperscript{55}In the Port Huron Statement, SDS members articulated several root principles as they related to participatory democracy. In essence they argued that participatory democracy had to be based upon decision making carried out by public groupings, that politics has the purpose of bringing people out of isolation and into community. For an insightful and illuminating re-evaluation of the pertinence of SDS activities and The Port Huron Statement see "Port Huron: Agenda For A Generation" by Richard Flacks, Jim Hawley, Michael Harrington and Barbara Haber in Socialist Review, May-August, 1987, vol.17, no.3&4, pp.105-166.
their radicalism was a consequence of their growing disillusionment with capitalist democracy.

While both champions and critics of the era may disagree about the subsequent progression or digression which succeeded that decade, no one can deny that what is called the "Sixties" exemplifies an unparalleled and thus far unmatched devotion to critique and emancipation.

...beneath the Sixties' dramatic displays of iron certainty, invisible from the outside, there were questions, endless questions, running debates that took their point from the divine premise that everything was possible and therefore it was important to think, because ideas have consequences. Unravelling, rethinking, refusing to take for granted, thinking without limits - that calling was...the spirit of the Sixties. (Gitlin, 1987:7)

Sixties radicals disputed the university's leading positions - impartiality, objectivity and value-neutrality, claiming that these positions were inconceivable in a society where knowledge was always connected to issues of power. Research in the 1960's and 1970's directed its attention to the cultural context of the dominant curriculum and began to exhibit the ideological foundations of "knowledge". Revelations about how educational practices reflected the ideologies and practices of governing social groups came to the fore. Inquiries into the subcultures of the oppressed and marginalized demonstrated how the educational system failed to value their specific experiences, histories and voices. Furthermore, it revealed how the "interplay with formal education became destructive and divisive for disadvantaged groups." (Connell, 1989:119)
Moreover, the Sixties gave birth to a number of intellectual advances which questioned the prevailing quantitative, empiricist and positivist notions of social theory and research. These approaches developed as a result of the increasing dissatisfaction with mainstream theories and methodologies which seemed unable to adequately grasp the nature of social reality.

The new paradigms of phenomenology, ethnomethodology, structuralism, Marxism, feminism and other critical theories offered new conceptions, which claimed to be more adequate in characterizing contemporary society and in providing inspiration, and guidance for transforming it. (Kellner, 1990:11)

Ruminations of the influence of continental theory and French philosophy were also being felt within the academy, mainly in the humanities and in the area of literary criticism. In addition, the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, especially that of Marcuse, grew in popularity.\(^{56}\) Marcuse's "Great Refusal" became one of the slogans for Sixties' radicalism and One Dimensional Man helped to show a "generation of political radicals what was wrong with the system they were struggling against." (Kellner, 1984:280) Looking back, one can recognize the political relevance which Marcuse's ideas held for Sixties radicals, for his unyielding and caustic critiques of advanced capitalism, the oppression of blacks and other minorities, and the hellish realities of war spoke eloquently and explicitly to a generation disenchanted with and disillusioned by the barbarism of Western civilization. *An Essay On*

---

\(^{56}\)Kellner (1984:281) reminds us that Marcuse was the only member of the Frankfurt School who openly and enthusiastically supported the student movement and political activism of the sixties.
Liberation captured the essence of the revolutionary spirit which had been flourishing in the Sixties and at once invigorated radicals and infuriated the stolid academic establishment. (Kellner, 1984) Hence, there was to some degree, both a social and an intellectual revolution in the Sixties and to a certain extent, given Marcuse’s popularity, in addition to the popularity of other intellectuals including Noam Chomsky, theory played an integral role in the radicalization of students and progressive faculty members. Aronowitz and Giroux remind us that in the 1960s, Marcuse, C. Wright Mills and others became instant "organic" intellectuals.

...the new left succeeded in exerting considerable influence among intellectuals, even if something short of hegemony in the Gramscian sense. Its work in all countries might well be described as pedagogical...Ideas such as grassroots democracy to replace the oppressive structures of representative government, the critique of consumer society, the demands for community control and individual freedom in major institutions such as schools became commonplace public issues. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985:14)

There is no doubt that events in the Sixties illuminated the democratizing and radicalizing potential of education, while at the same time illustrating the limits of education in transforming society. In addition, it shed light on the revolutionary capacity of an active, dynamic student populace.

In every phase of the Sixties, student protest associations such as the SDS and the Student Peace Union (SPU) played integral roles. From the free

57Of course it is important to note that the SDS was only part of the New Left or “the Movement” as insiders called it, and the Movement itself was part of a larger cultural upheaval that occurred during the decade. (Lee & Shlain, 1985)
speech movements at Berkeley to the civil rights movement and the Vietnam protests, university teach-ins and campus protest played an indispensable role in changing the course of events. It is therefore imperative to recognize that the campus politics of the Sixties cannot be disassociated from "books, ideas or intellectuals." (Jacoby, 1987:114) This in turn serves as a reminder to the liberating and emancipatory potential which schools embody when they connect with social movements outside of the academy. Furthermore, it compels progressive educators to re-examine the Sixties and to encourage the development of counter-memory or what Welch (1985) referred to as "dangerous memory". From a Freirian perspective, to remember in a critical mode means to confront the social amnesia of generations "in flight from their own collective histories - the subjugated knowledges of the marginalized, excluded, and disenfranchised." (McLaren, 1992:38) In Teaching Against The Grain, Roger Simon delineates a critical pedagogy of remembrance and outlines its relevance.

Remembrance is the practice in which certain images and stories of a collective past are brought together with a person’s feelings and comprehension of their embodied presence in time and space. Indeed, pervasive struggles over how remembrance should be done attest to its importance in the life of human communities. This struggle has taken place and continues to take place not only in the realm of what constitutes an accurate historical record and what images and stories are worth remembering but as well in the consideration of what it might mean to

58 In his book Social Amnesia, Russell Jacoby (1975:4) describes social amnesia as a "society's repression of its own past...memory driven out of mind by the social and economic dynamic of this society."
learn from the past given our situated standpoint in the present. (Simon, 1992: 149-150)

Hence, a pedagogy of remembrance envisions history not as a limitation on the present, but rather as a

...source or precondition of power that can illuminate our political project of emancipation. History, therefore, becomes a source of imaginative power as remembering invites us to remember in different ways so as to comprehend our social and political situatedness ...(McLaren, 1992: 38)

It should be stated that the concept of "history" being invoked here should not be understood as a plea for a master narrative - that is "one" single collective story with a single fundamental theme. Rather than thinking of history as some kind of eternal essence or reifying force, it is best to think of histories, especially those which have been suppressed and marginalized. It is remembrance of the histories of subaltern groups and their struggles which may provide a basis for present and future political engagement. In the present epoch, remembrance must take the form of a radical agitation, what McLaren (1992) calls a "blasting" which is strong enough to overcome unconscious repression. On the subject of redemptive remembrance, McLaren is worth quoting at length.

Redemptive remembering creates an arch of social dreaming, that is, a forum for sharing stories of pain, but also for constructing narratives of hope through the development of pedagogies capable of uniting those who have experienced racial, gender, and class subordination... Redemptive remembering is a form of utopian dreaming. It demystifies the present by allowing us to recognize ourselves from a critical/historical perspective... (McLaren, 1992: 39)
Bell hooks maintains that if "we want signs of hope", we must critically evaluate "the Sixties as a time of powerful transformation, even as we see its weaknesses." (1991:100) Similarly, Benjamin Barber reminds us of the important insights which the lessons of the Sixties have to offer critical educators in today's context.

From all those endless teach-ins, from the campus riots and student rebellions, from the campaigns against secret research and the anti-ROTC demonstrations, from the foolish innovations and the curricular novelties, from the free speech movement and the free university ideal, have come some saving truths. Equality is not the enemy of freedom; power must not be the determinant of culture; pluralism is not a recipe for nihilism; the opening of the schools to all need not spell the closing of the American mind...finally, all education is and ought to be radical -- a reminder of the past, a challenge to the present and a prod to the future. It will be worth something to set aside sufficient space in the pedagogy of the nineties to accommodate these hard-earned lessons of the Sixties. For they are small but precious truths capable of securing a future in a world that, however much the cultural conservatives curse it, is not going to be exclusively American, or white or male. (1989:173)

While Barber passionately argues that the Sixties embody "dangerous" memories full of liberatory potential, the subversion of historical memory has been well documented by critical social theorists as well as by critical pedagogists. Indeed, the counter-revolution initiated by the new Right coupled with the perversion of historical consciousness through commoditization has proven successful at quelling the dangerous memory of the Sixties. It is imperative to recognize that both past and present are matters of
interpretation since different meanings may be given to the same events. As with current events, so with the past: there is "an inevitable taking of sides which comes from selection and emphasis in history." (Zinn, 1980:10) Ultimately one's views of the past depends in good part on one's views of the present and vice versa. As Christopher Hill (1975:15) points out history is "rewritten in every generation" because while the "past does not change the present does". In the current social and cultural climate the denigration of the Sixties has occurred at two levels - in both the commoditization of history and in the ways in which the "Sixties" has served as a convenient scapegoat for conservatives who need to sidestep, for obvious ideological reasons, a serious examination of the underlying economic and political conditions which have impacted on the current state of societal malaise. While some of us see the Sixties as a source of hope, others - especially conservatives - blame the alleged "liberalism" of that era for everything from educational "decline", the "disintegration" of the family to the current drug "problem".

Thus, it is crucial to examine how both the commoditization of the Sixties and the conservative restoration have ultimately stripped the legacy of the sixties of its radical and revolutionary content. In a commoditized culture, what could be construed as counterhegemonic images and ideas are diffused and undermined by the process of objectification. In addition, the Sixties as it is immortalized in our media created collective consciousness often times points to the counterculture, the drugs, the hippies and the sexual revolution at the expense of some of the more "political" issues advanced in that decade.
The Commoditization of History: Sixties Symbolism in the Nineties

Some of the trends in vogue at the present historical juncture intimate a nostalgic posture. The influence of the Sixties seems to be all around us from filmmaker's preoccupations with Jim Morrison, JFK and Malcolm X to advertisers' recycling of "the sixties." 59

A recent article about Malcolm X in Newsweek acknowledges the renewed interest in the ideas of this seminal thinker due in part to Spike Lee's film but also influenced by the lyrics and messages in much of hip hop and rap music. Despite the heartening message of these developments and the hope which they embrace, one would be hard-pressed to suggest that they signify a revitalization of protest for the revival of Sixties symbolism seems to be falling prey to the unavoidable trap of commodification in our consumer culture. This is an issue taken up by bell hooks' in Black Looks: Race And Representation (1992). In particular hooks addresses the resurgence of black nationalism and white cultural appropriation of blackness. hooks claims that the fantasy of otherness reduces protest to spectacle, as such black nationalism is "more a gesture of powerlessness than a sign of critical

59In All Consuming Images, Stuart Ewen analyzes a variety of advertisements which portray the sixties as a "romantically longed-for, exciting time." (1988:255) The decade, divested of content or coherent meaning, is presented as a "procession of evocative captions" intended to sell a "stylized" image of the sixties. As Ewen (1988:258) asserts, "history disintegrates as a way of comprehending the world; it becomes an incomprehensible catalog display. It shifts from the realm of human subjects engaged in social relations, motivated by interest, circumstance, and experience, to the realm of objects, discrete commodities to be bought and sold. Popular historical retrospectives capture decades in terms of how things looked." In other words, the political character of the sixties is denigrated and decontextualized through the process of commodification.
resistance". (p.33) As hooks claims "when young black people mouth 1960s' black nationalist rhetoric, don Kente cloth, gold medallions, dread their hair, and diss the white folks they hang out with, they expose the way meaningless commodification strips these signs of political integrity and meaning, denying the possibility that they can serve as a catalyst for concrete political action."

In a recent article in Z Magazine, hooks claims that Malcolm X has turned into a "hot" commodity, "his militant black nationalist, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist politics diffused and undermined by a process of objectification." (hooks,1993:36) As signs, "their power to ignite critical consciousness is diffused when they are commodified." (1992:33) In essence communities of resistance are replaced by communities of consumption.

In his recent book, Malcolm X:In Our Own Image (1993), Joe Wood demonstrates the divorce of form and substance in the revival of Malcolm X's thought. As Julius Lester (1993:255) points out, the "adoration of Malcolm X is possible only to the extent that his image as a black man is separated from the content of his political thought." In this sense, nostalgia becomes a trick - a trick devised and brilliantly manipulated by advertising and the whole circus of commerce. While the 80's was mostly built on a nostalgia for the 50s, many have claimed that the 60s will be to the 90s what the 50s were to the 80s. (duCann.1991) However, the search for individual freedom in advanced capitalist society is encapsulated in the consumer industry in a phenomenon they call "attitude". Individuality, your own "look" can be had by "conforming" to the ideology of capitalist consumption - history collapses into issues of life-
style. John Fiske refers to this as the "process of incorporation" and is worth quoting at length. Incorporation refers to the process by which the dominant classes take elements of resistance from the subordinate and use them to maintain the status quo, rather than to challenge it. They incorporate resistances into the dominant ideology and thus deprive them of their oppositionality. 'Don't worry, be hippie: The 60s attitude is back - in clothes, music, food, and social awareness', is an example of incorporation. The social movements of the 1960s, from freedom rides against racism in the U.S. South to the worldwide protests against the Vietnam war and the student anti-government demonstrations that swept Europe and the U.S., have all been reduced to fashion, musical style, and the safe, respectable social awareness of ecology... The political oppositionality of that decade has been defused and incorporated into the dominant ideology. (1990:181)

Thus, the distortion and commoditization of history is best revealed through the

...translation of lives into lifestyles... generations attached to decades become little boxes of commoditized experiences drained of political or social substance, reduced to nostalgia and fashion. (Lyons, 1985:76)

Indeed, several recent phenomena in the realm of popular culture and music attest to this and point to the depoliticized nature of the nineties appropriation of Sixties symbolism - one need only look to Woodstock '94 for evidence of this tendency. Furthermore, events like Lollapalooza and the "rave" sensation
indicate that today's youth lack political awareness and a sense of collective action.⁶⁰

Indeed this generation, those born between 1961 and 1981 have been dubbed by the mainstream media as "The Shadow Generation" more concerned with surviving in the world rather than attempting to change it. (Bannon & Cross, Dec., 1992:A1) The Shadow Generation are typically described by Baby Boomers as "shallow", "materialistic", "cynical" and "selfish". They are a "twentysomething" generation without vision and without hope, not surprising

⁶⁰Events like Lollapalooza and "rave" point to the fact that alternative music and lifestyles have become "fashionable". Lollapalooza, which has been deemed the 90's version of Woodstock lacks the political commitment which was evident at that historical event. Lollapalooza represents according to some pop culture observers, a "New Transcendence". In a Village Voice article entitled "The New Transcendence: Consumer Mysticism", Frank Owen and Carlo McCormick describe house music and the hallucinatory technology of the Pagan 90's. House music is futuristic because it employs the latest musical machines to achieve its aim. More than music, house is a technique using lighting, environment, drugs, sleep deprivation, and music to experience "otherness." What house music means "is irrelevant; it’s what it does that's important". (Owen & McCormick, 1991:9) It appears as if the "radical politics of the SDS and the liberal leanings of the MTV generation have come into power simultaneously - at least superficially - the topical grooves of several rock and roll performers have reached a fashionable plateau." (Smith, 1993:2) Furthermore, "raving" which is essentially a sort of recycled flower-power for the young and the tragically hip is devoid of any form of political praxis. Self-proclaimed ravers declare that their music doesn't have any words so one does not spend time contemplating meaning. Lacking "campus protests and the intense politics of the turbulent '60s...rave is simply a movement about movement". (The Toronto Star, March 27, 1993:K2) The "new transcendence" is devoid of politics, rather it epitomizes a kind of hyperindividualistic apathy and cynicism. Moreover, these "alternative" forms of music "be-ins" are reminiscent of the sixties only at a very superficial level for there is a conspicuous scarcity of political and/or social content. The rise of these kinds of "alternative subcultures" are reduced to "disembodied constellations of style." (Ewen, 1988:249) They are commoditized concepts made innocuous by their packaging. Being "alternative" may mark one off via values and behaviours, however murkyly defined, but it is done through consumption which only serves to sustain and lend support to an oppressive capitalist structure.
given the overwhelming influence of media, those empires of consciousness which package, pervert and petrify the past. Furthermore, their formative years were the "yuppie eighties" which embodied an extreme form of the "me" focus that had emerged in the seventies. This undoubtedly had a profound impact on their consciousness or lack of social consciousness since there was a very powerful emphasis on forging a materialistic lifestyle. (Tikkun, May/June, 1993:61)

Some have argued that one of the defining characteristics of the shadow generation has been the "aestheticization of politics" wherein youth has become comfortable with the destruction of any notion of a political totality (a la pomo) about which they could think or in which they could act. Much of pop music reflects this as in the REM song which claims that "It's the end of the world as we know it and I feel fine." Commenting on this at a Tikkun roundtable, Akiva Lerner maintains that this nihilism reflects the mood of much of today's youth.

...its basic notion is that the disintegration of society is something we should cheer on. Instead of reacting with horror and outrage over this disintegration we respond to it as an aesthetic moment. (Tikkun, May/June, 1993:61)

Yet other cultural critics maintain that while it would be easy to dismiss the nostalgic trip as a symptom of a tired culture industry, one must question whether or not it represents something much more fundamental. Many observers have pointed to a resurgence of "sixties" attitudes at a less superficial level. Concerns about the environment and issues of racism and
sexism seem to be of central importance in the lives of many youth but as Lyons reminds us they aren't "personifications of 'The Great Refusal'". (1985:90)

Yet Ferguson argues that,

...when tens of thousands of students took to the streets...to protest the Gulf war, many saw the 60's all over again...the Gulf war and the protest movement that rose up around it did help to forge alliances between very different types of activists, people who'd never even thought about working together. (1991:6)

Ferguson may be expressing a naive desire or even experiencing a nostalgic flashback to the sixties when the Vietnam war "helped to get a cohesiveness we don't have today." (Tikkun, May/June, 1993:62) Yet, Ferguson illuminates a key point for she brings to the fore the notion of forging "alliances". Unfortunately, the advancement of a politics of alliance has not materialized on the Left not merely because of the well orchestrated right wing campaign against anyone who could be deemed as left-leaning but also as a result of the fragmentation characteristic of the Left. In addition, students are often prevented from exploring and making sense of the Sixties by the "commoditization of history that reifies the concepts of 'decade' and 'generation'." (Lyons, 1985:90) Under such circumstances, the continuation of the past into the present and towards the future is obscured.61

---

61 This abjuration of the past and the repudiation of history and modernity is typical in the discourse of ludic or reactionary postmodernism and as such represents a dangerous detachment from the historical context which has shaped and which continues to influence the present historical juncture. As I have tried to argue, the radical history of the 60s can serve as an important point of reference for
Despite the fact that many progressive faculty members and students have attempted to introduce pedagogical changes their efforts are being undermined by the new Right in a fashion similar to the way in which the students movements of the Sixties were denigrated in that decade. In short, the backlash against many of the breakthroughs that resulted from the Sixties has been epitomized in the anti-"p.c." assault.

...it has become fashionable in the Bush era to construct "domestic enemies" (such as the American Civil Liberties Union, affirmative action advocates, gay activists, and leftist academics) and then wage war against them in the name of the "unproblematic" principle such as the public's right to free speech. Beneath the surface of this rhetoric is a politics of erasure. Racism, poverty, sexism, ecological ruin, and a host of other problems are no longer addressed in serious terms; instead, it has become commonplace to deflect or mask one's complicity with these practices by labelling those who argue against them, ideological tyrants who are attempting to impose a form of "political correctness". (Giroux, 1992:4)

Furthermore, the backlash against progressive ideas hardly makes addressing relevant social issues attractive to youth. Rather they are inundated with messages which privilege the values of capitalism -- individualism, consumerism, and material success. It is within this context -- within a society in which image has transcended issue and wherein entertainment as the supradiscourse has led us to the brink of "amusing ourselves to death" --

a critical pedagogy in the 90s. The denial of historical consciousness which permeates reactionary postmodernism and the related glorification of identity politics and difference merely perpetuates the hyperindividualism of the 80's and prevents the cultivation of a collective political identity forged among and between subaltern groups.
that the need for a critical education which embraces democratic ideals gains
even greater ascendancy.

In *Amusing Ourselves To Death*, Neil Postman argues that it was Aldous
Huxley and not George Orwell who was correct in predicting the fate of modern
society. Huxley observed that there was no need for Big Brother since people
would come to love their oppression and relegate themselves to the realm of
the trivial. As Postman asserts Huxley believed that "we are in a race between
education and disaster" (1985:163) and that the desperate solution to the
crisis we now face lies in the only medium capable of addressing the problem
-- our schools. As Giroux and McLaren (1987) argue, schools and teaching
must be defined as counterhegemonic spheres in which dominant ideological
assumption are both challenged and transcended. Marcuse also emphasizes
this ideal:

> In a society where the unequal access to knowledge and information is part of the social structure, the distinction and the antagonism between the educators and those to be educated are inevitable. Those who are educated have a commitment to use their knowledge to help men and women realize and enjoy their truly human capabilities. All authentic education is political education, and in a class society, political education is unthinkable without leadership, educated and tested in the theory and practice of radical opposition. (1972:47)

While Marcuse proffers a radicalized version of education, mainstream
educational discourse has been governed by a brothel of die-hard
conservatives with a propensity to reformulating the educational equation in
terms of efficiency, dollars and profits. Schools have been relegated by the
profiteers to the sphere of incoherency and irrelevancy, as locales for reproducing the stagnant, short-sighted being able to unquestioningly serve the interests of the capitalist ideologues.

Given that conservative demagogues like Bloom, D'Souza, and Kimball have been able to promulgate and perpetuate this vision, critical pedagogists and progressive leftist intellectuals must align themselves in the struggle and fight for perhaps the last bastion of hope in our mass mediated, consumer society - our schools. Schools must be conceptualized as sites which emanate and foster not only critical engagement with the world, but a utopian vision. They must be fortresses of hope and democratic potential rather than dungeons of despair.

**Backlash: On The Road To Conservative Restoration**

Despite the fact that history demonstrates the enormous potential which campuses have as locuses of political intervention and that the Sixties offer progressive educators the historical context in which to promulgate notions of a liberatory "democratic" education, we are witnessing a brutal frontal assault initiated by conservatives, on educational activists. Indeed, one of the unifying themes of right-wing educational discourse centers on an attack on the social and educational reforms of the 1960's. (Giroux, 1988) According to these conservators of the status quo, the educational upheavals and reforms that characterized the Sixties weakened academic standards and bequeathed a significant decline in academic achievement and competency. Yet, these
assertions fail to concede the more substantive challenges which originated in that decade.

Sixties' radicals contested the university administration and called attention to the necessity that universities had to "become less like a corporation and more like a community." (Menand, 1991:54) This is of utmost significance given that

...many of the gains made during previous decades in social and educational reform have been abandoned or at the very least have demonstrably waned...we have seen an inordinate stress placed on career motivation and school/business partnerships in efforts to link youth to the corporate imperatives of the international marketplace. (McLaren, 1989:3)

The critique of education which emerged in the 1980's had a much different twist than the radical challenges which surfaced in the Sixties for greed became respectable in the yuppie '80's while notions of community and democratic struggle were either ignored or deemed subversive. Blatantly missing from the neo-conservative philosophy of the 1980s was any formulation of democratic citizenship aimed at fostering critical consciousness and oppositional agency.

Absent...was any notion of democracy that took seriously the importance of developing a citizenry which could think critically, struggle against social injustices and develop relations of community based on the principles of equality, freedom and justice. (Giroux, 1992[b]:200)

Rather, undergirding the educational reforms proposed by the recent confederation of conservatives and liberals, is a discourse that both "edifies and mystifies their proposals." (Giroux, 1988:177) Unlike the push for reform
in the 1960's, this new effort was not rooted in humanitarian concern but rather in an interest for competitiveness in the global economy.\textsuperscript{62}

Indeed, the increasing infiltration of corporate ideology into schools and universities is unprecedented. In a recent educational supplement, \textit{The New York Times} reported a "growing bunch of entrepreneurs are suggesting that unabashed capitalism can succeed" in the delivery of education. The \textit{Times} went on to say that if private corporations can accomplish what government cannot "why should they not make money in the process?" (cited in Kozol,1992:272) In fact, this is precisely what a number of corporations are seeking to do. As Kozol points out, we now have Burger King Academies, which are "fully accredited quasi-high schools in fourteen cities." (1992:272) I.B.M and Apple are currently contemplating the idea of starting schools for profit and there are a number of other profit oriented firms running schools while making lucrative returns on their investments.

However, the most ambitious project to date was started by Chris Whittle, founder and chairman of Whittle Communications. Whittle launched the Edison Project, a $2.5 billion plan to construct a system of "for-profit

\textsuperscript{62}In 1989, then President George Bush reiterated these concerns and promised to "revitalize public schools by establishing education performance goals to make [America] internationally competitive." (Kaestle,1990:32) Educational strategist Lamar Alexander designed the "America 2000" strategy, a voucher program that would invite the private sector into the schooling market. (Kozol,1992:272) Entrepreneur, publisher and advertising mogul Christopher Whittle took up the challenge of privatization, and with the vision of an untapped market in his eye, announced his own strategy for school reform. Just five weeks after the announcement of America 2000, Whittle Communications threw it's hat into the proverbial ring with the announcement of the "Edison Project."
schools." (McNichol, 1992:4) Whittle plans to open "200 profit-making schools by 1996 and foresees as many as 1,000 schools serving two million children within another decade." (Kozol, 1992:274)

Channel One, unlike its companion endeavour the Edison Project, is a Whittle dream already come true. For many, it smacks of some strange and apocalyptic science fiction novel, yet to date it is a reality in over 10,000 U.S. schools and boasts an audience of over eight million students per day. (Kozol, 1992:273) Whittle Communications provides participating schools, which are largely underfunded and under equipped, with free televisions, VCR's and a satellite dish. In return, the schools sign a legal agreement to show a twelve minute pseudo-news program (including two full minutes of commercials) to ninety percent of the students, ninety percent of the time in its entirety. It cannot be interrupted and under the contractual agreement the teacher cannot turn it off. (Kozol, 1992:273) What Whittle has created in Channel One is an advertisers dream. For a fee of $150,000 to $200,000 dollars per 30 second spot, (Roeg, 1993:8) Whittle can promise the advertiser a captive audience and one that assuredly has a taste for Doritos, Nikes and M&M's. From Channel One alone Whittle grosses annual revenues of more than 100 million dollars (Kozol, 1992:273), a good deal for Whittle and the advertisers, but at what cost to the student?

---

63 There are four partners in the Edison Project - Whittle, Time Warner, Philips Electronics and Associated Newspapers of Britain. See Tom McNichol "Chris Whittle's Big Test" USA Weekend, Sept.18-20, 1992, p.4-6.

64 See chapter one also for a brief description of Channel One.
In Canada, six provinces - Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick - have decided to purchase daily twelve minute newscasts directed to youth produced by YNN - the Youth News Network. Of course, the driving force behind YNN is electronic companies that are supplying schools with hardware for interactive television who stand to expand the market for their products. As Suzuki points out,

...the most telling part of the YNN proposal is the two minutes of the 12-minute broadcast that will be devoted to commercials. No matter how innocuous or well intended government or private ads are, the basic ideology is the same as hard-core commercials - buy the product or ideas we are selling. (1992:A10)

Suzuki proceeds to point out that because YNN is a company driven by profit, the education and well-being of students is an inconsequential issue.

While Whittle, YNN president Rod McDonald and others claim that they have no intention of indoctrinating students with their ideology, their approach to education as a neutral, mechanical experience is both misleading and dehumanizing.

When business enters education...it sells a way of looking at the world and at oneself. It sells predictability instead of critical capacities...students are described and valued, not as children but as "workers". They are seen as future "assets" or "productive units"...not as human beings who have value in themselves. (Kozol,1992:277)

Furthermore, these slick pre-packaged programs further exacerbate the pernicious dangers inherent in situations where teachers are reduced to "clerks of the empire" As Aronowitz and Giroux contend, educators are "relegated to
instrumental tasks that limit the possibilities for oppositional discourse and social practices." (1985:24)

Similarly, universities have always maintained affiliations with corporate and military interests - affiliations which have paradoxically prostituted their intended ideal. In their book The University Means Business (1988), Janice Newson and Howard Buchbinder discuss many of the implications of the increasing corporate-university links and argue that the supremacy of "market" knowledge is a perversion of higher education in the most profound sense.

While the ultimate academic role is to incite consciousness and foment a long term view in order to balance the short term perspectives of business, the university has also succumbed to the power structure. David Suzuki discusses the "prostitution of academia" in his book Inventing The Future. He explains how university administrations are encouraging academics to develop ties with the private sector in response to pressure from government and industry. Suzuki argues that the invasion of private companies into universities runs counter to the spirit of academic freedom and community and that the allure of profit often results in a "narrow focus that ignores broader questions of social responsibility and impact." (Suzuki, 1991:75) In addition, by focusing on concerns that are economically profitable

...we lose sight of the broader context within which that activity falls; we forget history; we become blind to environmental and social costs of our innovations. (Suzuki, 1991:76)
As Chomsky (1973:159) points out, the university was and is under "narrow ideological controls". Despite the fact that the student movement and the activities of the new Left resulted in some efforts at augmenting accepted forms of expression and discourse, the ideological controls have been "effectively re-established". (Chomsky, 1975:160)

Indeed, the right has been quite successful in creating an effective counter-establishment graciously funded by corporations and think tanks. (Blumenthal, 1988; Diamond, 1991; Henson, 1991) In addition to the prostitution of academia by corporate capitalism and the intensity of the conservative restoration, a number of other factors contributed to the decline of the New Left and political activism including the covert activities of COINTELPRO, the rightward shift of the major media, the

65 In *War At Home*, Brian Glick describes the covert activities of COINTELPRO (the code name for a Counterintelligence Program) which were aimed at Sixties activists. He asserts that it is necessary to contextually understand the 1960’s in order to grasp the impact which COINTELPRO activities had on dissidents. During the 1960’s millions of people began to reject the dominant ideology and culture. The social upheavals of the 1960’s had largely subsided by the mid-1970’s when radicals found themselves on the defensive as the right gained major government positions and were increasingly able to define the contours of accepted political debate. While domestic covert operations were scaled down after the social protests subsided, they did not cease. Covert activities continued into the 1970’s and persisted throughout the 1980’s. (1989:13-19)

66 Brian Glick also discusses how the mass media, "owned by big business and cowed by government and right-wing attack, helped to bury radical activism by ceasing to cover it." (1989:14) Todd Gitlin's *The Whole World Is Watching* (1980), surveys the mass media’s treatment of the new Left and argues that their treatment of the new Left, specifically the SDS resulted in the subsequent decline of the movement and the containment of serious political change. Michael Ryan and Douglas Kellner articulate the right turn in culture and specifically in Hollywood in their book *Camera Politica* (1988). In *Television And The Crisis Of Democracy* (1990), Kellner documents the essential role that television played in the making of
professionalization of the intellectual\textsuperscript{67} and the lack of a long-term political vision on the Left.\textsuperscript{68}

In their failure to consolidate a new "radical" democratic politics, one with consensual aspirations, the social movements of the 1960s, "provided the political space in which right-wing reaction could incubate and develop its political agenda", the reforms won by minority movements in the 1960s provided a "formidable range of targets for the counter-reformers of the 1970s."

---

conservative hegemony. Kellner claims that television "did not provide the information necessary to produce an informed electorate and that the media actively helped forge a conservative hegemony rather than impartially mediating among competing social forces." (1990:134) In We Gotta Get Out Of This Place, Lawrence Grossberg argues that the "center of life - political, social and cultural - has shifted to the Right." (1992:160) He examines the new conservatism in a certain sense, as a matter of public language, "of what can be said, of the limits on the allowable. Certain statements - anti-capitalist, pro-communist, anti-family, pro-drugs - simply cannot be made or, if they are, they have no chance of being taken seriously, of entering into the broader channels of public debate." (1992:162) In addition, he attributes the right-ward shift not only to the disappearance or fragmentation of the Left but also to the fact that much of what may be deemed "oppositional" or "alternative" in the culture is commodified to such an extent that its political significance is lost in a sea of irrelevance.

\textsuperscript{67}In The Last Intellectuals, Russell Jacoby (1987:26) claims that "intellectuals associated with the sixties failed to maintain a public presence; many departed for other careers; others disappeared into the universities." In other words, radical academics succumbed to professionalization and the academic division of labour. According to Jacoby, "professionalization also spells privatization, a withdrawal from a larger public universe." Academic careers, for Jacoby, "undermined academic freedom" for the university "neutralizes the freedom it guarantees...in many universities academic freedom meant nothing more than the freedom to be academic." (1987:118-119)

\textsuperscript{68}As Glick reminds us 1960's activists were unable to make the "connections and changes required to build movements strong enough to survive and win structural change" due in part to their upbringing, social position and isolation from older radical traditions. "Originally motivated by goals of quick reforms, 1960's activists were ill-prepared for the long-term struggles in which they found themselves." (1989:14)
Marcuse referred to the attempts by the right to re-establish their power after the sixties upheavals as the counterrevolution. ...the defense of the capitalist system requires the organization of counterrevolution at home and abroad...the counterrevolution is largely preventive and, in the Western world, altogether preventive. Here, there is no recent revolution to be undone, and there is none in the offing. And yet, fear of revolution which creates the common interest links the various stages and forms of the counterrevolution. (1972:1-2)

Sidney Blumenthal's *The Rise Of The Counter-Establishment* (1988) provides a detailed historical account (with a strong liberal bias) of the early beginnings of the counter-establishment or what Marcuse deemed the counterrevolution. In his text, Blumenthal traces the creation of right-wing think tanks ranging from the American Enterprise Institute, the Institute for Educational Affairs through to the Olin Foundation - all of which have recently provided funding for the reactionary diatribes found in the books of Allan Bloom, Dinesh D'Souza and Roger Kimball. In addition to providing financial backing for right-wing mouthpieces, these foundations also support a large number of conservative campus publications and newspapers. (Blumenthal,1988; Diamond,1992) Seeking to counter what they perceived as liberal control of the public and intellectual spheres, the Right deliberately created their own establishment, piece by piece with hopes of supplanting the alleged liberal stranglehold.

In *Culture Wars*, Ira Shor documents how the ideological controls in the educational sphere were reinstated beginning with Nixon who claimed to speak
for the "silent majority". Shor claims that Nixon's quiet quest turned into the noisy 'moral majority' in Reagan's 1980 victory when we began to see a "long swing towards conservatism". (1992:5)

Shor claims that the 1960's had taken its toll on the conservative right. The values and concerns of sixties activists and protest movements appeared as threats to the corporate capitalist ideology. Environmentalists, affirmative action advocates, anti-racist and anti-sexist proponents were perceived obstacles to corporate power.

The 1960's was a tough medium limiting the advance of conservative politics...An autonomous discourse invented from below put the establishment on the defensive. At the grass roots, there was a subversive emergence of action and communication. This new vocabulary validated the demands and the language modes of historically dominated groups -- minorities, women, the young, senior citizens, natives, gays, the handicapped...Something had to be done fast to silence the daily talk, the rally speeches, the many teach-ins, the underground publications, the guerilla theatres, the radical films, the experimental courses, the alternate programs, the many small groupings through which the themes of dissent spread along with unsupervised organization. The voice of authority had to move from the defensive to the offensive. (1992:5-6)

Behind the conservative restoration was a clear sense of loss: of control, of economic and personal security, of the knowledge and values that should be passed on to children, of visions of what counts as sacred texts and authority.

The shrill of protest and opposition language in the 1960's compelled the conservative force to forge ahead with a campaign to reimpose the "right"
words. According to Shor, teaching the "right" words and displacing the "wrong" words of radical opposition was the dual essence of the culture war. The double process occurs wherever ideas are conveyed -- curriculum, mass media, public spectacles. In the 1970's, in the educational realm, "conservatizing words like career, survival, illiteracy, tests, accountability, competence, quality, excellence, and high tech" dominated educational and public discourse (Shor, 1992:11) in an attempt to re-establish the function of schools as purveyors of dominant ideological assumptions. The ultimate aim, in other words, was to make the values and loyalties of the university indistinguishable from those of the powerful.

For the most part, the commitments of the university are in line with those conservators of capitalist dogma rather than the aspirations of the rebels and their emancipatory visions.

The radical values of critics cannot be disguised as "scientific" or value-neutral because they show up in sharp relief to the general background of established values. But the values of those in power vanish into the background that has produced them and permit supporters to claim neutrality on their behalf because against this background they are invisible -- black cows grazing in a black forest in the middle of the night. (Barber, 1989:164)

Indeed, in contemporary late capitalist society, the academy has come to exercise increasingly centralized control over the production of knowledge - knowledge which is often produced to secure and preserve existing relations of capitalist organization. The fervour of the "p.c." debate and the new Right's complaints about the Left's influence in the universities has brought to light
just how "normal" their (the conservative Right’s) influence seems there. And while the academy is circumscribed by its socio-economic context and the hegemony of conservatives therein, it nonetheless remains one of the principal locations for the development of radically oppositional knowledge. (Chomsky, 1988; Kellner, 1984) In this sense, it is a site of political intervention. This is something that the Right has long recognized as its attempt to restore conservative hegemony clearly demonstrate. However, the guardians of the Western tradition proclaim repeatedly to have no position and declare their devotion to "objective" and "value-neutral" scholarship at a time when philosophy and social theory have demonstrated the ideological underpinnings of such a stance. It is this challenge which is throwing the new Right into hysteria. At the social level, feminists, blacks, ethnic minorities, gays and lesbians are demanding that changes in the curriculum be made so that their lived realities and histories be reflected in the educational system. Similarly, in the intellectual realm, critical social theorists are waging war against the exclusionary nature of the "Western" tradition, the debilitating effects of an adherence to the paradigmatic presuppositions of positivism as well as, and the ideological underpinnings of the conservative educational agenda.

Critical theorists have pointed out that the questioning of the Eurocentric tradition involves the re-assessment of the power/knowledge issue. That is, who has historically been granted the authority to evaluate the relevance of various information and how these evaluations have been carried out. Given that this issue has been taken up by a variety of theorists and
philosophers (cf. Alcoff, 1993; Ferguson, 1993; Lloyd, 1984; Nicholson, 1993) it is not the intention of this work to delve further into this specific concern. Rather, what must be investigated is the potential for broadening the limits of academic discourse to include the voices of those previously marginalized. However, the need for a curriculum which is "relevant" and which reflects a multiplicity of discourses must not merely be satisfied with the mere inclusion of difference - that is with the mere multicultural add-ons. Rather, this difference must be politicized and understood within the broader material relations of capitalism.

Many of the current struggles over curriculum reform with respect to inclusion and relevancy as well as, the challenges to the capitalistic underpinnings of the academy echo a Sixties demeanour. Yet, many of the constructive advances which grew out of sixties radicalism have been decontextualized and denuded of any political and historical significance. In many conservative narratives the sixties have been denigrated and characterized by the likes of Allan Bloom (1987:320) as an "unmitigated disaster".

The new Right offers a retreat into nostalgia and social amnesia while dismissing or ignoring that...

...for millions of people the "Sixties" did on fact offer a real liberation from the tyranny of old bigotries, prejudices, institutions and inhibitions...That the challenges mounted against entrenched ideas and established customs brought about an extension of

---

69 The issue of multiculturalism is taken up in chapter three.
civic rights, a questioning of unthinking obedience to governmental power, a new sense of possibility for women, blacks and members of other ethnic minorities. (Jones, 1992:71)

Indeed, blaming decline and moral decay on the Sixties has become a mainstay in the cultural backlash initiated by the Right and their sermonizing abounds, from the zealotry of Pat Buchanan, the garishness of Rush Limbaugh to the intellectual dishonesty of corporate sponsored authors such as Allan Bloom, Dinesh D'Souza and Roger Kimball.

The Conservative Counter-Revolution

The conservative right-wing has, since the early 1980s, commanded the debate over education due in part to a network of foundations supporting their agenda and the acquiescence of the mainstream media in promoting their agenda. Progressives, on the other hand, have been put in the awkward position of defending the pedagogical policies initiated in the Sixties in a cultural climate hostile to democracy and inclusiveness. Despite the fact that many of the programs and policies spawned during that era were either improperly implemented or never set in motion,(Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985, 1991) the Right has enjoyed considerable success in demonizing the vision of education which emerged from that decades' movements. In a sense, critical pedagogy itself is under siege since it emerged in the 1960s as a response to conservative, traditional approaches to teaching and theorizing education.

The Right-wing offensive in the educational domain is of course, part of a broader cultural backlash against some of the "liberal" advances of the
1960s. (Giroux, 1992; Ryan & Kellner, 1988; Shor, 1992) The power of the conservative restoration resides in part, in the right’s ability to link schooling to the ideology of the marketplace and to successfully champion the so-called virtues of Western civilization. Furthermore,

...neoconservative discourse...not only taps into a wide range of discontents, it also takes a strong position on important educational issues such as standards, values, and school discipline. In mobilizing existing public discontent, it combines two aspects of conservative philosophy so as to add a powerful element of popular-cultural appeal to its theoretical discourse. In diverse ways, it embraces elements of community and localism in its support of the family, patriarchal authority, and religion. Similarly, these aspects of traditional conservative philosophy are combined successfully with the tenets of classical liberalism, with its stress on individualism, competition, and personal effort and reward. (Giroux, 1988:178-179)

By capitalizing on popular sentiments and discontents, neoconservative discourse has conveniently argued for educational policies that champion traditional values and conservative forms of authority and discipline. Moreover, the Right has been extremely victorious in sabotaging any notion of the public good. Michael Apple (1993:9) points out that the Right has been able to

...convince a significant portion of the population that what is private is now good and what is public is bad inside and outside of education.

It is important to note; however, that the success of the right-wing backlash owes a great debt to the organizations which have helped to fund their reactionary efforts. Indeed, the counterrevolution initiated by the Right in the early 1970's (Blumenthal, 1988; Marcuse, 1972; Shor, 1985) intensified in the
1980s and early 90s as more and more funds were allocated for fuelling the "backlash" against progressive ideas and educational strategies.

While the assaults on progressive educators are not entirely new,70 the amount of corporate funding underwriting the proliferation of conservative narratives about the malaise of higher education and leftist infiltration is unprecedented. Given these circumstances, one must identify the contemporary epidemic of newspaper articles and books purporting to warn of a p.c. consortium of deviant leftist academics for what it really is - a by-product of more than a decade of heightened corporate influence at the university level.(Diamond,1991) Indeed, in recent years the Right has had complete, almost unopposed triumph in labelling as left-wing or subversive, ordinary agendas and desires that, in a saner polity would not be accorded demonic qualities and deemed blasphemous. (Hughes,1992) The conservative restoration and the network of corporate money underwriting it is of course, enhanced within academic circles by groups of neoconservatives who have become the organic intellectuals for much of the rightist resurgence.

Young reactionaries recruited by older neoconservatives and well-funded by rightist think tanks have been successful in convincing the public at large that universities have become hotbeds of radicalism. Hegemonic intellectuals

70Attacks on leftist in the academy can be traced back to the publication of William F. Buckley's God And Man At Yale in 1951 when the then 24 year old Buckley launched an all-out assault on the idea of the independent academy. Evoking the cold war ideology of anti-communism, Buckley "advocated the abolition of academic freedom and other left-leaning tendencies in favour of a standardized curriculum designed to promote capitalist and Christian values." (Davidson,1992:18)
like Dinesh D'Souza and Roger Kimball have been enlisted in the war against the "new barbarians" who have been accused of turning schools into laboratories for ideological indoctrination. Right-wing intellectuals are now attempting, through "tales" of "discrimination", to silence the voices of progressive intellectuals who support the demands for equality and democratic social arrangements made by women, blacks, Latinos, and lesbian and gay people, among others. Guilty of this so-called reverse discrimination are those sixties revolutionaries trapped in a time warp, unable to put issues like racism, sexism, classism and homophobia to rest in the graveyard of history. Left-over sixties radicals, we are told, are now academic blue-bloods plotting no less than the demise of Western civilization.

For the most part, the debate over education has been predictably one-sided for the moneyed manacles of conservatism have circumscribed the bounds of the expressible. Since the right has enjoyed an onerous grasp on the debate thus far democratic considerations have been virtually absent in deliberations about educational reform. Rather, the imperatives of contributing to economic productivity and preserving the sanctity of Western civilization have served as the parameters of discourse.71 While one cannot

71 Giroux (1992:92) points out that the Right has presented an agenda and purpose for shaping higher education "that abstracts equity from excellence and cultural criticism from the discourse of social responsibility. Under the guise of attempting to revitalize the language of morality, these critics and politicians have, in reality, launched a serious attack on some of the most basic aspects of democratic public life and the social, moral, and political obligations of responsible, critical citizens." Moreover, Giroux asserts that cultural uniformity and a rigid view of authority are being valorized in the neoconservative discourse regarding educational reform. In addition, the neoconservative agenda for higher education "includes a call
neglect the Left's relative inability in provoking public discourse as well as the retreat into particularism conspicuous within the trajectory of identity politics, one cannot underestimate the strength and scope of right-wing power.\textsuperscript{72} Indeed, the success of the anti-p.c. backlash seems to lend credence to the old cliche - money talks! Such a situation therefore warrants a brief examination of those institutions which have helped to finance the well-orchestrated assault aimed at undermining progressive change in our institutions of learning for they undoubtedly have been instrumental in setting the agenda and propelling conservative reactionaries into the limelight of mainstream consciousness.

**Funding The Right-Wing Agenda**

The attack on so-called political correctness, framed by the Right and the media as a challenge to the enforced orthodoxy, one-sided debate, and brainwashing by tenured radicals is, in fact, an assault on liberal and leftist ideas in general. To break what they perceived as the "liberal" monopoly of higher education, over the last two decades "conservatives" have constructed a powerful host of ideological policy institutes which have grown influential within policy making circles and in the media. (Hager, 1992:58; Messer-Davidow, 1993)

\textsuperscript{72}The issue of identity politics is taken up in chapter three.
In 1978, William E. Simon and neoconservative writer Irving Kristol founded the Institute for Educational Affairs which was initiated with four grants of $100,000 each from the John M. Olin Foundation, the Scaife Family Trusts, the JM Foundation, and the Smith Richardson Foundation. (Clarkson, 1985) IEA’s commitment lies in the development of a conservative infrastructure with young cadres at the helm and a constant theme in their deliberations was the need to promote scholarship that would make the case for the morality of capitalism. Between 1980 and 1983, the foundation provided the funding which spawned "thirty-three student publications". (Blumenthal, 1988:67) According to the IEA’s Annual Reports, their mission is to combat the "liberal orthodoxy strangling opinion on campus." (cited in Blumenthal, 1988:67)

In September of 1990, the IEA merged with the Madison Center which was founded in 1988 by Allan Bloom and former education secretary and drug czar William Bennett. The hybrid organization is now known as the Madison Center for Educational Affairs. The Madison Center’s financial supporters run the gamut from private citizens, business corporations and corporate and family foundations. In 1990 some of the more generous donors included the Dow Chemical Company, the W.H. Brady Foundation, the Lynde & Harry Bradley Foundation, the Scaife Foundation and the Olin Foundation. (Hager, 1992) According to Hager (1992:58) the MCEA, headquartered in Washington, D.C.,

...works to propagate right-wing ideas on campuses across the country and to transform higher
education so as to reflect more closely the values and ideas of conservative business, governmental and cultural elites.

At the heart of the Madison Center is its student journalism program. This program operates as a support base for a consolidated system of right-wing student newspapers. This system known as the Collegiate Network has no precedent in the history of campus journalism.

The Collegiate Network is something entirely new: an integrated system of campus papers operating with significant off-campus financial support in service to a distinct ideological perspective. (Hager, 1992:58)

In 1990, the MCEA spent $330,617 on its reactionary network of campus newspapers and a total of $1 million on all its projects. Current figures indicate that MCEA is now a major force behind more than sixty notorious tabloids published on fifty-seven campuses including the infamous Dartmouth Review. (Diamond, 1992) With a combined circulation of more than 600,000, the MCEA writes "Collegiate Network publications remain the most potent catalyst for debate on campuses." (MCEA Annual Report, 1991:4) In this assessment, it is correct since most of the well-known debates on race, gender, sexuality and leftism in the academy were catalyzed by these newspapers. (Messer-Davidow, 1993) In addition to generously supporting the

---

73 These figures were taken from the MCEA 1990 Annual Report. For a fairly current list of locations and titles see Susan Dodge (1990:35-37) Moreover, evidence suggests that Canadian campuses were not immune to the wrath of the IEA's conservative agenda. During the 1980's right-wing campus rags sprang up in Canada at the University of Toronto, Queen's, McGill and the University of British Columbia and were supported financially to some degree by the Institute for Educational Affairs. (Edwards, 1993:10)
Collegiate Network, MCEA provides editorial and technical assistance, maintains a toll-free hotline for advice, publishes *Newsl ink*, a monthly newsletter, distributes free of charge the publications of CN Friends, a group of more than eighty conservative policy organizations and magazines (including the Heritage Foundation. *National Review* and *American Spectator*); gives monthly cash awards for student writing, hold regional conferences for newspaper staffs and distributes free of charge the "book of the month" (which in the past have included gems like Dinesh D'Souza's *Illiberal Education*). (Messer-Davidow, 1993) The American Enterprise Institute which is funded by many of the same sources as the Madison Center For Educational Affairs, is a self-proclaimed flagship of conservatism and one of the most influential think tanks now in operation. While this organization started as little more than a letterhead it is now bankrolled by more than six hundred major corporations and boasts a budget of $12.6 million. (Blumenthal, 1988:42) The American Enterprise Institute charged that "federal intervention to promote educational equity was excessive" and its agenda called for a re-ordering of public education goals that would "promote economic growth for the nation" and help "preserve a common culture by teaching students the basic values upon which American capitalism is based". (Pincus, 1984:51-53)

MCEA and AEI both receive endowments from the Olin Foundation - yet another pillar of the conservative establishment. In 1990, the New York-based John M. Olin Foundation paid approximately $19.8 million in grants to scores
of conservative scholars, think tanks and political organizations.\textsuperscript{74} According to the Olin \textit{Annual Report}, some of the major benefactors in 1990 included prominent conservative media like \textit{Commentary}, \textit{The American Spectator}, \textit{The National Review}, \textit{New Criterion} and \textit{The Dartmouth Review}. (Henson, 1991:8)

Moreover, according to Olin's \textit{Annual Report}, the general objective of the foundation is to

...provide support for projects that reflect or are intended to strengthen the economic, political and cultural institutions upon which the American heritage of constitutional government and private enterprise is based. The Foundation also seeks to promote a general understanding of these institutions by encouraging the thoughtful study of the connections between economic and political freedoms, and the cultural heritage that sustains them. (cited in Henson, 1991:8)

The Olin Foundation is responsible for funding a number of conservative academic projects, academic lecture series and also professorships at various universities for conservative scholars who in turn train conservative graduate students, some supported by Olin postdoctoral fellowships. (Messer-Davidow, 1993)

Smith (1991: xv-xvi) argues that the network of think tanks and foundations have created an "ideas industry" in which a cadre of professional right-wingers use think tanks, interest groups and media to produce and distribute conservative ideas. Indeed, the same think tanks he discusses were

\textsuperscript{74}Sara Diamond (1991:46-49) also points out that a similar array, but smaller number of organizations received a total of $4.8 million form the Smith Richardson Foundation; $8 million from the Scaife Foundation (whose largest benefactor is the Heritage Foundation); and approximately $2 million from the Earhart Foundation.
instrumental in providing financial support for many of the tracts indicting higher education written in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Certainly, the influence and popularity of publications such as D'Souza's *Illiberal Education* (1991) and Kimball's *Tenured Radicals* (1990)\(^{75}\) seems to suggest that the p.c. controversy marks a resurgence of right-wing influence, rather than a large scale pogrom by the left as many p.c. critics would have us believe. While the belief among right-wing intellectuals that Marxists, minorities and feminists dominate universities has long been part of conservative dogma, tenured radicals have not taken over campuses. In reality, it has been the Right which has effectively organized into a group known as the National Association of Scholars (NAS).

The NAS, generously funded by Right-wing think tanks, which surfaced as the organ of anti-p.c. rhetoric was quite successful in commanding the media and limiting public discourse on the issues involved in the p.c. debate. The NAS began in 1987 as a concerted effort to organize Right-wing faculty however its genealogy can be traced back to the Institute for Educational Affairs.\(\text{Diamond}, 1992\)

The complex structure of the NAS - a national organization which boasts some three thousand members, approximately thirty-five state chapters, campus chapters, caucuses within the disciplines, and international affiliates - performs several functions. \(\text{Messer-Davidow, 1993}\) Most of the funding for this organization is derived from corporate foundations including the Coors

\(^{75}\)These two publications will be discussed in detail in chapter three.
Foundation, the John M. Olin and Smith-Richardson foundations in New York City and the MCEA. (Weisburg, 1992). While the NAS claims its aim is to defend "traditional analytic methods and scholarly standards against politicization and ideology," this seems highly unlikely given the corporate funding which underwrites the organization. (Weisburg, 1992:80) In its scholarly guise, the NAS holds conferences, publishes a journal called Academic Questions, and makes declarations about academic culture. (Messer-Davidow, 1993) Their commentaries on academia have intense political ramifications. Messer-Davidow (1993:64) points out that the national headquarters of the NAS mobilize "membership to lobby government officials" and "churn out writings on the excesses of tenured radicals." In her research, Messer-Davidow (1993) found that the research center of the NAS "assembles the stories of alleged conservative victims of left academic abuses" and has been known to compile "data on leftist academics."

So while the right has been able to exert formidable power both within and beyond the academy,

...the academic left has degenerated into a loose aggregation of margins...romancing the varieties of difference, speaking in tongues...the elevation of difference to a first principle is undermining everyone's capacity to see, or change, the world as a whole. (Gitlin, 1991:5)

Excessive concern with disparity as well as, linguistic concerns -- that is, with the formative rather than substantive issues -- has led some leftist intellectuals and activists to focus on differences among themselves resulting in a splintering of the Left. But more politically ominous is the abandonment
of opposition and the embracing of pseudo-radicalism - p.c. politics in an antiseptic quarantine, lacking any commitment to concrete, social transformation.

It is precisely the ineptitude of the academic left that renders the declarations of conservatives all the more farcical for the high priests and priestesses of the new right have charged a cabal of leftist charlatans and rogues with inaugurating the current p.c. brouhaha and captivating university students. The virtual power which the right holds and commands over the media and in the realm of popular culture obligates committed leftists to consolidate their efforts.

The need to embrace a transitional, transdisciplinary social theory that draws from the positive contributions of social democracy and Marxism and which integrates ideas from the movements of environmentalists, people of colour, feminists, and gays and lesbians yet which also shares a common critique of corporate capitalism and a vision of democratic community, is an integral first step in counteracting the right-wing backlash. Critical pedagogy offers a provisional discourse for those conscious leftists who are now beginning to see that constructive counterhegemonic activity requires an

...innovative working strategy to develop and sustain working relationships among Latinos. Blacks, Asians and whites, between unions and community groups, between intellectuals and workers. (Mann, 1993:586)

Apple (1993) reminds us that we are in danger of forgetting the decades of hard work which it took to put even a limited vision of equality on the social and
educational agenda and suggests that the task of keeping alive the collective memory of the struggle for equality is one of the most significant tasks educators can perform. A reinvigorated left must remember that its greatest historical contributions were made during the 60s "in the fight for the interests of society's most oppressed." (Mann, 1993:590) The Sixties offer us a passionate point of reference for if the left can revisit its origins and radically critique its own history, it may be able to breed a revitalized revolutionary spirit.
CHAPTER THREE

A Brief Note On Ideology Critique

In chapters three and four, I attempt to scrutinize the ideological dimensions of the anti-p.c. crusade launched both in texts and the mainstream media. In particular, I will focus my attention on two recent books - Roger Kimball's *Tenured Radicals* and Dinesh D'Souza's *Illiberal Education*, as well as mainstream media portrayals of the p.c. debate - primarily those accounts offered by *Newsweek* and *Maclean's*. My interest is in pointing to the themes, emphases and omissions which undergird these texts and articles. Moreover, particular attention will be given to the contextual framework which has engendered these discourses in an effort to demonstrate the social, political, cultural and economic implications which they embody and the ideological agenda which they attempt to promulgate.

In this thesis, I practically apply a radical "critique-al" theory and mode of ideology critique which draws extensively from critical pedagogy. 76 Zavarzadeh (1991:1) describes the political urgency of inquiring into the operation of ideology and states that the

...unchecked domination of ideology limits historical possibilities and produces a world in response to the needs of the dominant class, the privileged gender and the hegemonic race in a society; consequently it subjugates all other needs.

\(^{76}\)The concept of radical critique-al theory and ideology critique will be defined subsequently in this section.
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It is imperative to note that engaging in any form of ideology critique, tacitly denotes that one already has criticisms of a particular system of beliefs, an institution or cultural formation. While these criticisms often remain unarticulated and undefined\textsuperscript{77}, an ideology critique rooted in critical pedagogy is necessarily self-reflexive and therefore entails an obligation to justify critiques in terms of certain ideals which one is prepared to articulate and defend.

Critical pedagogy is fundamentally concerned with understanding the relationship between power and knowledge. Thus, if practically applied to the contemporary debates over p.c. and the curriculum, a pedagogical approach to ideology critique would serve to illuminate the ways in which certain ideological formations barricade themselves within the realm of "commonsense" and disguise the grounds of their operations.

To be concerned with issues of power, that is how class, race and gender inequalities work through schools and curriculums reflects a particular ideological agenda and specific ideological presuppositions. Indeed, the critique and analysis put forth in this thesis have been greatly influenced by the discourse of critical pedagogy and reflects the underlying tenets discussed in chapter one.

Just as the concept of ideology has been subjected to a spate of varying interpretations, so to has the notion or method of ideology critique. In essence

\textsuperscript{77}Indeed this is evident in neoconservative discourse which rather than articulating and acknowledging its epistemic foundations disguises its ideological underpinnings by clinging to notions of objectivity.
these competing notions of ideology critique assume competing epistemological and political positions as well as positions about how people change their beliefs. Burbules (1993) attempts to construct a loose typology of five forms of ideology critique.\textsuperscript{78} He defines the first and most common form of ideology critique as being "scientific" or "rational" critique. According to this approach, ideologies lack certain formal attributes of rational discourse. That is, they "ignore facts, they argue fallaciously, they distort truth, etc." (Burbules, 1993:5) Burbules claims that this position is based on an orthodox Marxian conception of ideology which suggests that ideology is a belief system that makes "pretentious and unjustified claims to scientificity" and is therefore "failed science, not authentic science".\textsuperscript{(1993:5-6)} For Burbules, this approach regards ideology as a "subject of epistemic scrutiny and judge it against traditional measures of truth, clarity and validity."\textsuperscript{(1993:6)} The epistemological assumptions of such a position assume that there is "objective" evidence against which purportedly "ideological" claims can be compared. Hence, this position is rooted in the Enlightenment ideals of rationality, reason, truth and argues that matters of social and political import can and should be resolved through the "application of objective social science or historical methods." (Burbules, 1993:6)

\textsuperscript{78}This typology, although somewhat problematic, provides a useful context from which to describe the form of ideology critique which will be employed in this thesis. It in no way claims to be all inclusive nor is it meant to erect rigid boundaries between the various forms of ideology critique.
Immanent critique, the second form of ideology critique was emphasized by early critical theorists, namely the Frankfurt School. In attempting to move beyond the traditional Marxist conceptions of ideology and ideology critique, the Frankfurt School opted for a stance that sought to disclose hypocrisies and contradictions inherent within cultural formations and/or texts. Burbules points out that by employing this framework, one attempts to discredit or challenge a belief system not by comparing it against a set of external, objective standards but by demonstrating its internal incongruities.

Burbules identifies the third form of ideology critique as deconstructionist. A deconstructionist critic does not argue for a position of epistemic superiority indeed, most proponents of this method embrace the postmodern rejection of notions of evidence, truth or logical validity. Burbules (1993:8) argues that advocates of this approach, namely Lyotard and Derrida define apparently neutral criteria such as clarity and consistency as "remnants of an anachronistic search for intellectual order." Moreover, deconstructive criticism seeks to disclose mechanisms for constituting truth, meaning, and value as ultimately arbitrary and culturally particularistic. Ideology-critique is this view attempts to wean people away from "beliefs in metanarratives, to see the world as fractured, disordered, and irreconcilably plural." (Burbules, 1993:9) Far from being radical, ludic deconstructionist critique does not substantively contest ideology but rather deconstructs "discursively" the "truth" of ideology. Zavazadeh and Morton illustrate the ways in which deconstruction has become a device for "systems-maintenance and the
conservation of the status quo." (1991:194) They maintain that since the ideological function of deconstructive "dehierarchization" reinforces pluralism it also reinscribes political pluralism which conceals relations of domination by representing "the elements of power as sovereign, individual and equal." (1991:213)

The fourth type of ideology critique is an "argument from effects". From this perspective, all systems of belief and value exist in a "socio-political context and have consequences within the dynamics of that context." (Burbules, 1993:9) Burbules claims that an alternative reading of Marx engenders this form of ideology critique. This mode of critique differs from the first three in that its basis for judgement does not "pertain to epistemic adequacy, reasonableness, consistency" but to the ways in which ideologies "legitimate and support a social system that itself is judged." (Burbules, 1993:10) Ideologies that support a social and political system that one judges favourably are due to their effects, positive; while ideologies that maintain social and political systems which are judged harshly are, correspondingly, negative. Thus, the basis for critique is not content, but consequences.

The last type of ideology critique which Burbules identifies is one which advocates the development of a counter-ideology. He claims that to the extent that one embraces this form of ideology critique, one is "making claims about

---

79Mas'ud Zavarzadeh and Donald Morton offer an intensive and insightful critique of deconstructive criticism in chapters one and six of their book Theory, (Post) Modernity, Opposition, 1991.
what is better and worse, not only for one’s own preferences but for others as well.” (1993:12) To some degree, Burbules is critical of this stance for he claims adherence to this conception one

...perpetuates popular dependencies on simple answers, dogmatic beliefs in the justice of one’s cause, exaggerated dichotomies between victims and persecutors, or between liberators and reactionaries - and the sort of naïve utopianism that assumes we already know what the best kind of society is and that the only question is how to achieve it.(1993:12)

Burbules argues that because each of these five modes of ideology critique exhibit limitations, a pedagogical perspective on ideology critique which incorporates the strengths of these various approaches needs to be articulated. Hence, following Zavarzadeh and Morton’s conceptualization of a radical critique-al approach and incorporating critical pedagogy, I will examine the aforementioned texts.

Zavarzadeh and Morton develop their notion of a radical critique-al theory and mode of ideology critique and strongly advocate the need to move beyond deconstructive critique which in their view is a kind of rhetorical (not political) theoretical intervention which does not "radically contest the ruling relations of production”. (1991:194)

---

80Zavarzadeh and Morton employ the term "critique-al" in order to distinguish their position from the work of other academics who have "appropriated" the term critical. As they point out, a number scholars think of their work as critical in the sense that it involves "criticism" or the evaluation and judgement of the merits of various texts of culture.” (1991:191) In contrast, they emphasize the notion of "political critique” which embodies an explicit praxis committed to social transformation.
In contrast to traditional and ludic deconstruction and/or postmodern forms of theory and method, the task of radical critique-al theory and ideology critique is to change the "dominant social relations of production" (1991:225) Zavarzadeh and Morton suggest that in order to accomplish this task, this form of "critique" must

...first intervene in the construction of hegemonic cultural meanings that erase social contradictions from the scene of the social and produce a ludic political imaginary free of class antagonism for the subject in late capitalism. Such an intervention requires that radical theory not only go beyond humanist common sense but also beyond ludic undecidability. (1991:225)

Thus, what these authors are in essence proposing is the cultivation and advancement of a discourse which transcends both the limits of mainstream academic trajectories and ludic postmodernist constructs. In other words, they argue that forms of ludic deconstruction and traditional critique be abandoned in favour of a political ideology critique

...which (because it rejects hegemonic presuppositions and by doing so works to oppose and displace the established meanings of culture through intervening in the relations of production and the social formation that produces those meanings/representations) constitutes an oppositional, political practice. (Zavarzadeh & Morton, 1991:190)

The ideology critique which will be used in this undertaking is therefore explicitly political and engages in theory as a form of critique - as an intervention, a disruption of dominant ways of seeing.
More specifically, ideology critique informed by critical pedagogy seeks to provide a contextual understanding of the material conditions undergirding the production of knowledge. It involves revealing the ideological dimensions of regnant academic discourses, practices and cultural forms. The purpose of such an exercise is to interrupt those hegemonic (or commonsensical) discourses which occlude the potential for change by representing themselves as "natural" givens rather than as constructed, historical products. In this sense, the taken-for-granted presuppositions embodied within dominant ideological formations are problematized. Moreover, this form of investigation does not satisfy itself with simply "interpreting" or presenting different versions (or subversions) of the world but rather aspires to produce an actively revolutionary knowledge which would enable citizens to become actors in making history. In contrast to traditional empirical strategies which merely describe the "given" social order with "value-neutrality" as their guiding beacon in order to "increase" knowledge, those engaged in the critical tradition are "unembarrassed by the label 'political'" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994:140) and enter into the investigation with their assumptions on the table so that "no one is confused concerning the epistemological and political baggage they bring to the research." (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994:140) The researcher, identified as a "worker", conducts their research as a form of social or cultural criticism and accepts and acknowledges certain basic assumptions including the recognition that all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are socially and historically constituted: that facts can never be isolated from the domain
of values or removed from the realm of ideological inscriptions and that relationships or social formations examined within our society are mediated by relations of capitalist organization.

In the following chapters, I attempt to illuminate the contextual framework which gave rise to the proliferation of conservative attacks on "political correctness", uncover the underlying ideological agenda, interrogate the hegemonic presuppositions contained in the texts and more generally, seek to advance the discourse of critical pedagogy and resistance multiculturalism.

The (Not So) Great Books

In the previous chapter it was argued that the Sixties provide an important frame of reference for current contestations in both the educational and political realms. However, a number of texts which have recently emerged served to distort the historical and political relevance of that decade and undermine contemporary progressive initiatives. Setting the tone for the proliferation of conservative texts attacking higher education was the publication of Allan Bloom’s The Closing Of The American Mind. Between 1986 and 1989, Bloom received over “three million dollars in mostly unrestricted gifts” from the Olin Foundation and in 1987 published his right-wing cultural manifesto which many agree started a trend towards the corporate funded diatribes against progressive educational reforms now so popular within mainstream culture. In retrospect, Bloom’s book was the opening salvo in a concerted campaign to undermine the public’s faith in education and set the
tone for two recent publications - Dinesh D’Souza’s *Illiberal Education* and Roger Kimball’s *Tenured Radicals*.

In his text, Bloom condemns the Sixties and blames the democratic reforms of that decade for the decline of Western civilization. Bloom (1987:319) claims that in the aftermath of campus upheavals in the Sixties, "the very distinction between educated and uneducated...had been levelled". Hence, for Bloom, the 60s were earmarked by a blatant disrespect for authority, particularly the authority of the intellect. Bloom conjures up images of "chaos" and "decay" in the moral and intellectual fabric of our society which are, according to his narrative, the inevitable result of Sixties radicalism. The following lengthy quote best illustrates his position.

>Catering to democracy's most dangerous and vulgar temptations was the function of the famous "critical philosophy"...[It] provided an artificial substitute for intellectual stimulation...About the sixties it is now fashionable to say that...many good things resulted. But, so far as universities are concerned, I know of nothing coming from that period; it was an unmitigated disaster for them...The sixties were the period of dogmatic answers and trivial tracts. (Bloom, 1987:319-322)

Bloom’s attack on higher education however, conveniently excludes the degree to which the sources of decadence and decline may be attributed to existing arrangements of social and economic power. Of course, criticism of economic arrangements would be equivalent to an attack on the system itself and since the maintenance of repressive conditions was the impetus behind the conservative restoration, any interrogation of the system is out of the question.
Indeed, issues of inequality and injustice are relegated to the domain of inconsequentiality. Bloom (1987:314) claims that

[the imperative to promote equality, stamp out racism, sexism, and elitism (the peculiar crimes of our democratic society), as well as war, is overriding for a man who can define no other interest worthy of defending.]

Bloom's disdain for activism therefore suggests that the engagement of academics with specific contemporary social issues is, at best, a "distraction from the scholar's true vocation", and at worst, results in a "total subversion of scholarly integrity." (Jones, 1992:71) Hence, for Bloom, the pedagogical and moral responsibilities of scholars should be divorced from the struggles of everyday life - a position which perpetuates the separation of theory and praxis and which is therefore antithetical to the central tenets of critical pedagogy. Indeed the notion of transformative or insurgent intellectualism is greeted with contempt by neoconservatives. Yet, the neoconservative position begs the question - if objectivity, detachment and impartiality are necessary to the actual process of acquiring and transmitting knowledge - as the dominant value system of the university clearly affirms- how does such scholarship connect with ordinary life, with society or with the world outside of the academy? Furthermore, how does the objective, scientific scholar even have a social conscience? Does the disinterested pursuit of knowledge preclude concern for social change on the part of the scholar?

From the standpoint of critical pedagogists, educators must avoid the bourgeois model of intellectual life which permeates the academy and which
conceives of academic activity in individualistic or elitist terms. (hooks & West, 1991) Moreover, the virtue of detachment valorized within rightist educational discourse becomes in critical pedagogical terms, the vice of indifference when intellectuals stop viewing themselves as active agents in society. The ivory tower philosopher-kings whom Bloom and company cherish are the equivalent of what Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) deem "accommodating intellectuals" who denounce politics while simultaneously refusing to take risks. Accommodating intellectuals function primarily to "mediate uncritically ideas and social practices that serve to reproduce the status quo" by clinging to the spurious concept of objectivity. (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985:39)

By contrast, scholars working in the tradition of critical pedagogy remind us of the importance of insurgent or transformative intellectualism and claim that educators

...can and should make a difference through an active engagement in counter-hegemonic struggles of resistance to racism, sexism, homophobia and capitalist exploitation in its many insidious formations. (McLaren, 1993:30)

Yet, according to Bloom, concern for social injustices would seem to be irrefutable evidence of one still unquestionably enamoured of the sixties. Thus, Bloom conveniently evades the disconcerting, unsettling problems of "sexism, racism, class exploitation, and other social issues that bear down so heavily on the present." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:52)

Furthermore, Bloom brazenly assumes that youth have no interest in such pertinent social issues and that they have no understanding or
appraisal of courses which address them. \textsuperscript{31} He simply dismisses them as propagandistic and ignores that these issues often inform the very conditions of student's existence. Under the banner of excellence, Bloom promotes a nineteenth century brand of elitism by appealing to a narrowly defined "Western tradition" conveyed through a pedagogy unencumbered by the messy concerns of equity, social justice, or the need to educate a critical citizenry. Of course such a pedagogical approach runs counter to the spirit of critical pedagogy for Bloom's solution to educational malaise is both profoundly anti-utopian and corresponds with a more general vision of domination and control.

As Aronowitz and Giroux (1991:53) point out.

\textit{...conditions of learning become impossible for the vast majority of diverse peoples who live in this society. What we are left with is the philosophy and pedagogy of hegemonic intellectuals cloaked in the mantle of academic enlightenment and literacy.}

Bloom's best-selling tirade created a great deal of controversy and incited a number of thoughtful critiques. It is therefore not my intention to recycle the criticisms of Bloom's work. Rather, I will focus on the recent publications of D'Souza and Kimball who like Bloom espouse an elitist, hegemonic system which is primarily based in their defense of the "classic" Western tradition. Other common elements of their analyses include the seventeenth century, free market liberal usage of the concept of free speech and academic freedom:

\textsuperscript{31}Bloom (1987:61) complains that courses in "value-clarification" which are "springing up in schools are supposed to provide models for parents and get children to talk about abortion, sexism or the arms race, issues the significance of which they cannot possibly understand." In addition, Bloom claims that such education is "propaganda".
unsubstantiated allegations that universities are being overrun by leftist academics: an unrelenting belief in value-neutral scholarship: the role of the university in: capitalist legitimation: a concerted attack on the Sixties: "special interest" groups and, multiculturalism in general. It is important to point out that both these texts should be seen as two more products of the "ideas industry" created by the conservative right.

In 1990 Roger Kimball, managing editor of Hilton Kramer's conservative art journal, The New Criterion\(^2\) published Tenured Radicals - essentially a pastiche of previously written essays that had appeared in the journal. Despite Kimball's claims that his book was a work of investigative journalism, it reads more like another tract in the cultural war and is peppered with stock phrases from the vocabulary of the cultural right wing. In his text, Kimball attempts to prove that recent developments in the academy signify a "concerted effort to attack the very foundations of [Western] society." \(1991:xviii\) Kimball's book, an indignant screed against the soecism of "tenured radicals", was generously funded by Olin and the IEA and received a glowing cover endorsement from Allan Bloom who (apparently thinking that Kimball was working on a major motion picture) claimed that "all persons serious about education should see it." Not surprisingly, Kimball's assessment of Bloom's book (which was published in The New York Times Book Review).

\(^2\)The New Criterion itself began as a bodyguard of Western civilization with a $100,000 start-up grant from the Olin Foundation. It also receives funding from the Heritage, Bradley and Scaife Foundations. (Blumenthal,1988; Diamond,1991; Messer-Davidow,1993)
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graces the front cover of Bloom's book and credits it with being "an unparalleled reflection on today's intellectual and moral climate...that rarest of documents, a genuinely profound book."

In grand melodramatic fashion, Kimball claims that yesterday's student radical is today's tenured professor or academic dean who by and large has remained true to the radical ideology of the sixties. He writes:

The truth is that when the children of the sixties received their professorships and deanships they did not abandon the dream of radical cultural transformation; they set out to implement it. Now, instead of disrupting classes, they are teaching them; instead of attempting to destroy our educational institutions physically, they are subverting them from within. Thus it is that what were once the political and educational ambitions of academic renegades appear as ideals on the agenda of the powers that be. (Kimball, 1990:166-167)

According to Kimball, the aim of these tenured radicals is "nothing less than the destruction of the values, methods and goals of traditional humanistic study". (1990:xi) In order to illustrate this assault on the academy, Kimball offers his book as a self-proclaimed "report from the front." This use of military slang is indicative of the hysterical and aggressive tone of Kimball's book which far from being a sophisticated critique of academia, reads more like a log book in which Kimball provides blow by blow descriptions of the "wars" being waged at academic conferences and on campuses. Yet one would be hard pressed to feel the need to take shelter for the campus "debacles" which Kimball describes are far from revolutionary. Indeed, Kimball's account succinctly demonstrates the way in which the left has isolated itself from the
broader public sphere. In this sense, concerned educators should take note of Kimball's book - not for the reasons undergirding Bloom's endorsement - but because it documents what Gitlin called the "dismantling of the left."\footnote{83}{In 1990 the University of Michigan hosted a conference titled "P.C. - What's Behind The Frame-up?" which featured Todd Gitlin as one of the keynote speakers. In his lecture, Gitlin traced the rise of the new right and reminded leftists that the hegemony of the right was re-established through a concerted and financially backed campaign. He also expressed a disdain for the development of identity politics which he credits in part, for the dismantling of the left. He also argued that the claims made by conservative reactionaries like Bloom, Kimball and D'Souza about left-wing hegemony on campuses is an "embarrassing overstatement given the endless fragmentation and divisions that characterize the left."} Of course, such an assertion is not meant to condone this book for critics like Kimball make no distinction between extremists among their opposition and those who are raising legitimate questions about pedagogical practices. Rather than presenting the current debate over education as a tenable conflict in which reasonable disagreement is possible, they reduce it to a simple binary opposition between "us" and "them". As Graff points out that,

> Arguments that at the very least are worthy of debate - like the argument that political factors such as race, class, gender, and nationality have influenced art and criticism far more than education has traditionally acknowledged - have been reduced by their opponents to their crudest and most strident form and thus dismissed without a hearing. (1992:4)

The conservative desire has been to cast the debate in terms of the West v.s. the Rest or as Roger Kimball puts it, a choice between "culture and barbarism". Critical educators by contrast, eschew the propensity to see the world in Manichean terms, as some sort of titanic struggle between forms of...
civilized "high" culture and the primitive, contaminating forces of popular culture. Yet, by creating this reductionistic, binary opposition, conservatives become by default, the defenders of civilization itself.

Of course, this type of reductionism is rejected by critical pedagogists for it reflects the Cartesian dualism inherited from the legacy of Western Enlightenment. As McLaren (in press) argues,

> Western language and thought are constructed as a system of differences organized de facto and de jure as binary oppositions - white/black, good/bad...with the primary term being privileged and designated as the defining term or the norm of cultural meaning, creating a dependent hierarchy. Yet the secondary term does not really exist outside the first, but, in effect, exists inside of it, even though the phallogocentric logic of white supremacist ideology makes you think it exists outside and in opposition to the first term.

Taken a step further McLaren's insights can be extended to the debate in education between the guardians of the Western tradition and those various groups arguing for a more inclusive curriculum. Far from being a cohesive, unified group, progressives articulating the need for a multicultural curriculum represent a variety of interests and concerns. Thus the way in which the right has characterized the debate between us and them, good and evil represents the crudest form of reductionism. The so-called p.c. controversy is far more multifaceted than conservatives would have us believe. The either/or binarism exemplified by neoconservative education reformists is repudiated by critical pedagogists in favour of a more dialectical approach. In other words critical pedagogists argue for a both/and approach in which there
is room for the Eurocentric position as long as it does not parade as the
universal. Eurocentrism and whiteness, rather than being an invisible marker
against which all "others" are constituted and judged becomes itself a form of
"ethnicity" to be interrogated and examined. Coco Fusco warns that
to ignore white ethnicity is to redouble its hegemony
by naturalizing it. Without specifically addressing
white ethnicity there can be no critical evaluation of
the construction of the other. (cited in
Wallace,1991:7)

In these conservative texts however, Eurocentricity and/or whiteness represent
the normative frame of reference and are the standards of valuation used to
judge "other" works. Hence, the thought of women, persons of colour etc. are
deemed subordinate and those incorporating these works into curricula are
accused of being anti-Western. No doubt it delights such critics to think of
themselves as defenders of civilization against the invasion of intellectually
inept, left-wing guerillas.

A similar Manichean-like reductionism is evident in the work of Dinesh
D'Souza (currently a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute) who
was launched into the limelight when his book Illiberal Education became the
anti-p.c. bible in conservative and liberal circles. 84 A hand-picked

84There is a certain degree of irony in the way in which D'Souza's book became the
anti-p.c. bible for it appears that D'Souza was unable to trace accurately the history
of the term and was incapable of understanding its ironic undertones. In the
introduction to his book, D'Souza claims that the term p.c. seems to have originated
in the early part of the century and was employed by various species [emphasis mine]
of Marxists. D'Souza, employing a remarkable leap in logic claims that because the
revolutionary ideologues of that era were "serious people", there is "no indication that
they spoke of political correctness with any trace of irony of self-deprecation." (D'Souza,1992:xiv) Such an assertion would come no doubt, as a surprise to various
spokesperson and former domestic policy analyst in the Reagan administration, underwritten by neoconservative since his teens, D'Souza was capitulated from virtual anonymity to media stardom. (Henson, 1991) His meteoric rise from obscurity to a national best-selling author is almost as bizarre as it is sublime especially for someone whose first book, an admiring biography of Jerry Falwell, remains virtually unknown and unread. (Henson, 1991) Yet D'Souza's background provides a prime example of the way in which a few right-wing institutions can transform an unsung incendiary into a national public figure. Blumenthal (1988:48) describes in detail how conservative think tanks recruit youthful lackeys, usually "under forty" and launch them into stardom - all it takes is money. Shortly after his book was published, it became a best-seller and D'Souza began appearing on nationally syndicated talk shows as a revered expert on "educational" issues despite the fact that D'Souza is a think tank research fellow and not a scholar. This is an example of a trend identified by Messer-Davidow (1993) who claims that think tanks have been able to endow an "academized" aura of authority on research done outside of the academy. Of course, D'Souza's fame is due in large part to financial banking from right-wing think tanks. A John Olin fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, D'Souza received in 1988 through the IEA a $30,000 grant from the Olin Foundation to begin working on a book tentatively

leftists who have spent time tracing the genealogy of the term. (Perry, 1992; Raskin, 1992) Had D'Souza spoken to anyone on the left he would have discovered that the term was invariably used in an ironic sense. For a more detailed discussion of this, see chapter two.
titled *The New Elite*, which eventually became *Illiberal Education*. When he became a research fellow at the AEI in 1989, the Olin Foundation contributed another $50,000. In 1990 Olin gave him yet another $50,000 and the Madison Center authorized a $20,000 grant for the promotion of the book upon publication. (Henson, 1991) Hence, D'Souza received $150,000 for the writing and promotion of his book from a variety of think tanks which have, in popularizing and promoting his book, also advanced their political agenda.

In the introduction to the Vintage Edition of *Illiberal Education* (1992) D'Souza claims that left-wing educators have, instead of "cultivating in young people...qualities of critical thought and civil argument" created "communities where serious and honest discussion is frequently drowned out by a combination of sloganeering, accusation and intimidation." (1992:xiii) D'Souza however, is himself an expert on intimidation. His experience derived in part from his participation in a long list of humiliating and degrading tactics while he was editor of the notorious *Dartmouth Review*. While editor of the Dartmouth Review and later as managing editor of Policy Review (the theoretical journal of the Heritage Foundation), D'Souza participated in several racist, anti-Semitic, homophobic and sexist exploits.\(^85\) While an understanding

---

\(^85\)D'Souza's infamy in leftist circles can be attributed to his many and varied perverse activities and articles. For example, while at Dartmouth, he ran an interview with a former KKK leader and included an illustration with a black man hanging from a tree. (*New Yorker*, 1991) In another incident he published an article attacking affirmative action written in a parody of black vernacular. (*Village Voice*, 1991) In another article written for the Heritage Foundation's *Policy Review*, D'Souza, commenting on gender issues claimed that "The question is not whether women should be educated at Dartmouth. The question is whether women should be educated at all." (cited in Henson, 1991:6) In another instance D'Souza and others
about and knowledge of the backgrounds of authors such as Kimball and D'Souza is interesting, it is relevant for the purpose of this work only insofar as it provides a contextual framework from which to analyze the major themes which undergird their undertakings.

Although the positions of Bloom, D'Souza and Kimball defend various aspects of the conservative agenda for schooling, they share common ideological and political threads. It is therefore my intention to provide a brief overview of the "pattern which connects" these various indictments of progressive educational initiatives.

**The Myth of Left-Wing Repression**

While Kimball (1990:xvi) warns us of the "alarming development" of a "new form of thought control based on a variety of pious new Left slogans and attitudes" and D'Souza (1992:xv) claims that those who have "trespassed against the prevailing orthodoxy [of p.c.] were made to suffer", little evidence exists to substantiate their claims. In fact, reports that radicals are running amok in the academy in their attempts to impose p.c. thinking appear to be exaggerated.

A study conducted by the American Council on Education found that during the 1990-1991 academic year only three percent of all institutions surveyed reported controversies on their campuses with regards to textbooks working at the *Dartmouth Review* illegally obtained confidential files from a gay and lesbian organization and published excerpts from them in the newspaper. Under his editorship, the newspaper also decided to commemorate Hitler's birthday and emblazoned the front page with a picture of the Nazi leader.
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or information presented in the classroom. In addition, a national survey of university administrators released in the summer of 1991, found that p.c. was not the intense campus issue that rightist pundits had portrayed it to be. According to the survey's findings, faculty members complained of pressure from students and colleagues to alter the "political and cultural content of their courses at only 5% of all colleges." (cited in Ehrenreich, 1991:57)

Moreover, the claim that tenured radicals have taken over the universities is based more on fear than on fact. In a national poll roughly five percent of university faculty called themselves "radical". (Gitlin, 1991; McLaren, 1990, 1992) Ironically enough both Kimball and D'Souza chose to ignore and/or misrepresent a variety of findings which do not support their charges. In Illiberal Education, D'Souza (1992:231) claims that evidence suggests that the composition of faculty in terms of political philosophy is "remarkably homogeneous" in that the number of liberal professors is "more than double the number of conservative professors." The evidence he cites is from a Carnegie Foundation report; however, D'Souza conveniently neglects to give the actual breakdown of the findings. The fact is that the documentation which was gathered by the Carnegie Foundation suggests that academics are not nearly as "radical" as D'Souza, Kimball and other NAS members would have us think. According to the study which surveyed 5,000 teachers, a mere 5.8% considered themselves "left" as opposed to 33.8% who considered

---

86 This statistic was taken from the survey which was cited in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 4, 1991.
themselves "liberal", 26.6% who said they were "middle of the road", 29.6% who said they were "moderately conservative", and 4.2% who claimed to be "strongly conservative". If one examines these figures carefully, 39.6% of teachers deem themselves radical and/or liberal while 60.4% consider themselves centrist and/or conservative. Moreover, the Carnegie findings represent a "shift to the right since 1969." (Weisburg, 1992:87)

Another survey of 35,000 faculty members at 392 U.S. colleges and universities revealed that only a small minority of faculty members identify with left-wing politics. Moreover, only five per cent of respondents to a survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute identified themselves as "far left." It appears as though the picture of campuses as bastions of intellectual tyranny ruled by radical professors is a figment of p.c. bashers' imaginations. D'Souza, Kimball and their anti-p.c. comrades seem to have overstated their case, for the "dominant power remained in the hands of the traditional status quo" both in the universities and in other centres of power. (Shor, 1992:248) Interestingly enough, even as they denounce the despotism of the "radical" thought police, right-wingers grant that universities became more conservative during the 1980s. John Podhoretz, son of *Commentary* editor Norman Podhoretz claimed that,

> there's a fundamental redirection going on...The world is a hospitable place for conservative ideology today in a way it certainly wasn't in the 1970s. (cited in Hammer, 1985:48)

---

87In May 1991, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* published the results of the 1989-1990 survey which placed the number of "radical" faculty at 4.9 per cent.
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Even Kimball (1991:xiv) cannot ignore this reality although he does his best to understate the case by claiming that the student population moved "quietly to the right in recent years". In fact, they moved to the right noisily.

...by flying Confederate flags and disrupting the classes of black professors, shouting slurs and spitting at minority students, quoting Hitler on Yom Kippur and beating gays with baseball bats. (Berube, 1991:6)

Rather than focusing on the realities of campus relations, these authors have instead successfully demonized Leftist intellectuals and student activists as a coterie of proselytisers bent on stifling free expression and exercising censorship on behalf of thought police resurrected from Orwell's universe. However, much of what is called "censorship" in the p.c. debate is actually protest. It is the free speech of those people whom D'Souza, Kimball and company do not want to hear. Conservative spokespersons accuse their p.c. opposition of cultivating mini "ministries of truth" which by their accounts, have sprung up like noxious weeds on campuses and threaten to choke out the flowers of free expression. Yet, there is a disgusting irony in this charge. The reforms which anti-p.c.'ers attack were won in part by the student movement of the 60s which fought some of its first battles over free speech with the first major struggle being the 1964 free speech movement at Berkeley. Activists who fight bigotry and discrimination on campus today are descendants of the radical tradition of the sixties and are attempting to extend

---

88Louis Menand cites a poll conducted by the American Council On Education which found that seventy-four per cent of the nation's freshman class described themselves as "politically middle-of-the road or conservative." (1991:48)
free speech and "voice" to subaltern groups thus far marginalized from regnant academic discourse. In contrast, the right-wing crusaders against p.c. are for free speech only when it suits their purposes. Howard Zinn illuminates this form of political hypocrisy.

The right declares their admiration for such freedom in principle, and suggests that radicals are insufficiently grateful for its existence. But when teachers actually use this freedom, introducing new subjects, new readings, outrageous ideas, challenging authority, criticizing "Western civilization", amending the "canon" of great books as listed by certain educational authorities of the past - then the self-appointed guardians of "high culture" become enraged. (1991:148)

Indeed, there is a curious propensity on the Right to resuscitate issues like free speech and academic freedom at different times to advance specific academic and political agendas. (Kellner, 1991)⁸⁹ In speaking to this issue, bell hooks claims that,

Again and again, academic freedom is evoked to deflect attention away from the ways knowledge is used to reinforce and perpetuate domination, away from the ways in which education is not a neutral

---

⁸⁹As was argued previously in chapter two, I am not suggesting that certain factions on the left are completely innocent for there are instances of dogmatism when the "correct" language is expected and often times demanded. Indeed, many left liberals have sought the institution of speech codes; however, speech codes are no solution. First of all, speech codes leave untouched institutional sources of racism and bigotry. Moreover, in some instances, university administrations facing movements against racism on campus have adopted speech codes as a manoeuvre to avoid more radical demands. In other words, they may be seen as strategies of containment. Once again it is important to reiterate the fact that verbal uplift and issues of language do not constitute radical or revolutionary changes in the actual structures of power and domination. As Louis Menand (1992) reminds us, the institution of speech codes or for that matter, changes in the curriculum are merely esoteric quick fixes and are the cheapest social programs ever devised.
process. Whenever this happens, the very idea of academic freedom loses its meaning and integrity. (1988:64)

Herbert Kohl suggests that today neoconservatives are using the complaint that their intellectual freedom is being restricted as a mask for their attempts to exert control over ideas on university campuses and to "push out ethnic and women's studies" as well as to prevent the "rethinking of the curriculum from a world rather than Western European perspective." (1991:35) Thus it appears that the supposed defenders of free speech and academic freedom are those who are taking a rigid, "correct" stance in an attempt to silence students and educators who raise questions about the way in which universities have traditionally defined what is necessary to know in order to be an educated person. In essence, the new Right has attempted to coordinate efforts in conservative political, educational, and cultural circles to define a narrow, exclusive, and monolithic vision of what it means to be an educated citizen. The point of conservative haranguements of course is to harass and intimidate all marginalized teachers who have the moral courage to interrogate and challenge the hegemonic assumptions of the dominant groups in the universities that "insist that their views prevail because they are 'natural'." (Morton, 1992:90)

Essentially all view schools as institutions organized to propagate and sanction either the economic and political interests of business elites or the privileged cultural capital of ruling class groups. This is demonstrated in
D'Souza's (1992:xx) following remarks where he suggests that a new vision of education must

...integrate the highest ideals of equality and excellence, enabling future generations of young people to be more productive workers and harmonious citizens.

The underlying logic of capitalism legitimation becomes clearly obvious in this "vision" for higher education and any deviation from this agenda becomes tantamount to high treason. Furthermore, from the standpoint of conservative authors, any interrogation of the established "canon" becomes commensurate to threatens the foundation of Western civilization and equivalent to ideological brainwashing.

In this war against Western culture, one chief object of attack within the academy is the traditional canon and the pedagogical values it embodies...Instead of reading the great works of the past, students watch movies, pronounce on the depredations of patriarchal society, or peruse second or third-rate works...after four years they will find that they are ignorant of the tradition and that their college education was largely a form of ideological indoctrination. (Kimball, 1990:xii,xvii)

The trepidation, apprehension and sanctimonious indignation that typifies this perspective rests on a "defensiveness in which all 'others' are seen as enemies bent on destroying our civilization and way of life." (Giroux, 1992:233) In his book Beyond The Culture Wars, Gerald Graff argues that the protective attitude of neoconservatives really betrays a lack of confidence in Western culture and represents a fear that it could not stand up to criticism. He claims that

It is Western insecurity, not Western self-confidence, that one senses beneath the chest-thumping
exhortations heard today to stop acting like wimps, whiners and victim lovers and to stand up for the superiority of the West. In fact, the West-Is-Besters are doing precisely what they denounce others for: revelling in self-pity, presenting themselves as helpless victims, and using the curriculum to prop up a flagging self-esteem. (1992:49)

**Feminists, Special Interests And Other Politically Correct Bogeymen**

Kimball and D'Souza both blame "special interests" as the culprits responsible for the current "decline" in the academy. These so-called "special interests" apparently personify a Sixties demeanour and the contention that current campus unrest is the natural outcome of Sixties upheavals is common to these recent attacks on higher education. Indeed, D'Souza and Kimball, following in Bloom's footsteps, launch rhetorical missiles aimed at the sixties and its children who are now apparently holding the universities hostage and "politicizing" students. All of these books share the lament that radicals have corrupted the universities. Central to such a charge is the underlying assumption that conservatives are politically nonpartisan and that their call for educational reform is objective and value-free. How these custodians of Western culture can protest the irruption of politics into something that has always been political is not only laughable but says something according to one commentator, about "how remarkably successful official histories have been in presenting themselves as natural objects, untainted by worldly interests." (Gates,1990:72) As discussed in the previous chapter, the right's complaints about increasing leftist influence demonstrates the hegemonic nature of their own discourse. As such they fail to acknowledge that the
controversies over what constitutes knowledge really signify more profound political, economic and cultural relations of history. As Appie (1993:46) states,

...what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations and struggles among identifiable class, race, gender and religious groups.

The neoconservative argument is often made in defense of an objective and unbiased academic discourse. While the claim to objectivity may be acceptable to conservatives, in reality such rhetoric is merely a mask intended to conceal their own highly charged, ideological agenda. As Gramsci (1971:212) so aptly pointed out, "so-called neutrality only means support for the reactionary side." In addition, by invoking claims to value-neutrality and objectivity, such accounts neglect the fact that the paradigm which has dominated the academy for many years is anything but "value-free". Michael Apple (1990:8) maintains that such a claim

...ignores the fact that the knowledge that now gets into schools is already a choice from a much larger universe of possible social knowledge and principles. It is a form of cultural capital that comes from somewhere, that often reflects the perspectives and beliefs of powerful segments of our social collectivity...is repeatedly filtered through ideological and economic commitments.

Therefore, the "objective", "impartial" inquiry presumed to be under attack by a frenzy of left-wing radicals and "special interest" groups never did exist in the first place.

Yet, Kimball (1991:xiii) claims that every special interest - women's studies, black studies, gay studies - has found a "welcome roost in the academy" while D'Souza (1992:2) announces that a "new worldview is
consolidating itself" in the universities. D'Souza (1992:17) declares that the older professorate has given way to a new generation of intellectuals "weaned on the assorted ideologies of the late 1960s."

It must be noted here that one of the major themes in the conservative attack has been its indictment of feminist scholarship and the development of women's studies programs. As Susan Faludi documents in her book *Backlash*, the backlash against women has reached epic proportions and the success of this vitriolic hate campaign owes much to the contribution of a number of university scholars. Faludi (1991:290-291) claims that while Bloom's book was ostensibly about the decline in education, he dedicates page after page to an indictment of the women's movement and to feminist scholarship. According to Bloom, feminists have invaded every academic sanctuary - a view shared by the recent harangues of D'Souza and Kimball who in a similar vein denounce feminism and feminist scholarship in the university.

In the first chapter of *Tenured Radicals*, Kimball (1990:15) claims that "the single biggest challenge to the canon as traditionally conceived" is "radical feminism" which "seeks to subordinate literature to ideology". According to Kimball (1990:xii), proponents of feminist studies, among other radical tendencies, have become one of the "dominant" voices in the academy. However, it appears that Kimball overstates his case for there is an abundance of research which suggests that women are still not equally represented in the academy. According to Faludi, "women, feminist or otherwise, account for a mere ten per cent of the tenured faculty at all four-year institutions (and a
mere three to four per cent at Ivy League colleges) - an increase of only six per cent from the 1960s." Moreover, "five times more women with Ph.D.'s are unemployed than men" and the claim that feminist professorships are overrunning campuses is also fallacious for "only twelve women's studies chairs exist nationwide".(1991:293)

Another example which points to the falsity of claims that feminists have infiltrated campuses in great numbers, is a Canadian study published by the CAUT which cited a StatsCan study that had revealed that in 1985, women accounted for "only 17% of full-time teachers at Canadian universities up from 13% in 1969-1970."(cited in Smith,1991:10)

Kimball also dedicates several pages to the "feminist assault" which is "deeply at odds with the presuppositions of traditional humanistic study." (Kimball,1991:17) In a similar vein, D'Souza (1992) refers to feminists as a tyrannical minority and the institutionalization of women's studies as an exercise in ideological indoctrination. D'Souza's intellectual dishonesty and shoddy scholarship are blatantly obvious in his discussion of reading lists for various women's studies courses. He cites Harvard as his example and claims that the assigned texts, which include among others Freid'an's *Feminine Mystique*, de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* and bell hooks *Feminist Theory: From Margin To Center* and *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*, "reflect a similar if not identical understanding of gender difference." (1992:213) This statement alone reveals the fact that D'Souza has not even read the books he so freely critiques and reflects the ways in which D'Souza used "tourism"
rather than accurate methods as his "main method of collecting data". (Thompson & Tyagi, 1993) The positions put forth by the various authors D'Souza mentions are anything but identical. In fact, bell hooks has been one of the most outspoken critics of "white middle class" feminism and she denounces those feminist scholars who reduce their examinations of women's positions solely to the study of gender to the exclusion of other important factors such as race and class. (See the discussion of this in chapter one.) In addition to his lack of accurate scholarship, D'Souza also makes the absurd claim that women's studies courses are biased because they do not include any "text that could fairly be described as antifeminist." (1992:213) He claims that such a bias is detrimental given the fact that a majority of women "eschew the feminist label." (Kimball:1992:213) If D'Souza wants anti-feminist material to be made available to students, he could easily advise them to watch a movie, turn on the television, or read virtually anything in the popular media for as Faludi (1991) brilliantly and exhaustively details, these are the terrains in which the backlash has manifested itself. And it is precisely this reactionary context which has lent itself to the rejection of the feminist label by young women. It is clear that D'Souza has chosen to ignore the vast amount of literature which exists on this issue, perhaps due in part to his proclivity for seeing such work as politically motivated rather than, "objective" scholarship.

In hindsight the various indictments of the Sixties and the charge of politicization merely reiterate the now commonplace conservative charge that
the legacy of the 60s has contributed to a decline in "traditional" education and a debasement of Western "culture". The new conservatism evident in these educational critiques utilizes the language and image of decline and resonates with a nostalgia for some mythical Golden Age. According to these reactionary innuendoes, an abominable atmosphere now prevails on college campuses. The monsters responsible for the contemporary descent into madness are the left, feminists, Marxists, blacks, minorities - all those groups which D'Souza and Kimball deem "special interests". The fact that minority voices are challenging the existing monocultural society has made neoconservatives tense and they have characterized the demands made by oppressed groups as a wanton attack on Western culture by unruly "special interests" who are undermining the cornerstones of Western virtue and civilization. Yet what the right-wing has effectively done is to subvert and silence the voice of the "other" while promoting the logic of the capitalist marketplace.

Understandably, neither D'Souza nor Kimball view corporate influence as a special interest in the academy. While this is not surprising given their source of funding it also indicates their failure to contextualize their arguments within the broader framework of capitalist social relations. Like Bloom, D'Souza and Kimball rarely see the sources of educational decline as economic and political. In these conservative invectives there is not a "whisper of criticism of capitalism." (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991:29) Indeed, capitalism has no name in these books yet the values and ideals needed to maintain its
hegemony are never interrogated - in fact, they are exalted. For example, Kimball finds nothing objectionable about viewing universities as corporations. He asks what educators find so objectionable about being an employee of a corporation and suggests that business influence places no constraints on intellectuals or the academy.

What is so compromising about being an employee of the state or a corporation? At what point did leftist attitudes so infiltrate everyday language that working for...a major corporation such as Columbia University, should...seem to carry with it a moral taint?...And what dire constraints does...the university impose on the thoughts and actions of its employees? (Kimball,1990:23)

To support his claim that corporate influence does not carry with it a "moral taint". Kimball reiterates the banality of the now well-worn argument which cites the collapse of communism as incontestable evidence of the supremacy of Western society. He claims that countries the world over are rushing to "embrace the principles of Western liberal democracies".(Kimball,1991:23) In other words, he uses the plight of Eastern Europeans as testament that everything on this side of the iron curtain is beyond reproach. In a sense, Kimball's trajectory on education would manifest itself in a sort of pedagogy which intimates that all one needs to know is how to conform to the existing Western paradise. Moreover, in regurgitating assertions of Western superiority, Kimball fails to acknowledge that the principles of democracy are not inherently capitalistic. Indeed, several critical scholars (Chomsky,1990;Kellner,1990;McLaren,1989) have demonstrated that democracy and capitalism are antithetical concepts in practice. D'Souza
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claims that educational institutions must embrace the responsibility of preparing its young people for the "challenges of a globally competitive workforce" by creating "generations of young people to be more productive workers." (1992:xx) Of course, such a pedagogical approach reduces learning to the dynamics of the transmission and imposition of facts and skills - to what Freire calls a banking education.

In *Pedagogy Of The Oppressed* (1970), Paulo Freire delineates his conceptualization of the banking method of education. Freire claims that in the banking concept of education, knowledge is a "gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing." (1970:58) Students, rather than being conceived of as active agents, become depositories and teachers become depositors. That is, students become the passive recipients of a stagnant and unchanging storehouse of "facts" and "information" rather than dynamic creators and interpreters of knowledge. Freire (1970:60) reminds us that the banking method of education regards people as adaptable, manageable beings and that the more students work at storing the "deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world." If one applies Freire's ideas to the current debate over the curriculum and the conservative cries for the preservation of the tradition of Western thought one can immediately recognize the banking method mentality which undergirds this position. By treating the Western tradition as the highest achievement of humankind and as something to be
extended to subaltern classes. Students are expected to be the passive recipients of a "classic" storehouse of information while their lived realities, histories and voices are silenced. In essence such a situation lends itself to the development of what Shor (1987) refers to as a "culture of silence" by which he means the ways in which official/traditional pedagogy constructs students as passive characters in the classroom rather than as animated and active agents in educational formations. The notions of critical consciousness and citizenship education are subverted by conservative positions which are intended to legitimate a form of pedagogy which serves as a hegemonic apparatus for maintaining the current conditions of inequality and injustice.

As McLaren points out,

By defining academic success almost exclusively in terms of creating compliant, productive, and patriotic workers, the new conservative agenda...dodges any concern for nurturing critical and committed citizens...The neoconservative agenda has, in effect, brought the advancement of democracy in our schools to a state of arrest. (1989:161-162)

Apple (1993) reiterates this concern and claims that neoconservatives have cleverly transformed the very meaning of democracy so that it is disconnected from notions of equality and social justice. Rather, a vision of society based on individualism, market imperatives and competition are the currents that run deep in the conservative agenda.

Pedagogical differences are without a doubt, the crux of the current contestation in academic and intellectual circles as the new Right's exorciating attack on schooling argues that the moral vocabulary of critical pedagogy must
be expunged as leftist or socialistic. For conservative traditionalists, knowledge is, from beginning to end, thinking with and through established codes and conventions and pedagogy is reduced to the transmission or passing on of culture's required skills whereas for critical educators, knowledge is working against established codes, interrogating conventions and pedagogy is thinking beyond the required skills. (Zavarzadeh & Morton, 1991)

The Attack On Popular Culture And Cultural Studies

One of the mostly hotly debated notions in the current controversy is that of culture. For the guardians of the status quo, culture is for all intents and purposes defined as the "best of what has been thought and said." The attempts to preserve so-called Western civilization are simultaneously attempts to valorize Eurocentricity and high culture over popular culture. In the world of Bloom and company

...both non-Western knowledge and the uncultivated knowledge of the masses become a primitive non-knowledge that serves as a conduit to savagery and barbarism - a descent into hell. (McLaren, 1991:11)

Of course, critical pedagogists counter such a view of culture by arguing that "high culture was itself developed out of the fabric of domination and mystification" and therefore must be rejected. (Giroux, 1988:183)

Allan Bloom's denigration of popular and especially youth culture are relatively well-known in academic circles and like his tirade, the discourses of D'Souza and Kimball are based on the myth of decline and their vilification of popular culture is inextricably linked to the call for the restoration of a so-called lost heritage.
In his discussion of "cultural studies" which Kimball describes as a "movement" he claims that

...the study of popular culture has been pursued primarily as a means of attacking the traditional academic concentration on objects of high culture. This can be seen in any number of modish academic movements, but is perhaps most completely exemplified by the movement called Cultural Studies.(1990:39)

He proceeds by demeaning the development of cultural studies and rages against the notion that the products of popular culture are "granted parity (or even precedence over) the most important cultural achievements of our civilization."(1991:xiii) His disdain for cultural studies and popular culture is deeply rooted in his elitist disposition and is clearly exemplified in the following excerpt.

At campuses around the country...we have for some time now been witnessing an aggressive effort to erase the qualitative distinction between high culture and popular culture...Instead of perpetuating the best that has been thought and said, our new humanists assure each other and their students that best is a socially relative term...(Kimball,1990:45)

Kimball’s assertions however neglect that what is considered the "best" or "important" is indeed relative, contextual and political. The traditional canon which he obviously holds dear, was not deemed "superior" in a social and cultural vacuum and is undoubtedly related to issues of power. Yet Kimball completely dismisses this and clings to the notion of culture as having an existence on its own. His disavowal of the political nature of culture and his
disdain for those who view it as such are revealed in this critique of contemporary cultural studies.

In good Marxist fashion, culture is denied autonomy and is reduced to being a coefficient of something else: class relations, sexual oppression, racial exploitation, etc. (Kimball, 1990:193)

In a similar vein, D’Souza claims that the great Western tradition is being corrupted by leftist intellectuals who are overhauling the entire curriculum to reflect "issues of race, ethnicity and gender." (1992:68) In such formulations culture is treated as an entity unto itself - removed from and untainted by societal conditions. These and other such narratives treat the category of true culture as a storehouse filled with the goods of antiquity, waiting to be disseminated anew to each generation. Such a perspective rests on the neo-classical notion that the culture somehow "contains" knowledge (as distinct from the concept that knowledge is socially constructed) and presumably high status knowledge is the only kind of knowledge esteemed enough to warrant inclusion in the curriculum. (McLaren, 1989:20)

Knowledge from this viewpoint becomes exalted, revered and removed from the demands of social critique and ideological interests.

The neo-conservative contempt for popular culture refuses to acknowledge that popular culture is one of the most important sites for building a curriculum. Indeed critical pedagogists have elaborated the notion that the study of popular culture is a necessary and viable component of emancipatory pedagogical praxis. (Apple, 1993; Giroux & Simon, 1989; Giroux, 1992[b]; McLaren & Smith, 1989) The study of it offers the possibility
of comprehending how various cultural forms are imbued with ideological messages which may be internalized or resisted by students and is one of the most significant sites where the construction of everyday lives can be examined.

Conservative educational reformers who deny popular culture as an important foundation of knowledge often underrate students for they fail to accept and work with the knowledge that students already have. (Giroux, 1989, 1992; Grossberg, 1992; McLaren, 1989) In other words, they repudiate the fact that student subjectivities and identities are often heavily influenced by aspects of popular culture. Incorporating the study of popular culture in the curriculum is valuable for it

...provides the opportunity to further our understanding of how students make investments in particular social forms and practices...the study of popular culture offers the possibility of understanding how a politics of pleasure serves to address students in a way that shapes and sometimes secures the often contradictory relations students have to both schooling and the politics of everyday life. (Giroux, 1992: 183)

Furthermore, the study of popular culture and cultural studies allows educators to conceptualize schooling as a form of cultural politics. Of course, this is a pedagogical approach which is under siege by neoconservatives intent on silencing dissenting or oppositional voices which are, often times, cultivated in the terrain of popular culture.

It is imperative to recognize that the structure and discourse of curriculum is neither ideologically neutral nor politically innocent. Approaches
to educational reform always reflect some sort of vision and visions always belong to someone or some group. While the partisan character of critical pedagogy (and critical social theories in general) obviously represents a set of political biases, the stance of neoconservative positions in support of dominant cultural values, while often presented as value-neutral, represent an alternative set of political biases - a bias concealed in a stance of neutrality. To the extent that "biases" translate into curricula and pedagogical practices, they necessarily draw upon specific values, uphold particular relations of power, class, gender, ethnicity and race. In this sense they always have a moral and political dimension contrary to the "disinterestedness" claims made by right-wing education critics. Alexander Cockburn (1991:691) notes that undergirding the cry of " politicization" or what conservatives call the distraction of the university and scholars from their central task of open-ended disinterested inquiry is the intent to fashion minds "sufficiently deadened to reason and history to allow the capitalist project to reproduce itself from generation to generation."

Traditionally, the culture of schooling has operated predominately within a logic that defends it as part of the fabric of high culture. This is a practice which has been challenged and critiqued in the debate over "p.c." as progressive educators argue that the culture of subaltern groups be resuscitated in order to counter the "worst dimensions of dominant culture." (Giroux,1988:183) Moreover, as the opening up of the university brought heretofore excluded groups into the educational citadel, with them have come
conflicts that their exclusion once kept safely at bay. Today, new constituencies are claiming their right to have a say in how culture is defined. Molefi Kete Asante asserts that we occupy changing times and as such the structure of knowledge which has supported white hegemony can no longer be defended as superior or universal. Rather, the white Eurocentric position must take its place, "not above or below, but alongside the rest of humanity". (1992:302)[80]

Dominant groups have attempted to create an ideological consensus around the return to traditional knowledge. The great books and great ideas of the "Western tradition" are offered up as our salvation. It is argued that only the adherence to that tradition will preserve and/or restore democracy. However, it is imperative to recognize that the search for the truth of the Western canon of great works is actually based on an epistemological error that presupposes the existence of a language of primordial being and truth. (McLaren, in press) In general critical pedagogists reject the idea that there can be one textual authority, one definitive set of facts that is divorced from its social, political, cultural and economic context. As such the call for a "common culture" based on the Western tradition can never be an extension to everyone of what a minority mean and believe. Homi Bhabha's

[80] This statement also serves as a reminder that most serious progressive scholars have not argued for the dismissal of the works by so-called "dead white European males" as the right and the media have suggested. Rather they argue for a more inclusive curriculum - one more diverse and relevant for the changing student body.
conceptualization of common culture as the regulation and normalization of difference is worth quoting at length.

Like all myths of the nation's "unity", the common culture is a profoundly conflicted ideological strategy. It is a declaration of democratic faith in a plural, diverse society and, at the same time, a defense against the real, subversive demands that the articulation of cultural difference - the empowering of minorities - makes upon democratic pluralism...The vision of a common culture is perceived to be an ethical mission whose value lies in revealing, prophylactically, the imperfections and exclusion of the political system as it exists. The healing grace of a culture of commonality is supposedly the coevality it establishes between social differences - ethnicities, ideologies, sexualities - an intimation of simultaneity across homogeneous empty time that welds these different voices into a "unisonance" that is expressive of the contemporaneous community of the national culture.(1992:234-235)

Asante maintains that there is no common culture as is claimed by the defenders of the status quo. Rather there is a hegemonic culture promulgated as though it were a common culture. Asante argues that conservative educational reformers have confused the ideas of a common society with that of a common culture. He states that there are certain "cultural characteristics' which are "shared by those within society" but that the meaning or commitment to difference requires the acceptance that there are many cultures. (Asante,1992:308) McLaren argues that the goal of a common culture is born out of a

...modernist legacy of trying to own knowledge, control knowledge, and is related to the Cartesian perspective...It is born out of the legacy of imperialism that privileges the "high" culture of the
Western Enlightenment. It's tied to the desire for objective knowledge. It's a symptom of the desire to contain and control the social by asserting a stable identity. (1992:12)

Furthermore, another important problematic is raised by those who invoke the idea of "common culture" for they speak as if the content of that culture were already settled. Thus, culture is viewed, mistakenly I would argue, as a static, already existing entity - a finished and completed phenomenon, rather than something people struggle to create and change. Moreover, it must be noted that the call for the return to a common culture is merely a rhetorically clever disguise for one of the central issues involved in the current contestations - the attack on multiculturalism which is yet another common thread in the works of D'Souza and Kimball and one to which I now turn.

**Maligning Multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism has undoubtedly become the buzzword of the late 80s and early 90s and has come to mean almost anything to anybody. Furthermore, the genealogy of the term is somewhat difficult to trace. One explanation (Jayo, Oct.1992) cites its origins as being sometime in the early 70s when people, mostly grassroots organizers began trying to describe their communities as members of society without using the term minority which had failed to address the contemporary realities, traditional histories and contributions to society by people of colour.\(^1\) Yet as the conservative

---

\(^1\)Ash Corea also reminds us that one of the problems with the term "minority" is that people of widely differing backgrounds and cultures are lumped together because of one factor: the readiness of white people to discriminate against them. In addition, the label of minority effectively marginalizes them and sets them apart from
restoration gained momentum the term has worked its way into corporate and political arenas to deal with and manage the minority problem. That is, multiculturalism has often been used as a strategy of containment by the state in order to quell dissension among immigrant populations.

In addition, multiculturalism has been appropriated by capitalist interests who have recognized the significance of multiculturalism for the world of commerce. As Rieff points out, there is an ironic affinity between the language of multiculturalists and the language of the modern corporation. Catchphrases such as "diversity" and the need to "do away with boundaries" resemble the stock phrases of CEO's and their desires for "product diversification, the global marketplace and the boundary-less company". (Rieff, 1993:67) Indeed, ethnicity, difference and otherness have been commodified and promoted as "spice, seasoning that can liven up the dull dish that is mainstream white culture." (hooks, 1992:21) Jonathan Rutherford comments on this tendency:

Paradoxically, capital has fallen in love with difference: advertising thrives on selling us things that will enhance our uniqueness and individuality. It's no longer about keeping up with the Joneses, its about being different from them. From world music to exotic holidays in Third World locations, ethnic t.v. dinners to Peruvian hats, cultural difference sells. (cited in hooks, 1992:17)

"mainstream" social life. (1990:255) In a similar vein, Asante (1992) argues that the idea of "mainstream" is nothing more than an additional myth meant to maintain Eurocentric hegemony. In essence, mainstream is a code word for "white".
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Indeed, multinational corporations are working hard at creating a multicultural "image" in order to preserve their marketing. As a result, multiculturalism is offered to us as one of the many colours of Benetton, a candlestick from afar at Pier One Imports, an instant whiff from the Body Shop or the gourmet memories of Dave Nichols' President's Choice products.

Given this context, it is difficult to define the term in such a way that it cannot be manipulated, oversimplified, co-opted, appropriated by cultural opportunists, transformed into a divisive monster, used in quotation marks or mentioned as a substitute for words that have always been used to describe the agenda of the "other". However, the recent work of critical cultural theorists which will be discussed subsequently assists in a critical re-appropriation and reconceptualization of the term multiculturalism.

The attack on p.c. can also be seen, according to Kellner as a camouflage or smokescreen for the maligning of multiculturalism and affirmative action policies. Indeed, the diatribes of D'Souza and Kimball charge multiculturalists for infusing the curriculum with "politics."

...multiculturalism as used in the academy today..is about undermining the priority of Western liberal values in our educational system and society at large...multiculturalism provides a convenient umbrella for the smorgasbord of radical ideologies regnant in the academy.(Kimball,1990:192)

---

92 Kellner's comments on multiculturalism are derived here from personal correspondence and based on a lecture he gave at the University of Texas at Austin on Nov.29,1991.
By the same token, D'Souza describes the "visigoths in tweed" who brainwash students to an approach that "deprecates Western learning and exalts a neo-Marxist ideology promoted in the name of multiculturalism." (1992:b:12) Given the political nature of the debate over education, the conservative propensity of charging multiculturalists with politicizing campuses is somewhat mystifying for conservative critics have never hesitated to furnish a political defense of what they consider the "traditional" curriculum. The right, threatened by demographic shifts in the student body and by the demand for curricular reform, has retreated to a stance of what Gates (1992:xiv) refers to as "intellectual protectionism" where the inviolable Western tradition is exalted while multiculturalism is denigrated as a threat to the literacy, as a poison which has lent itself to a decline in academic standards and as a menace which jeopardizes the presumed cohesiveness of Western society by creating ethnic enclaves and promoting separatist values. Thus, the view of multiculturalism articulated by conservative critics insinuates that minorities unwilling to adopt a consensual view of social life are stubbornly separatist and ethnocentric. However, this view of multiculturalism...carries with it the assumption that society fundamentally constitutes social relations of uninterrupted accord. This view of society furthermore assumes that society is largely a forum of consensus with different minority viewpoints accreditively added on. Of course, this is fundamentally a Cartesian viewpoint. It presupposes a harmonious space in which differences can coexist undisturbed by conflict. (McLaren,1991:47)
In other words, conservatives essentially value the notion of a monocultural education, but in some instances do grant that multicultural courses could potentially be offered in universities. Such a version of multiculturalism then seeks to include diversity in a white contextual hegemony which is referred to as traditional and which remains revered as superior. In the most basic sense, this approach excuses us to return to educational business as usual after "adding a few token minority texts to the syllabus." (Graff, 1992:46) This form of multiculturalism is referred to by McLaren (in press) as conservative or corporate multiculturalism. He points out that while advocates of conservative multiculturalism would like to distance themselves from racist ideologies, they pay only

...lip service to the cognitive equality of all races (the discourses of sameness) but nonetheless charge unsuccessful minorities with having "culturally deprived backgrounds" and a "lack of strong family-oriented values". This perspective provides conservative multiculturalists with a means of rationalizing why some minority groups are successful while other groups are not. (McLaren, in press)

To be sure, this form of conservative multiculturalism undergirds the work of right-wing thinkers like D'Souza and Kimball. Indeed, D'Souza's racist tendencies are evident in his text, especially in his discussions of affirmative action policies. After accurately describing one original aim of affirmative action, to find "capable but disadvantaged minority students", he then pronounces that

There is a desperate shortage of black students who, by any measure of academic promise, can meet the
demanding work requirements and competition of the nation’s best universities. (D’Souza. 1992:40)

In addition, D’Souza’s book is peppered with references to Blacks and Hispanics as “certified” minorities, which are, according to D’Souza accorded a privileged status in the university. The suggestion that universities are in deep trouble because multicultural admissions policies let in students who are less capable is one of the most pervasive myths promulgated by the anti-p.c.’ers. Troy Duster (1991:31) demonstrates that SAT scores and GPA’s (the measures that critics themselves use) indicate, to use just one example, that the typical student is now far more competent, more eligible and prepared than the average 1950s student. 93

In Illiberal Education, D’Souza (1992:2) claims that universities have altered admission rules so that more Blacks and Hispanics are let in while white and Asian American applicants are refused admission. D’Souza claims that this occurs despite the fact that Blacks and Hispanics have considerably lower grade point averages and standardized test scores than whites and Asians. These forms of “essentialist” racism conceive of race differences in hierarchical terms of essential biological inequality with the assertion of white

93 D’Souza’s attack on admissions policies are part of his broader attack on affirmative action. Graff (1992:88) however, maintains that “conservatives who accuse affirmative action programs of lowering academic standards never mention the notorious standard for ignorance that was set by white male college students before women and minorities were permitted in large numbers on campus.” In fact, Graff argues that it has been the “steady pressure for reform from below that has raised academic standards by challenging the laziness and anti-intellectualism of the privileged classes.” (1992:88)
biological superiority used to "justify economic and political inequities." (Frankenberg, 1993:13)

Despite the fact that Duster (1991) points out that SAT scores and GPA's are higher, at least at Berkeley what he, D'Souza and others fail to mention is that the SAT test used for college admission is inherently culturally and racially biased. Hacker claims that not only are SAT tests culturally and racially biased, they are also inherently classist for within each racial group, "students from wealthy families of all races score higher on the SAT than students from poorer families." (1989:64) The "standards" argument is not only narrow but also misleading since a great deal of excellent research exists which debunks the merits of standardized testing. These standardized tests

...test logical reasoning but not patience, one's dictionary vocabulary but not metaphorical grace, one's dexterity with numbers but not argumentative power or scepticism - they have very little to do, in fact, with how people perform in the real world, and they are an insult to education. (Brennan, 1991:21-22)

Moreover, Stanley Fish (1992) reminds us that one of the authors of the SAT was Carl Campbell Brigham who championed in his A Study Of American Intelligence, a classification of races which identified the Nordic as the superior race and, in descending order, locates the least superior race as Negro. In addition, by maintaining that minority student admissions are based on less stringent conditions than those applied to whites, D'Souza and Kimball ignore the long-standing practice (especially at elite universities) of admitting
predominantly white "legacies" - sons and daughters of alumni - regardless of their credentials. (Larew, 1991)

Both D'Souza (1992:5) and Kimball (1991:3) claim that universities have diluted or displaced the "core" curriculum comprised of the great works of Western civilization which have been abandoned in favour of new course requirements stressing non-Western cultures and the works of women. D'Souza, Kimball and their conservative cohorts advocate the preservation of the "core" curriculum and suggest that perhaps some time could be allotted for the study of non-Western works in the interest of diversity. Yet they use the term "diversity" to cover up the ideology of assimilation that undergirds their position. (McLaren, in press) In this view, ethnic groups are reduced to "add-ons" to the dominant culture. However, before one can be added on to the dominant culture, one must first adopt a consensual view of culture and learn to accept the essentially Euro-American patriarchal norms embedded within traditional academic discourse. (McLaren, in press) To insist that students master the "common culture" before being exposed to others defers the pestering question of what constitutes common culture? What makes knowledge worthy of study? Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, universities have historically taught us that the Eurocentric culture, masquerading as the universal, constitutes common culture, while different cultural traditions are depicted as primitive, tribal, exotic or parochial. McLaren (in press) is particularly insightful on this issue for he claims that it

...is not hard to see how racism can be a pre-condition for this form of multiculturalism in so far
as Western virtues become the national-aestheticist
ground for the conservative multiculturalist's view of
civilization and citizenship.

Such racism is evident in the work of D'Souza who laments the demise of
American society should it lose its "predominantly white stamp." (1992:13)
The conservative invectives of both D'Souza and Kimball maintain that
universities are expelling white males from their required reading lists and to
prove that their fears are well-founded they point to an incident at Stanford as
evidence.94 Both authors dedicate a great deal of space to examining the
Stanford "debacle" as a clear indication that the malaise of multiculturalism
has infested the universities and as such necessitates a closer examination.

94Graff(1992:17) points out another example which demonstrates that the claim
that the "classics" have been or are in the process of being expelled from the
curriculum is "provably false". In his book Beyond The Culture Wars, Graff provides
an array of statistics which not only discredits this claim but which illuminates the
shoddy scholarship of D'Souza. Graff examines the case of The Color Purple which
became one of the exhibits in the anti-p.c. defense. Indeed, D'Souza used this case
as an example which illustrated that Shakespeare and other canonical works were
being displaced by the works of people and women of colour. Graff found over a four-
year period (from the fall of 1986, when Alice Walker's novel was first assigned to the
spring of 1990 at Northwestern University) only "two courses in which The Color
Purple was taught", while eight courses "required at least six plays by Shakespeare"
and another eight courses that "required at least two".(1992:21) In addition, Graff
looked at enrolment figures which revealed that the courses which assigned six
Shakespearean plays had an enrolment of 681 students and the one assigning two
had 874 students enrolled, for a total of 1,555 students reading at least two
Shakespearean works. By contrast, student enrolment in the two courses assing
Walker's novel was 124. Thus, for every student who read The Color Purple, 12.5
read at least two Shakespearean plays and 5.5 read six or more. In the end for every
reading of Walker, "there were approximately eighty-three readings of Shakespeare."
(Graff,1992:21) Not only are the charges overblown but it appears that D'Souza did
not check his facts very carefully. In fact, examples of this are abundant in both
D'Souza's and Kimball's books.
In the fall of 1989, Stanford University, after a long debate among faculty and administration, decided to change the name of its Western Civilization course to "Cultures, Ideas and Values." Shortly after this change was made, a melee initiated by the cultural right-wing ensued for they viewed the mild reform as an opportunity to bash the so-called tenured radicals. D'Souza and Kimball, for their part, distort and exaggerate the facts as they apply to the Stanford situation.

D'Souza (1992:59-93) and Kimball (1991:27-32) that the switch made to CIV no longer requires students to take a course on Western civilization or to read the "great" books. These claims are quite simply rebarbative nonsense. Prior to CIV, new Stanford students were offered the choice of enrolling in one of eight yearlong sequences or tracks – each having a slightly different emphasis. Since the institution of CIV, seven of these track continue to be taught essentially as they were, while the change to CIV led to the creation of one new track entitled "Europe And The Americas" which highlights intellectual developments that resulted from the discovery of the New World. Moreover, the claim that the great books are no longer read is a complete and utter distortion for all eight tracks included selections from the Bible, Freud, Shakespeare, Aristotle and St. Augustine. (Mowatt,1992:129-132) The allegation that students now only read second-rate works by women and other minorities not only

...abusively distorts and dismisses the serious scholarship of the past decades on race, ethnicity and gender. It also feeds the common misperceptions that this scholarship, still marginal
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to many classrooms, has instead hijacked them.  
(Stimpson, 1991:382)

In fact, a 1991 survey showed that only "11% of the faculty in general, and 8% of those at community colleges, using readings about race and gender in their undergraduate courses." (cited in Stimpson, 1991:382) The argument that the Western tradition is being junked at places like Stanford is laughable. In spite of challenges to the "great" books courses and a more general insistence that previously excluded cultures should be taught and discussed, "minorities are still grossly underrepresented." (Robbins, 1991:153)

Thus, it appears that similar to their other exaggerated examples, D'Souza and Kimball have also conflated the degree to which multiculturalism and the "victim's revolution" have overhauled the campus climate. Nonetheless, the issue of multiculturalism is a tenacious one which requires further examination. To some degree, D'Souza and Kimball have something in common with critical pedagogists for they both critique the practice of incorporating multicultural add-ons to the curriculum however, the critiques come from two vastly differing perspectives.

**Theorizing Multiculturalism**

In much of his recent work McLaren (1994:in press) has attempted to map out a tentative theoretical grid for conceptualizing multiculturalism and difference. His typology, which he offers as a "heuristic" device is particularly insightful as a way of understanding the various versions of multiculturalism now in circulation. McLaren (1994) distinguishes between conservative and/or corporate multiculturalism (which was discussed previously to some degree),
liberal and left-liberal multiculturalism - three discourse which he finds inherently problematic. While McLaren argues that conservative multiculturalism must be rejected for a number of reasons,\textsuperscript{95} he also cogently articulates the need to critically interrogate the liberal and left-liberal formulations of multiculturalism.

Liberal multiculturalism argues that a natural equality exists among "whites, African-Americans, Latinos, Asians and other racial populations." (McLaren, in press) Such a perspective is based on the notion of "sameness" and intimates that we are "all the same under the skin." (Frankenberg, 1993) This conception of sameness suggests that everyone has similar opportunities regardless of personal attributes or racial characteristics and as such perpetuates the myths of liberal democracy, namely the myths of meritocracy and equality of opportunity. That is, such an approach is based on the assumption that equality exists in our society or that it can be achieved

\textsuperscript{95}In \textit{White Terror And Oppositional Agency: Towards A Critical Multiculturalism} (in press), McLaren conveys the import of rejecting a corporate/conservative rendition of multiculturalism. He cites several reasons why this denunciation is necessary in order to advance a truly democratic and liberating pedagogy. First, McLaren cites the fact that conservative multiculturalism refuses to treat whiteness as a form of ethnicity and as such adheres to whiteness as the standard by which other ethnicities are judged. Second, the use of the term "diversity" in rightist educational discourse disguises the ideology of assimilation that undergirds its position. (A point which was addressed previously in this chapter.) In addition, conservative multiculturalists posit standards of achievement for all students which embody the cultural values of the white, middle-class as clearly exemplified by the biases inherent in standardized tests such as the SAT. Furthermore, conservative multiculturalism must be rejected for it fails to interrogate the high status knowledge - that knowledge which is deemed worthy in the context of white capitalistic, patriarchal culture and the way in which judgements of relevance are culturally and racially predisposed to a white, Eurocentrist value system.
merely by "reforming" existing cultural and social formations. Moreover, the adherence to notions of meritocracy ignore the structural barriers and forms of institutionalized racism which impact the lives of people of colour and instead views failure to achieve as a result of the shortcomings of individuals themselves. (Frankenberg,1993) Hence, liberal multiculturalism often

...collapses into an ethnocentric and oppressively universalistic humanism in which the legitimating norms which govern the substance of citizenship is identified most strongly with Anglo-American cultural-political communities. (McLaren,in press)

Left-liberal multiculturalism emphasizes differences related to race, class, gender and sexuality and maintains that the stress on equality of the races smothers important cultural particularities. Hence, the notion of sameness is rejected in favour of difference. McLaren (in press) however, notes that there is a tendency to essentialize difference by reducing the political to the personal and ignoring the historical and cultural "situatedness" of difference. In other words, identity based on "sameness" and identity based on "difference" are both forms of essentialist logic. This form of multiculturalism is evident in discourses of identity or difference politics in which difference is seen as an end in and of itself.

To some degree, P.C. politics and its interest in inclusiveness can also be conceptualized as a form of left-liberal multiculturalism - a point which demands further clarification. Many of the groups and activists who have been labelled p.c. are those who have demanded that curricula reflect the diverse needs of all students - that the works of women, people of colour,
gays/lesbians etc. be included in the curriculum. While this is indeed an important and necessary reform, multicultural add-ons or changes in the discursive realm do not adequately address the historical and material conditions of colonialism, racism, sexism etc., in any substantive way. In other words, opening up the space for discursive possibilities for those previously marginalized - a quantitative increase - while imperative, does not necessarily guarantee a qualitative change in the dominant relations of knowledge production. In addition, this practice of adding on often lends itself to forms of academic separatism. Thus, rather than transcending borders as critical pedagogists advocate, new borders between intellectual traditions are often erected. While the inclusion of marginal discourses is necessary in the university curriculum, their mere "addition" does not constitute radical transformation nor does it provide the incentive for crossing borders - a task which critical pedagogists deem essential for a liberatory pedagogy. The mere tolerance or inclusion of "difference" is as Lorde (1984:111) suggests "the grossest reformism" and simply results in the extension of "bourgeois privilege to as many people as possible...without ever abolishing the bourgeois system itself." (Zavarzadeh & Morton, 1991:126) As Asante(1992:306) asserts, "the real unity of the curriculum comes from infusion" and not from merely "including African-Americans, women, gays and lesbians and other minorities in what remains a terrain dominated by white hegemony." Moreover, left-liberal multiculturalism itself is not emancipatory when examined in relation to the workings of power and privilege. That is to say, the debate over
multiculturalism must not be divorced from the broader social and cultural context in which it occurs. Wallace cogently expresses her concerns with the tendency of isolating the issue of multiculturalism from wider material relations and the lived experiences of oppressed groups.

Many individual events on the current cultural landscape conspire to make me obsessed with contemporary debates over "multiculturalism" in both the art world and the culture at large, but my concern is grounded first and foremost in my observation of the impact of present material conditions on an increasing sector of the population. These material conditions which include widespread homelessness, joblessness, illiteracy, crime, disease (including AIDS), hunger, poverty, drug addiction, alcoholism, as well as the various habits of ill-health, and the destruction of the environment are (let's face it) the myriad social effects of late multinational capitalism. (1991:6)

Moreover, despite the fact that multiculturalism became a much debated intellectual current in the late 80s and early 90s the "conditions of the poor, of working-class women, and of non-white citizens deteriorated dramatically" while the "richest one per cent of Americans" grew richer. (Rieff, 1993:63)

This is not to suggest that multiculturalism is not important, but that we must not content ourselves with the mere inclusion of minority and radical voices

---

96Rieff argues convincingly that multiculturalism has been embraced by the corporate culture for it "helps to legitimize whole new areas of consumerism". (1993:64) He also states that multiculturalists are naive to believe that their efforts pose a threat to the fundamentals of capitalism since the workings of corporate capitalism have incorporated and indeed revelled in multiculturalism which accurately translated means "multinationalism". The scope and strength of multinational corporate culture is testament to the fact that the debates over inclusive and multicultural curriculums poses no real threat to the capitalist status quo. Rieff also points out that many self-proclaimed multiculturalists focus primarily on issues of race and gender at the expense of material issues related to class.
on campuses. When isolated within the walls of academia and comprised of simple add-ons to the curriculum, multiculturalism becomes just another intellectual trend rather than a genuine political project. Thus, it appears that the conservative approach ultimately aimed at quelling conflicts and controversies by imposing a "common culture" or "core curriculum": the liberal approach and its ultimate faith in equality of opportunity and meritocracy and the left-liberal proclivity of valorizing "difference" are equally problematic since none of these strategies seem to address more substantive issues - they do not address capitalist power relations and institutionalized forms of oppression and exclusion. Hence, one may argue that to a certain extent, multiculturalism has become palatable in the bourgeois academy for the mere incorporation of difference has not jolted the foundations of education nor of capitalism in general. It is therefore necessary to articulate a critical or resistance multiculturalism which, in addition to a having pedagogical goal, also embodies an explicit political vision. McLaren reminds us that a focus on the "material and global relations of oppression can help us to avoid reducing the 'problem' of multiculturalism to simply one of attitudes and temperament or, in the case of the academy, to a case of textual disagreement and discourse wars." (1993:120)

The escalating corporate-sponsored Right offensive and the proliferation of quasi-fascist movements point to the necessity of constructing an effective opposition. However, despite the political urgency for such an intervention, the vision of a unified Left has all but dissipated. One finds fragmentation on
the left: ideologues who eschew organizing, or, far more ubiquitous are those single-issue activists who deny any hint of a unifying ideology. In a "postmodern" culture any attempt to delineate a vision of collective struggle is dismissed as "totalizing". The inevitable result of this posturing has been the development of identity politics.

**Identity Politics And The Left**

In the most general sense, identity politics is an extension of the feminist assertion that the personal (i.e. experience, mediated by social difference) is political. (Fuss,1989; Grossberg,1992) Indeed, experience as a mediating influence between social structure and social consciousness, played a pivotal role in the feminist movement and feminist scholarship which sought to challenge the claims of universality of the subject by exposing its implicit masculinity and through its assertions that female experience differed significantly from that of males. In evoking the notion of "difference", the feminist assertion that the personal is political, challenged the essentialism of Enlightenment epistemology and conceptualizations of the human (read: male) subject. However, white bourgeois liberal feminism only addressed issues of difference in terms of gender and as a result fell prey to precisely those forms of essentialism which it set out to critique. Hence, in recent years, the concept of difference has been adopted by "feminists of colour" as a way to challenge the essentialism inherent in those feminist trajectories which focused mainly on white. Western subjects and which did not acknowledge the specificity and/or levels of oppression nor the intersections of things like class, race.
gender, and sexual preference. Indeed, throughout the 1970s and into the present, work predominantly by women of colour has been transforming feminist analysis, drawing attention to the white-centeredness and more generally to the false universalizing claims of much feminist discourse. (Bannerji, 1991; Carby, 1981; hooks, 1984; Lorde, 1984; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983)

While the attention and theorization accorded to "identity" and "difference", has intensified in recent years, one can actually trace the earliest formations of this trend to the late 1960s. The aftermath of the political upheavals of the 1960s resulted in a challenge to the classical Marxist conception of class struggle by pointing to the multiplicity of sites and mechanisms of power and domination which were characterized as irreducible to class exploitation and during the disintegration of the 1960's social movements, a trend then referred to as "lifestyle" politics emerged. Berman (1992:55) claims that there were a number of

...sundry campaigns that arose at the end of the sixties and eventually came to be known as "identity politics" - including the movements for a certain kind of feminism, for gay and lesbian liberation... for the Jewish and other ethnic revivals...and for black nationalism... (Berman, 1992:55)

In its most recent manifestations identity politics generally refers to the tendency to "base one's politics on a sense of personal identity - as gay, as Jewish, as Black, as female..." (Fuss, 1989:97) and therefore, celebrates differences as they are constructed around the categories of race, class, gender, ethnicity and sexual preference. And while identity politics has
enabled subaltern groups to reconstruct their own histories and give voice to their individual and collective identities. This development has engendered fierce debates in both intellectual and political circles. On the one hand, identity politics has been championed (Brunt.1989; Smith.1983) while others have complained that an exaggerated emphasis on difference has entailed a retreat from emancipatory and collective political projects. Ellen Willis (1991:58) provides a harsh but insightful critique of the theoretical and political dead end in which identity politics found itself in the past two decades and articulates the challenge of the 1990s.

The appeal of 'identity politics' is that it arises from a radical insight - that domination is systematically structured into the relations between social groups. The problem is that [identity politics] gives rise to a logic that chokes off radicalism and ends up by supporting domination. If the present obsession with group identity as the basis of politics is hard to imagine, much less build, a broad-based radical collectivity, it has even more tellingly stood in the way of a principled commitment to the freedom and happiness of individuals, without which no genuine radicalism is possible.

Hence, while a number of theorists and cultural critics have pointed to the need of acknowledging the importance of "difference" in any discourse which purports to be committed to social change (Hill Collins.1991; hooks.1992; Lorde.1984) they have been acutely aware of the limitations of identity based politics.

First, it is imperative to point out that one cannot simply reduce the political to the personal for this ignores that "the politics of any social position is not guaranteed in advance". (Grossberg.1992:365) In other words, there is
no inherent justification which necessitates that anyone occupying a specific experiential realm or situated in a particular social posture has to adhere to particular political agendas and interests. As Kobena Mercer (1992:426) states, the new social movements structured around race, gender, and sexuality are neither inherently progressive nor reactionary...just like everyday people, women, black people, lesbian and gay people, and people who worry about...nuclear power, or ecology can be interpellated into positions on the right as much as they can be articulated into positions on the left.

In other words, one cannot assume that the politics of any social position is guaranteed in advance. As Mohanty (1991:33) puts it, the formulation "I am, therefore I resist" is insufficient ground to "assume a politicized oppositional identity."

Closely related to this is the notion of "authenticity" in which it is asserted that only those that occupy a certain position can speak for themselves. In some accounts, either a person's physical proximity to the oppressed or own location as an oppressed person is allegedly supposed to provide a special authority from which to speak. Indeed, the politics of "voice" has accurately pointed to the fact that First world subjects cannot purport to speak for others and is obviously linked to the wider issue of agency - that is, how people either become agents in the process of making history or function as silenced, passive objects buried under the weight of oppression and exploitation. As hooks (1989:12) convincingly argues

moving from silence into speech is a revolutionary gesture...the idea of finding one's voice or having a
voice assumes a primacy in talk, discourse, writing, and action...Only as subjects can we speak. As objects we remain voiceless - our beings defined and interpreted by others.

One cannot repudiate the resistant, empowering nature of speaking for oneself nor the danger of representing others, and while identity politics originally provided a puissant challenge to Eurocentricity and extended political and cultural vocabularies to subaltern groups in order for them to reconstruct their own histories and experiences and "give voice to their individual and collective identities" (Giroux, 1992:172), what began as an asseveration of nobility and dignity, a recovery from exclusion and denigration, and a demand for representation is "not as unmixed a blessing as it appears to be." (Bannerji, 1991:82) The discourse of authenticity embodied within identity politics and the obdurate and exclusive reliance on the personal is laden with problems. First, as Said (1986:55) points out, the idea that only women can understand feminine experience or that only Jews can understand Jewish suffering or that only formerly colonial subjects can understand colonial experience are deeply problematical. Linda Alcoff (1991/92:17-24) similarly argues that the notion that we can only speak for ourselves raises a form of scepticism about the possibility of ever adequately or justifiably taking advocacy positions. Both Said's and Alcoff's comments raise the daunting question of who speaks, for whom, to what end, etc. However, their comments are best understood in the context of the crucial distinction which Alcoff (1991/92) makes between speaking "for" and speaking "with". In contrast to the dominant practice of speaking for, which implies that one group's voice can
replace and stand for another's, the concept of speaking "with" refers to the contradictions of voices engaged in dialogue with one another without suggesting that they are reducible to the same voice or epistemic standpoint. Second, the emphasis on the personal as a fundamental aspect of the political is somewhat limited in its scope since the notion that the personal is political does not necessarily "insist on a connection between politicization and the transformation of consciousness." (hooks, 1989:106) Speaking to some of the issues raised by the discourses of authenticity and identity politics, Michele Wallace (1994:185) claims that in many theoretical and political exchanges everyone is far too polite to come out and say the thing that needs to be said first - women are not to be trusted because they're women, any more than blacks are to be trusted because they're black, or gays because they're gay and so on.

In her bold declaration, Wallace elucidates the significance of critically and politically engaging issues of difference and claims to authenticity. In other words, while it is important to see how personal experiences are political, one cannot depend on perceptions alone as the basis for political analysis and action.

Locating the discourse of identity politics in its political and historical context, it would appear that at some level, the "collective" character of Sixties radicalism has been replaced by what Steve Best calls the "tyranny of the specific". Indeed, the intellectual and student radicalism of the early sixties embraced the idea that issues were interrelated - that single-issue groups like the peace movement, the civil rights movement, the environmental movement,
the women's movement etc. - could be conceptualized as sharing certain commonalities. This facet of sixties radicalism could be theoretically conceptualized as reflecting what Chantal Mouffe calls "chains of equivalences". (1988:100) For Mouffe, the progressive attributes of a struggle do not depend on the place of origin but rather on whether or not it links itself with other struggles.

The longer the chain of equivalences set up between the defense of the rights of one group and those of other groups, the deeper will be the democratization process...The concept of solidarity can be used to form such a chain of democratic equivalences. (Mouffe, 1988:100)97

Indeed, the radical groups of the sixties advanced the notion of solidarity and were all at some level, contesting white, capitalist, patriarchal hegemony. The Port Huron Statement created by Students For A Democratic Society (SDS) spoke "self-consciously in the name of all humanity" and the unifying postulate that of "participatory democracy". (Gitlin, 1993:175) The student

97While Mouffe's efforts at articulating a politics of solidarity are commendable, there is a danger in her rendition since it often reinforces a form of "liberal" rather than "radical" pluralism. Various subaltern groups are not democratic equivalents in a society in which social hierarchies and one's positionality therein influences the degree of one's oppression within a given social context. The place of origin is therefore crucial and necessitates an understanding of both different varieties and levels of oppression. The work of many feminists of colour (i.e. bell hooks) emphasize the relations of power within coalitions, while Mouffe and the notion of hegemonic articulation elaborated by Laclau and Mouffe(1985) acts without any reference to power stratification among and between oppositional subject positions. That is to say, that in Laclau and Mouffe's account they rely on a notion of identity politics as "hegemonic articulation" and assume that alliances will change the identities of power between participants in the coalition merely through the articulation of a decision to do so. Hence, their conceptions are somewhat problematic in this sense.
movement's attempts at universalism however, crumbled both practically and intellectually. In retrospect one can see the problems inherent in the philosophical underpinnings of the SDS project and its reliance on the Eurocentric conception of the subject and in the end the divisions spawned by race, gender, class and sexual preference within the movement were too deeply entrenched to be surmounted by the discourse of unity.

Identity politics and the notion of difference is something taken up in great detail in postmodern discourse yet there is a proclivity toward privileging the notion of difference in a way that echoes the banality of liberal pluralism. There exists the perilous affinity to affirm difference simply as an end in and of itself while disregarding "how difference is formed, erased and resuscitated within and despite asymmetrical relations of power." (Aronowitz & Giroux,1991:72) Such an approach is therefore, devoid of a substantive understanding of how difference is fashioned in both domination and opposition. Despite the fact that a rich description of immediate experience based on one's identity is "an indispensable point of beginning" it must be expanded into a "complex analysis of forms of social mediation." (Bannerji,1991:85)

Andrew Ross (1988:vii) reminds us that the development of identity politics or "micropolitics" is symptomatic of a "postmodern" culture which advertises itself as "decentered" and "pluralistic." As Aronowitz & Giroux point out,
engaging the important issue of what social conditions need to exist before such groups can actually exercise forms of self and social empowerment. (1991:73)

McLaren (in press) critiques this dimension of reactionary or "ludic" postmodernism and argues that within the discourse of resistance postmodernism, "difference is politicized by being situated in real social and historical conflicts". In other words, differences and subjectivities are understood in relation to capitalist configurations which mediate their construction and constitution.

In a brilliant essay entitled But Who Speaks For Us?, Himani Bannerji details some of the problems, both epistemological and political, posed by identity politics. She argues that while the essentialist discourses of the Western tradition have played up the general/universal at the cost of social, cultural and historical specificity, identity or difference politics

...errs on the side of the particulars, often making it impossible to see the forest for the trees...The politics of difference hides in its radical posture a neo-liberal pluralist stance...Generally it amounts to advancing a metatheory of competing interests built on the concept of a free market. The political sphere is modelled on the marketplace and freedom amounts to the liberty of all political vendors to display their goods equally in a competition...The refined particularism and individualism of the politics of difference...avoids naming and mapping out the general organization of social relations. (Bannerji, 1991:82-84)

This deeply embedded notion of individualism in the discourse of identity politics is obviously at odds with the notion of collectivism so central to the
discourse of critical pedagogy and resistance multiculturalism. Rather, identity politics reflects a form of left-liberal multiculturalism.

It is abundantly clear that a truly radical pedagogy must transcend the politics of pluralism and attempt to construct a politics of solidarity. As Barbara Epstein (1992:152-154) argues, a politics organized around defending identities based on race, gender, or sexual preference forces people's experiences into categories that are too narrow and serves as an obstacle to crossing boundaries and borders and creating alliances needed to build a movement for progressive change.

This assertion can also be traced to the scholarship of Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse argues that individual liberation must entail not only the

---

98 Many have argued that Marcuse's emphasis on the "Great Refusal" epitomizes the capitulation to bourgeois individualism, yet many of these appraisals evaluate Marcuse's work in a theoretical vacuum for they ignore the entire breadth of Marcuse's life work and instead focus narrowly on aspects of what could be deemed his more pessimistic writings. Despite the fact that the notion of radical individualism is deeply embedded in Marcuse's thought, Kellner (1984:279) accentuates Marcuse's emphasis on contextually mediated relations. Indeed, Marcuse seems almost prophetic about the problems inherent in "identity" politics. Because Counterrevolution And Revolt was published in 1972 at a time when the new left was fragmenting and "new social movements" were emerging, the impact which that splintering embodied for leftist politics had not yet been experienced. Nonetheless, Marcuse was acutely aware of the potential dangers when he wrote, "the new individualism raises the problem of the relation between personal and political rebellion, private liberation and social revolution...To be sure, no revolution without individual liberation, but also no individual liberation without the liberation of society.(1972:48) Hence, the importance of individual revolt and self-transformation, while constituting a vital part of Marcuse's writing also points to his impassioned understanding of the need for social change. Marcuse wrote extensively about the need for political alliance and unity. In Counterrevolution And Revolt and An Essay On Liberation, Marcuse puts forth his strategy for cultivating a unified and cohesive Left. While Marcuse heralded the liberation of the individual he never failed to articulate the need for social emancipation and collective liberation. For an excellent treatise on Marcuse's contributions to critical social theory see Herbert Marcuse And
transcendence of "bourgeois" individualism but also the recognition that genuine emancipation can only occur within the context of social transformation and liberation.

...from the beginning, the personal and particular liberation...must proceed within the political context, defined by the situation in which the radical opposition finds itself...in other words, the individual liberation must incorporate the universal in the particular protest...(Marcuse, 1972:49)

Of course, the aspect of the universal is one which has been fervently debated by recent postmodern theorists and left-liberal multiculturalists who argue against universality and totality. Yet there is a paradox in postmodern discourse for in its rejection of a totalizing worldview, it breeds ironically, a "totalizing perspective around issues of truth and politics which dismisses all notions of radically transcending the conditions of human oppression."

(Shapiro, in press) In other words, forms of postmodern micropolitics and discourses of difference are inadequate to the project of social transformation.

Lacking an analysis of forms of consciousness and social relations, theories of difference lack the potential for a revolutionary politics.

(Bannerji, 1991:86)

A strategy for radical socialist democracy demands that broader material conditions be taken into consideration. The necessity of situating social struggle within a contextual framework is cogently communicated within the discourse of critical pedagogy and reflected in the work of critical social theorists in general. Steve Best (1989) urges radical scholars not to reject

totality and universality outright. For the most part, critical pedagogists have advanced the need to resuscitate and rework the concepts of totality and universality in ways which ensure that they are not used unjustly and oppressively. (McLaren, 1993) Given that totality is one of the central categories of the dialectical approach (Giroux, 1981) espoused by critical pedagogists what needs to be abandoned is the reductive use of totality and not the concept of totality itself. The apostasy of totality could potentially sabotage the very concept of socialist transformation for without a shared political and emancipatory vision, we risk "endorsing struggles in which the politics of difference collapses into new forms of separatism." (McLaren, in press) As Steven Best argues:

The flip side of the tyranny of the whole is the dictatorship of the fragment...without some positive and normative concept of totality to counter-balance the post-structuralist/postmodernist emphasis on difference and discontinuity, we are abandoned to the seriality of pluralist individualism and the supremacy of competitive values over communal life. (Best, 1989:361)

Difference, therefore needs to be understood as social contradiction: as difference in relation, rather than dislocated, free-floating difference. Bannerji (1991:85) explains how many current formulations of "difference" reduce the notion of identity to a "static" entity. In this view, identity is viewed as something which already is, rather than something which also has the potential to become.

De-emphasizing the social and historical in the interest of individual uniqueness, expanding at most as similarity of detail, the concept focuses on a
content rather than a process and creates knowledge enclosures. Thus the stories we tell from our immediate experience become the end of our political destination, rather than serving as the first steps to an active/interpretive definition of self, which bears a constitutive relation to our social world. (Bannerji, 1991:85)

McLaren (in press) cogently expresses the need to move beyond the confines of a rigid notion of identity which simply affirms difference.

...we need to follow Said (1983) in condemning the endless celebration of difference and otherness in a manner that smothers the connections between the construction and legitimation of discourses of the center and margins and the construction of empire.

Unfortunately, many of the theoretical paradigms (i.e. postmodernism) now in circulation have dismissed these concepts (of totality, universality etc.) and have contributed little to emancipatory political discourses.

P.C. politics, in its extreme postmodern manifestations, perpetuates the fragmentation of the Left. In fact, today's political correctness comes out of a movement, or a political atmosphere that is dominated by postmodern micropolitics and various manifestations of identity politics - one which seems more concerned "with what language is used than with what changes are made in the social structure." (Epstein, 1992:152) Furthermore, in its implicit celebration of various racial, ethnic and/or sexual particularisms it often impedes efforts to create a unified vision of society or how to change it.

It's very difficult on campus to build links between these different movements, in part because there is a real resistance to totalizing ideologies that suggest that we have something in common. There is such a fear that any emphasis on commonality will mean that our individual or particular voices will not be
heard, so universalist ideologies are suspect. (Rosenfeld, 1993:62)

I would argue as has Giroux (1993) that simply dismissing identity politics however, is not an adequate approach. Rather, left cultural workers must engage the issue more dialectically.

...a critical perspective on identity politics should be seen as fundamental to any discourse or social movement that believes in the radical renewal of democratic society...the relationship between identity and politics can be reformulated within a politics of representation which is open to contingency, difference, and self-reflexivity but still able to engage in a hegemonic project that reconstructs public life through a politics of democratic solidarity. (Giroux, 1993:34-35)

In contrast to those forms of ludic postmodernism which concern themselves excessively with the signs rather than the substance of oppression and which exist primarily as discursive practices which defy any systematic understanding of broader social mediations, critical pedagogists argue the necessity of developing a primary meta-discourse in which the totality of social relations is accorded adequate attention. Totality in this instance is understood as a "global" understanding. Global understanding as Zavarzadeh & Morton (1991:155) define it is a "form of explanation that is relational and transdisciplinary". Moreover, global or relational knowledge points to the existence of an underlying logic of domination forged within the conditions produced by capitalist social organization. A primary meta-discourse then, could conceivably map out the potential for understanding difference contextually and relationally in a way that does not negate the influence of
capitalist configurations. In other words, the dialectical relationship of universality and particularity is maintained in that the particular, far from being subverted is, rather, located within the universal or the totality of social organization. Indeed, an understanding of global, material relations of capitalism is a necessary prerequisite for fostering genuine counterhegemonic struggle.

However, the fragmentation of the Left and the assorted theoretical squabbles alluded to in chapter one have stifled its ability to seriously counteract the well-organized and well financed anti-p.c. assault. Todd Gitlin illuminates an ironic element within the p.c. controversy and the futility of left academic discourse thus far.

Is there not something peculiar about a situation in which the right, which commands formidable political and military power, is up in arms about the poisoning of tender minds, while the left, which has not been so helpless in 40 years, devotes tremendous energies to the refinement of what, with consummate immodesty, some of its archdeacons call Theory? (1991:5)

Gitlin's contention has been reiterated by several radical intellectuals disillusioned with academic doublespeak and the lack of engaged political praxis. Zavazadeh and Morton (1991) have argued, convincingly I may add, that various "postie" theories have been accepted in the bourgeois academy and have served the function of displacing more radical forms of critique which interrogate the oppressive tendencies of global capitalism. Radical theories that call for the reunification of theory and engaged political practice then have been marginalized in the academy by those forms of ludic theory which are not
considered a threat to existing forms of social organization, i.e. capitalism. (Zavarzadeh, in press)

Indeed, rather than interacting with broad publics, many "left" intellectuals often fall short of political engagement with oppositional social movements. In short, they often fail to make the crucial link between theory and practice and thus relegate their social criticisms to the pages of obscure and unintelligible scholarly journals which are often inaccessible to the average citizen.

This however, is not to suggest that intellectuals assign themselves to the realm of "plainspeak" for any form of anti-intellectualism on the Left would indeed be a "service for the Establishment" (Marcuse, 1972:32) McLaren (in press) also argues that the critical labour of intellectual life does not always guarantee its politics although intellectual life can "have transformative social and political effects." The conviction that intellectual labour can be a radicalizing force emulates Marcuse's stance who claimed that the Left is "necessarily and essentially an intellectual movement". (1972:32) Noam Chomsky avows that the task of intellectuals is to try to "articulate goals, to try to assess, to try to understand, to try to persuade, to try to organize". (Chomsky cited in Otero, 1981:205)

Nonetheless, there appears to be a dearth of Leftist intellectuals who have been able to insinuate themselves and their ideas into the mainstream, especially in reference to pedagogical revisions. This conspicuously perplexing
predicament serves as an impediment to the advancement of a constructive counterhegemonic force. As Chomsky reminds us.

...a movement of the left has no chance of success, and deserves none, unless it develops an understanding of contemporary society and a vision of a future social order that is persuasive to a large majority of the population. Its goals and organizational forms must take shape through their active participation in political struggle and social reconstruction. (Chomsky cited in Otero, 1981:222)

While this lamentation about the shortage of the Left’s voice in the broader public sphere may be reminiscent of Jacoby’s sentimental journey in The Last Intellectuals, there is nonetheless, a great deal of truth to what he argues - the voice of Leftist intellectuals has been absent from the mainstream. At the same time however, there has been a growing influence in the public sphere of hegemonic “think tank” intellectuals, predominantly neo-conservatives.99

99While Jacoby is convincing with his charge that academicization has isolated left intellectuals and relegated them to the sphere of obscure disciplinary issues, he ignores the fact that there are indeed public intellectuals whose views circulate extensively in the mainstream. Unfortunately, these intellectuals are part of a conservative elite situated in foundations, journals and think tanks which are lavishly funded by major corporations. They are what Aronowitz & Giroux (1985) refer to as hegemonic intellectuals. In Education Under Siege, they sketch out a typology of intellectuals wherein they describe hegemonic intellectuals as those who "self-consciously define themselves through the forms of moral and intellectual leadership they provide for dominant groups and classes." They claim that hegemonic intellectuals can increasingly be found on the "consulting lists of major foundations, on the faculties of major universities, [and] as managers of the culture industry" (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985:39) For an insightful analysis of this phenomenon see Sidney Blumenthal The Rise Of The Counter-Establishment: From Conservative Ideology To Political Power, (New York: Times Books), 1986. Furthermore, during the last twelve years, there has been a tremendous transfer of power. Throughout this period, the ability of left intellectuals to engage effectively in debates about political and cultural issues and public policy has been "increasingly constrained by the cultural hegemony of the right." (Escoffier, 1988:119)
One need only look to the widespread adulation of neo-con author Dinesh D'Souza as the guru of educational reform. D'Souza has appeared on numerous television and radio talk shows and his right-wing diatribe (epitomized in *Illiberal Education*) against progressive revisions in higher education was a best-seller. The Left has not provided an adequate rebuttal to D'Souza's claims, at least not one which has had such popular appeal.\(^{100}\)

While it can and must be argued that mainstream media and mainstream popular culture in general, tend to exclude opinions which transcend the "bounds of the expressible", it is also significant to recognize the relative ineffectuality which leftist academic discourse has had in the broader societal context. Given these circumstances, it is imperative for leftist intellectuals to engage in "border-crossing", progressive scholars must enter into the public sphere and work towards countering the messages of the "glitzy foundation-supported spokespersons of the new Right." (Olson, 1992:103)

**Critical And Resistance Multiculturalism**

Liberal and left-liberal positions on multiculturalism are immersed in discourses of "reform", rather than exploring the potential of substantive economic, social and political reconstruction. As such versions of multiculturalism not grounded in a theory of social change or lacking a transformative political agenda can easily become another form of

\(^{100}\)With regard to such an assertion, Russell Jacoby is worth quoting. "Unlike left academics, more easily seduced by professional journals, jargon, and life, the conservatives are committed to lucid prose; for this reason they are readable and are read...The conservative critique comes alive...where the left often slumbers." (1987:197-198)
accommodation to the larger social order. In order to counteract the advent of such a development, those working within the tradition of critical pedagogy advocate the elaboration of a critical or resistance multiculturalist discourse.

From a critical multiculturalist perspective, representations of race, class and gender are comprehended as the result of larger social struggles over signs and meanings and attention is paid not only to "discursive" formations but to the social, cultural and institutional relations which mediate the production of meanings. (McLaren, in press) A resistance multiculturalism does not view diversity itself as a goal but rather argues that difference must be located within a politics of cultural criticism and a commitment to social justice. Hence, difference is understood as a product of history, culture, power and ideology and the construction of identity and difference is interrogated in relation to a radical politics. In addition, critical or resistant multiculturalism does not succumb to the left-liberal multiculturalist tendency to champion "add-ons" or linguistic changes in the curriculum or society at large. In other words, the goal of critical multiculturalism is far more reaching since it aims for the transformation of disparate social, cultural, and institutional relations of oppression and domination.

"Whiteness" as a cultural marker and normative criterion is also addressed by critical multiculturalists. Unlike conservative multiculturalism, which fails to treat whiteness as a form of ethnicity, critical or resistance multiculturalism acknowledges the necessity of exploring the category of whiteness. It becomes crucial to recognize as Frankenberg (1993) does, that
whiteness embodies a set of linked dimensions. First, whiteness is a location of structural advantage, of race privilege. It refers to a set of locations that are historically, socially, politically and culturally produced and that are intrinsically linked to relations of domination. In addition, whiteness is a standpoint from which white people look at themselves, at others and at the broader social structure. More importantly, whiteness refers to a set of cultural practices that have for the most part, remained unmarked and unnamed. As such, engaging and naming "whiteness" is an attempt to displace it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance. Hence, to look at the social construction of whiteness is to look head on at a site of dominance. (Frankenburg, 1993; Fusco, 1988; Wallace, 1993)

Epistemologically, a discourse of critical multiculturalism strives to transcend the legacy of binary oppositions inherited from Enlightenment thought - that form of thought which posits relations in terms of dualisms (sameness/difference; white/black) in which the primary term "is privileged and designated as the defining term or norm of cultural meaning." (McLaren, in press) Rather than perpetuating dualistic modes of organizing thought, critical pedagogy in general, and resistance multiculturalism in particular, advocates a more dialectical approach - one which conceives of these relations not in binary terms, but rather as relations of contradictions.

Furthermore, a critical multiculturalism seeks to transcend the left-liberal proclivity of celebrating diversity while denouncing any notion of
solidarity for the significance of cultivating a politics of alliance and solidarity which develops out of the imperatives of freedom, emancipation, and democracy is central to its project. In *Sister Outsider*, Audre Lorde (1984:112) eloquently speaks to this need and is worth quoting at length.

> Without community there is no liberation...But community must not mean a shedding of our differences...It is learning...how to make common cause with those other identified as outside the structures in order to define and seek a world in which we all can flourish.

Any attempt to trace a common bond between subaltern groups demands an understanding of the social totality and necessitates a comprehension of the forces which mediate reality and social relations therein. The discourse of critical pedagogy makes a passionate plea to intellectuals and activists to nurture a politics of alliance building, of solidarity which respects difference but which is ultimately committed to constructing a common ground where democratic ideals and utopian visions may be collectively dreamed of and fought for. As such it is a dialogue which we cannot afford to ignore if we set as our goal a more humane, just and equitable society.
CHAPTER FOUR

P.C. In The Media

Two years ago, the general public could not escape the deluge of articles and editorials warning of the p.c. plague spreading on university campuses all across North America. Even casual attention to the media was enough to discover that "political correctness" was the latest affliction gripping the nation. Major newspapers in Canada and the United States ran headline stories, columns, and editorials about the "left-wing takeover", the return of the "storm troopers" and "fascist control" of academic institutions. And while headline stories about p.c. have diminished considerably in number, the issues which emerged during that period continue to influence debates over educational reform and multiculturalism and will undoubtedly, persist as the 90s progress. Indeed, campus controversies over "free speech" issues continue to capture the attention of media pundits and conservative organizations like the NAS which has proclaimed its commitment to a "protracted journey toward higher education reform". (Diamond, 1993:31) Critical communications scholars (Gitlin, 1980; Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Kellner, 1990; Parenti, 1986; Winter, 1992) among others have illustrated the central role which the media play in setting the public agenda and limiting the terms of debate on topical issues. The media not only limit the bounds of the expressible, but have the potential, by virtue of how much attention is afforded to a certain event, to make an "issue" of it. Parenti (1986:10) reminds us that for many people an
issue does not exist "until it appears in the news media", and how we view issues, what we define as an issue or event is profoundly influenced by those who control communications systems and organizations which have formidable power over them.

Previous chapters demonstrated how the conservative restoration and the think tanks which sprang up in the last decade helped to create a backlash against progressive politics and maintain conservative hegemony. The media undoubtedly played a central role in the right-ward turn in popular sentiment.

In her book *Backlash*, Susan Faludi (1991) documents how the media were instrumental in promulgating and sustaining the "backlash" against women in general and feminism in particular during the 1980s. By early 1990, the backlash had gained momentum and entered a new phase that added "political correctness" to our lexicon of "weasel words." (Crean,1991/92:51) The mainstream media, for their part, played a fundamental role in introducing the backlash against progressive educational strategies to a national audience and helped to popularize it even beyond the new Right's expectations.

Beginning in the winter of 1990 and continuing into the spring and summer of 1991, the media in both Canada and the United States were awash with dire predictions about the new disease and figured significantly in expounding the myth of a p.c. invasion on university campuses. P.C. bashers received a boost and began to command even greater media attention after the
White House jumped on the anti-p.c. bandwagon with George Bush's commencement address at the University of Michigan in May of 1991. Hardly a paragon of civil liberties and academic freedom, then-president George Bush joined the chorus condemning the alleged left-wing plot to take over the university, and as Martin Lee (Nov., 1991) pointed out, what the President says is automatically deemed newsworthy. Shortly after Bush delivered his now infamous speech in Ann Arbor, the media leapt to the defense of the "fair-minded", rational anti-p.c. spokespersons who were characterized as the heroes in the war against the "terrorists" who were endangering free speech on campuses. Tim Brennan points out that the anti-p.c. campaign had such a high profile not because

...progressives are dreaming Stalinoid dreams or playing verbal games in silly academic wars. It is because the press is not free, and the allowable public discourse narrow and intimidating. (1991:28)

Until the mainstream media began to promote the anti-p.c. crusade, attempts to quell progressive pedagogical initiatives had generally been the concern of right-wing ideologues on campuses but, with the support of the mainstream media, p.c. emerged as an issue of national significance. Undoubtedly, the strength of the anti-p.c. campaign was enhanced by the attention it was accorded. The media were instrumental in making the plague of "political correctness" a household term, for they, more than any other influence, launched the issue into popular consciousness. In doing so, conservative efforts to undermine progressive pedagogy and politics were enhanced. This,
however, is not surprising given the "organized power of the right over certain sectors of the media." (Graff, 1992:34)

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the media’s role in the p.c. fiasco and to critically evaluate their coverage of the debate. Particular attention will be paid to the issues of Maclean’s and Newsweek which "investigated" the p.c. controversy with special focus being placed on the texts of Maclean’s. In addition to furnishing an ideology critique (as described earlier) I will also be drawing upon the ideas of a variety of communication and media scholars who have analyzed the various media strategies which are often used in covering or manufacturing a "crisis".

In the few months in which tales of the p.c. "crisis" were being circulated en masse, the media were used for rallying support against the alleged hegemony of the Left on campuses. They also helped to establish a hegemonic consensus around the conservative agenda, as well as reinforcing the notion of Western cultural superiority. While a number of media critics (Gitlin, 1980; Kellner, 1990, 1992) maintain that conservative hegemony was challenged to some degree in the 1960s, it has been argued that from the 1980s to the present, conservative hegemony has been successfully reinstated. In any event, the reaffirmation of conservative hegemony is undoubtedly due in part to the efforts of those agencies and organizations which were instrumental in funding the restoration effort during the 1970s and 1980s.

Although many of the issues sparked by the controversy imply that dominant ideology is being contested on campuses to some degree by
subaltern groups, mainstream media coverage of the “debate” was mostly one-sided as dissident voices were rarely accorded equal, if any, time and space. During the p.c. controversy, it is important to acknowledge the manner in which “p.c.” was defined. This took place, to a large extent, not in specialist journals or elite forums but in newspaper columns and in well-publicized reports and position papers, most often churned out with the support of conservative think tanks and then recycled in the mainstream media. In general, the anti-p.c. lobby represented a well thought-out (and effective) strategic use of the media by Right-wing intellectuals. In this chapter it will be argued that during the p.c. fracas, the Right achieved almost complete hegemonic control within the media and that few of the reports bothered to investigate complex issues or for that matter, to check “facts”.

**Framing The P.C. Controversy**

Kellner (1992) illustrates how the media mobilize public opinion according to frames through which they present events and individuals. It will be argued that the mainstream media fostered the p.c. hysteria through their framing of the images and discourse about the so-called campus crisis through its omissions and distortions. Moreover, this was further exacerbated by the ways in which the media were dominated by new Right ideologues in an attempt to manufacture consent to their hegemony.

Framing is, according to Parenti (1986:220) one of the most effective media techniques and is achieved

...in the way the news is packaged, the amount of exposure, the placement, the tone of presentation,
the accompanying headlines and visual effects and the labelling and vocabulary.

In addition, the manner in which news stories are covered through using emphasis, nuance, innuendo and peripheral embellishments can elicit a desired impression. (Parenti, 1986) In a similar vein, Kellner (1992) argues that in many instances, the media employ the Manichean frame of popular culture that portrays conflict as a battle between good and evil. 101 In the media coverage of campus controversies, progressives were quickly labelled p.c. and became villains in the debate. This reflects the practice of demonizing the dissidents and in a clever manipulation of rhetoric and terminology, critics, advocates and spokespersons for the poor, the oppressed and the disadvantaged were negatively described and depicted with disdain as thought police (Crean, 1991/92:50). Indeed, one of the most effective tactics deployed by p.c. opponents was to make an argument, issue or event sound scandalous by nothing more than the scornful tone in which it was described. "Watch What You Say" advised the cover of Newsweek. "A New Wave Of Repression Is Sweeping Through The Universities" warned Maclean's - the silencers, the thought police have taken over campuses. From the beginning, so-called p.c.'ers were maligned through the use of the phrases used to describe them, including "Hitler youth", "fascists of the left", "new McCarthyites" and by

101 For an insightful account of the Manichean frames of popular culture, see Jewett & Lawrence (1988) who demonstrate the ways in which popular cultural forms employ the metaphysics of the ancient Manichean Christian sect that characterized human existence as a struggle between good and evil. This construction of binary oppositions was also pervasive (as discussed in chapter three) in the neo-conservative critiques of the "p.c." agenda.
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depicting episodes of campus unrest as reminiscent of Stalin's "reign of terror". These soundbites offered by conservative critics then began to constitute the reservoir of language used to describe events and helped to establish a frame of reference through which the actual content of media reports was then interpreted. Moreover, the use of warring oppositions (good/evil) in structuring the controversy served to decontextualize and dehistoricize the issues involved and effectively "symmetrized" actual existing hierarchical relations of power and privilege in the academy. In other words, intellectual spokespersons of subaltern groups, from whom traditional academic awards and perks are often withheld (hooks & West, 1991), do not have the institutional power of conservative, traditional academics. Furthermore, student activists are situated even lower in the institutional strata. Hence, the media characterization that "two" opposing sides were involved in campus controversies disguises both the nature of academic hierarchy and the fact that those labelled p.c. did not constitute a monolithic, homogeneous side. Furthermore, conservative spokespersons are often supported by powerful think tanks with greater access to the mainstream media as they are often sought out as "authorized" knowers. Herman (1992) points out that one of the most important and greatly underrated constraints on freedom of speech is dissenters' lack of access to the mass media and hence to the general public. The framing of p.c. in media discourses seem to affirm his assertions, for radical voices of opposition were conspicuously absent in mainstream media coverage.
The use of the aforementioned terms and phrases (fascists of the left, McCarthyites, thought police, etc.) was particularly effective given that the p.c. controversy erupted shortly after the Gulf war "victory". Riding high on a regained sense of patriotism and nationalism spurred on by the triumph, the new Right and the media managed to create a new enemy within- the so-called politically correct. Rich (1991:30) points out that the U.S. military triumph led to a

...domestic policy of relentless conformity and national loyalty, one that has quickly replaced the obsolete Communist menace with a new internal enemy signified by political correctness.

Indeed, prevailing sentiment at the time of analysis is significant in explaining how the majority may react to particular messages, symbols and imagery. (Kellner, 1990, 1992) Terms such as freedom and democracy have a powerful impact especially in a post-war period and since these were the words used to characterize the anti-p.c. stance, conservatives were viewed favourably.

As a result, the viewpoints of those deemed p.c. were easily dismissed or ignored merely by the method in which they were contextualized and/or decontextualized. Indeed, one would never guess from the overheated and ill-informed accounts offered by the mainstream media that the issues in the battle over education were ones on which reasonable people might legitimately disagree. In the climate of frantic allegation and condemnation created by the media framing of p.c., merely to raise questions for debate almost guaranteed that one would be charged with the heinous "crime of political correctness." (Graff, 1992:32)
One of the ways the critics who appropriated the term p.c. used it was to describe what they perceived as an invidious trend wherein fad was brushing tradition aside. Moreover, the success of the anti-p.c. campaign is in part, due to the ability of the new Right and the media to capitalize on public concern about the quality of education. The now well-worn argument that North Americans are no longer capable of competing internationally coupled with the use of phrases like "declining standards" to describe the state of campuses allowed the mainstream media to instill fear in the public and exert a powerful influence over how people thought and spoke of educational reform. Rather than probing the issues involved in the controversy, the media chose to peddle the anti-p.c. rhetoric and portray p.c. as an enormous threat to tradition and the future of Western civilization.

The imagery used in the articles or what Parenti (1986) refers to as auxiliary embellishments, as well as, the use of loaded political phrases to describe the controversy imbued p.c. with negative undertones. For example, the Newsweek cover was emblazoned with the words "THOUGHT POLICE" and asked if p.c. was the "new McCarthyism". Clearly, the use of such epithets would influence, at least to some degree, the ways in which the reader could interpret the controversy. Maclean's boasted a cover photograph featuring two white academics - one male, one female - with gags over their mouths under the bold caption declaring that "The Silencers: The Politically Correct Crusaders Are Stifling Expression And Behaviour". The conclusion was thus
drawn for us on the cover. In *Newsweek*, a p.c. person was described only in

caricature; as someone in a

...tie-dyed T-shirt, with open-toed sandals and a
grubby knapsack dangling a student-union-issue,
environmentally sound, reusable cup... (Adler et
al., 1990:49)

This description embodies the archetypical image of the "hippie" - an image at
odds with the much valorized all-American, (or for that matter all-Canadian)
person-next-door-type so integral to our mythical landscape. Without a doubt,
cartoonists and satirists had a field day during the p.c. ballyhoo by concocting
such images and passing them off as accurate characterizations of "p.c.
people". Moreover, the use of "hippie" imagery assists in characterizing critics
as a radical fringe whose views are more easily dismissed.

Perhaps one of the most effective strategies for framing an issue and
infusing it with negative connotations is the use of anti-communist rhetoric.
Anti-communist ideology is, according to Herman and Chomsky (1988:29), a
powerful filter which

...helps mobilize the populace against an enemy and
because the concept is fuzzy it can be used against
anybody advocating policies that threaten property
interests or support...radicalism.

Thus, liberals and leftists often accused of being anti-American or anti-
democratic are "continuously on the defensive in a cultural milieu in which
anti-communism is the dominant religion." (Herman & Chomsky, 1988:29) By
immediately labelling p.c. as the "new McCarthyism", the Right, with the
assistance of the mainstream media, was able to frame the debate in terms
conducive to its hegemony. Indeed, the right-wing offensive was strongly rooted in the attempt to create the belief, or illusion, that a new and diabolic form of McCarthyism, emanating this time from the Left, had taken over campuses, stifling free thought and censoring free expression in its ascent to hegemony. Yet one would be hard-pressed to find state-sponsored tribunals, imposed firings and other strong arm tactics that were, in fact, used during the real McCarthy era. The allegation that a new form of McCarthyism had emerged is both absurd and naive and could only be made by people who either "don't know or don't wish to remember what the Senator from Wisconsin and his pals actually did to academe in the 50s." (Hughes, 1992:46) Perhaps it could also be said that such an unsubstantiated charge not only reflects the selective "historical amnesia" of the mainstream media but also serves to circumvent and limit discourse regarding issues of racism, classism, sexism and homophobia both on and off campuses.

**McCarthyism: New And Old**

Today's opponents of the "new" McCarthyism claim that the 1950s situation has been turned on its proverbial head - that today the mailed fist of tenured radicals quashes dissent by campus conservatives. However, these alleged p.c. McCarthyites don't carry the debilitating force of the traditional historic variety primarily because Left academics wield nowhere near the institutional clout in universities that conservative critics charge. Zinn (1991:150) points out that the real McCarthyism was one of the most pervasive attacks on freedom of expression.
McCarthyism...in which the corporate nature of academic institutions revealed itself in the surrender of university administration to government inquisitors was only the most flagrant of the attacks on freedom of expression.

However, the right and the mainstream media have, not surprisingly, neglected to explain what the real McCarthyism was all about. In order to shed some light on this topic a brief summary is necessary.

During the 1940s and 1950s, thousands of men and women who were active or had been active in the left fell prey to a massive wave of political repression under the auspices of Senator McCarthy who dominated the news with his reckless charges of subversion in institutions ranging from the federal government to universities and even Hollywood.\textsuperscript{102} In the 50s, the Left was under attack for espousing political views that were deemed "subversive" by

\textsuperscript{102}In his book \textit{Naming Names}(1980), Victor Navasky provides a stunning analysis of the Hollywood Blacklist and details the role of "informers" in the House on Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) hearings during the McCarthy era. The congressional hearings into Hollywood had begun in 1947 when ten unfriendly and uncooperative witnesses (who gained notoriety as the Hollywood Ten) had been cited for contempt of Congress when they refused to give an answer to the now infamous query which marks the era: Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party? (Navasky, 1980:viii) The investigation of Hollywood radicals by HUAC in 1947 and 1951 was a continuation of pressures first exerted in the late 1930s and early 1940s by the Dies Committee and State Senator Jack Tenney's California Joint Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities. HUAC had charged that Communists had established a significant base in the dominant medium of mass culture. These so-called Communist radicals were said to be injecting subversive messages into Hollywood films and discriminating against unsympathetic colleagues. A further concern was that these subversives were in a position to place negative images of the United States on films that would have wide international distribution. For excellent treatises on the Hollywood blacklist in addition to Navasky's book see Larry Ceplair & Steven Englund's (1983)\textit{The Inquisition In Hollywood: Politics In The Film Community, 1930-1960}; Nora Sayre's(1980) \textit{Running Time: Films Of The Cold War} and \textit{Mission For Moscow} (1980) edited by David Culbert.
the government and the political Right. Endless inquiries were undertaken to decide who possessed "un-American" affiliations. Evidently, the witch hunters were determined to uphold and protect the American ideal of democracy against the Communist threat within.\footnote{It is imperative to point out that those who were singled out as "subversives" and Communists during the McCarthy era weren't labelled as such merely because of their political affiliations. Indeed, many gays and lesbians were considered a threat to the "American way" because of their sexual rather than political preferences. I raise this issue because it is necessary to point out the various purges during McCarthy's reign of terror were far more multidimensional than is sometimes acknowledged.}

Though anti-communism had long been an important element of American politics, it was not until the United States became involved in the Cold War that it became the dominant element. Freedom of expression was something that Left-wing scholars could not practice for fear of being blacklisted. Because the prevailing belief was that Communism was a serious threat to national security, those sympathetic to it or with Leftist leanings were deemed undeserving of the political and civil rights that other "Americans" enjoyed.\cite{Schrecker1992:458} Indeed anti-communist ideology was in full force during the McCarthy era when the campaign effectively helped to destroy the American Communist Party and drove the Left out of politics for more than a decade.\cite{Schrecker1992:457}

The McCarthy crusade began in Washington, D.C. when the Truman administration succumbed to the pressure exerted by the anticommunist Republic party that had accused them of being soft on Communism. In response to this charge and in an effort to defend themselves, the
administration mounted a campaign against "domestic" Communists - against the enemies within. The focal point of the campaign was a loyalty-security program for government employees which was embodied in Truman's Executive Order 9835 of March, 1947. This edict barred Communists, fascists, and other totalitarians as well as anybody guilty of 'sympathetic associations' with them from maintaining employment. Truman's loyalty security program made the campaign a national priority and also established a two-stage procedure that characterized McCarthyism.

First, the supposed subversives were identified, then they were punished. The initial identification stage was usually handled by some kind of governmental agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or some kind of congressional investigating committee although conservative journalists and right-wing vigilante groups also helped to finger the "subversive" elements. Winter(1992) maintains that Joe McCarthy provides a lucid example of the inherent dangers of knee-jerk reporting which unfortunately remains an everyday occurrence. Indeed, the suggestion that p.c. was the "new McCarthyism" - a soundbite uttered initially by conservative Harvard historian Stephen Thernstrom - surfaced again and again in media reports.

The second stage of the McCarthyite process was the application of sanctions. While federal, state and local governments were sometimes instrumental in this stage, most of the time this second stage was handled by employers who readily collaborated with the process by firing those identified
as politically "undesirable". (Encyclopedia Of The American Left, 1992:457-460)

When compared with political repression in other societies McCarthyism may seem mild. However, the fact is that in the self-proclaimed "land of the free", two people - Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed and several hundred others were sent to jail. (Encyclopedia Of The American Left, 1992) The main form of punishment however was unemployment. In David Caute's (1978) estimation, 6,000 people were fired and/or blacklisted because of their political views. The situation continued to a certain degree in the early 1960's when professors of various sorts were often fired outright or denied tenure for their ideological tendencies. Attacks on academic freedom revolved around certain academics' opposition to the Vietnam war, or their stands on racism, sexism, classism and homophobia as well as their demands for the inclusion of women's, gay and lesbian, black and ethnic studies in curricula. (Kellner, Nov., 1991)¹⁰⁴

Once again we are witnessing various challenges to dominant ideology. However, financial cutbacks, increasing links between corporations and universities and the backlash aimed at rolling back educational advances made in the sixties are creating obstacles for any type of progressive and structural changes. Feminists, gays, blacks and other subaltern groups have

¹⁰⁴The Canadian record on anti-communist measures while not as extensive as that of the United States, deserves a mention here. Most notorious of these measures was the Quebec Padlock Law introduced by Maurice Duplessis, which stayed in force for approximately twenty years until it was struck down by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional. This law was aimed at those who were communists although they might not have been aware of it - a group which included among others, Liberal Party members and Jews. (Costaris, 19--)
launched serious challenges to the white, capitalist, patriarchal ideology which undergirds the university, yet in order to quell protest and undermine their efforts the Right and the media have conveniently labelled them as the "new McCarthyites" and their agenda politically correct. This then, could be construed as an example of "containing the enemy", a task often "assumed by ideological institutions" which work to "deflect any potential challenge to established privilege and authority before it can take form and gather strength. (Chomsky, 1991:vii) Rather than encouraging rigorous debate, conservatives have chosen to

name names, to discredit educators who have chosen to engage in forms of social criticism (work the new right considers political) at odds with the agenda of the new right's mythic conception of the university as a warehouse built on the pillars of an unproblematic and revered tradition. (Giroux, 1992:93)

In an ironic twist of events and in a culture characterized by doublespeak, critics and activists who are now using freedom to challenge the oppressive tendencies of hegemonic academic arrangements have been depicted as abusers of that freedom and are charged with restricting that of others. Yet undergirding these charges is what Raskin (1994:70) calls the "dirty little secret" of the new Right's war on p.c. The hidden agenda of conservatives is not to increase tolerance for free expression but to reinforce conservative orthodoxy.
However, since most people have no direct experience or knowledge of the nature of academic debates, their pictures of campus events are by and large, a product of new Right discourse and conservative spokespersons.

**Unreliable Sources**

Sigal (1986) claims that news is not what happens but rather what someone says has happened. Since reporters are seldom in a position to witness issues and events firsthand, they "have to rely on the accounts of others." (Sigal, 1986:15) In *Inventing Reality*, Michael Parenti describes many of the various strategies employed in reporting issues. Generally speaking, he notes that one of the most common tendencies of the mainstream media is to favour the "affluent over the poor...whites over blacks, males over females, officialdom over protesters, conventional politics over dissidence." (Parenti, 1986:10) One of the many ways that the press serves the interest of the privileged and powerful is illuminated by examining the media's treatment of the underprivileged and powerless. As Parenti (1986) maintains, the news media are largely an affluent white male domain where the views of subaltern groups and women are rarely granted adequate handling. More often than not, when their concerns are addressed they are characterized as "special interests" with dissident and hence "dangerous" ideas.

Lee & Solomon (1990) classify the term "special interest" as one of the most frequently used media buzzwords. According to them, the phrase "special interest"

...used to be applied to wheeler-dealers relying on big bucks instead of grassroots supporters to sway
the democratic process. But in recent years, mass media have turned the "special interests" label upside down and plastered it elsewhere - on large numbers of people with less money and less power - groups of black and Hispanic Americans, labour union members, women, lesbian and gay rights backers... (Lee & Solomon, 1990:13)

In the case of p.c., most of the commentaries were derived from conservative, traditional academics, some of whom were members of the NAS. Those radicals and "special interests" who had been accused of politicizing the university were either given sparse attention or in some cases "never quoted directly in any of articles." (Berube, 1992:125)

In an issue of Extral, the newsletter of Fairness And Accuracy In Reporting (FAIR), Laura Fraser's survey of the media's treatment of p.c. led her to conclude that "all the articles are by none-too-liberal men, usually white, defending the traditional academy." (cited in Smith, 1991:8) As we will see, this analysis appears to confirm Fraser's assertions.

Thelma McCormack (1991:8) argues that most of the ideas in the Maclean's cover story were taken from the recently published books of "young right-wing journalists, Illiberal Education: The Politics Of Race And Sex On Campus by Dinesh D'Souza and Tenured Radicals by Roger Kimball." The sources chosen by the authors of the Maclean's articles are indeed telling.¹⁰⁵ In fact, virtually all of those opposed to the alleged changes sweeping campuses or those who were alleged victims of the p.c. thought police were referred to as "respected", "prominent" and "internationally renowned"

¹⁰⁵ More on this will follow in a subsequent section.
scholars. *Maclean's* relied almost exclusively on conservative, white men for their articles on p.c. (Of the twenty-three sources, twenty-one were male). Among those cited by *Maclean's* as being pro-p.c. (four in total) two were editors of undergraduate newspapers at the University of Toronto and McGill University. Undergraduate students hardly embody the credibility that "renowned" scholars do for as Herman (1992:14) reminds us people in "higher ranks are assumed to be more credible" both by journalists and media consumers.

Another instance of questionable sourcing warrants special attention here. Both *Newsweek* and *Maclean's* rely on Duke University professor Stanley Fish as the expert on p.c. thought. In fact, *Maclean's* reporter D'arcy Jenish (1991:44) refers to him as "one of the leading advocates of the changes now sweeping through American campuses." Fish, a well-known deconstructionist literary critic is a long-time Republican (Lambrose, 1992) yet he is depicted as the radical voice of the politically correct. Furthermore, given that political correctness had been established as being the product of sixties radicalism, the choice of Fish as one of its strongest advocates is peculiar. Fish, who grew up in the 1950s had nothing to do with the Leftist political movements of the 1960s. (Berube, 1991) The fact that Fish was selected to be the official p.c. spokesperson is telling and provides yet another example of the way in which the media are able to ignore and/or exclude truly radical voices.
Thus, the negative image of p.c.'ers was forged by a combination of rhetoric, constructed images, popular culture demonology and unreliable sources. This in turn provided the context from which journalists proceeded to describe the myriad campus controversies. A careful reading of these various texts and the sources which were used however, illustrates the numerous distortions, omissions and biases of the articles - a task to which I now turn.

**Dispelling The Myths**

In its December 24, 1990 issue *Newsweek* dedicated almost the entire publication to the scourge of political correctness. "Watch What You Say" warned the cover, "There's a 'Politically Correct' Way To Talk About Race, Sex And Ideas" proclaimed the subtitle, while posing the question, "Is This The New Enlightenment - Or The New McCarthyism?" The lead article, entitled "Taking Offense" written by six *Newsweek* correspondents closely resembles the texts of D'Souza and Kimball.

Beginning with the first paragraph which describes the experience of Nina Wu, who was disciplined at the University of Connecticut for displaying a homophobic poster, to the descriptions of sixties radicals taking over campuses, the authors of the *Newsweek* piece obviously saved a great deal of time by reiterating many of the same arguments made by D'Souza and Kimball. In addition to recycling many of the same examples cited in those texts, the authors haphazardly link together everything from literary theory
and academic revision to university administration speech codes. In a sweeping, overgeneralized statement, it is suggested that the p.c. agenda is

...broadly shared by most organizations of minority students, feminists and gays. It is also a program of a generation of campus radicals who grew up in the 60s and are now achieving positions of academic influence. If they no longer talk of taking to the streets, it is because they are now gaining access to the conventional weapons of campus politics: social pressure, academic perks (including tenure) and - when they have the administration on their side - outright coercion. (Adler et al., 1990:48)

No evidence is provided, no statistic cited - just a blanket declaration claiming that there is a new "creed" on campuses due largely to sixties radicals engaged in political indoctrination. In this sense, Newsweek's account sounds strikingly similar to Kimball's introductory remarks in Tenured Radicals when he writes:

Proponents of deconstruction, feminist studies and other politically motivated challenges...have by now become the dominant voice in...many of our best colleges and universities and...exhibit a remarkable unity of purpose...the men and women who are paid to introduce students to the great works and ideas of our civilization have by and large remained true to the ideology of the sixties...the radical vision of the sixties has not so much been abandoned as internalized by many...who now teach at and administer our institutions of higher education...the university is now supplying many of those erstwhile radicals with handsome paychecks, a pleasant working environment, and lifetime job security. (1990:xi.xiv)

Furthermore, the assumption that p.c. is shared by minorities, feminists and gays falls prey to the erroneous belief that one's ascribed or
chosen identity (as gay, feminist, Black etc.) guarantees one's politics. It also negates the tensions and conflicts inherent within and among these groups.\(^{106}\) In addition, collapsing administrative bodies, academic theories and activism into one all-encompassing category is troublesome. Julie Hinds (Nov., 1991) has argued that the way in which things were clumped together and oversimplified obscured some very deep truths and undermined many credible challenges. In a similar vein, Gerald Graff (1992:34) argues that theories and practices such as feminism and multiculturalism, rather than being understood as "complicated and internally conflicted sets of inquiries" are depicted as a "monolithic doctrine" that insists on denigrating the Western tradition.

The article then proceeds to discuss the counter-attack to the alleged p.c. hegemony (as if it ever existed) mounted by the NAS and how opponents of p.c. view themselves as a beleaguered minority among "barbarians who would ban Shakespeare because he didn't write in Swahili."(Adler et al.1990:49-50) The very use of the word barbarians in the same sentence making reference to an African dialect is a thinly veiled racist comment. Indeed, the practice of suggesting a dichotomy between uncivilized barbarians and civilized Westerners is common in many of the anti-p.c. diatribes and

\(^{106}\)To cite just one example, feminists of colour (hooks, 1991; Lorde, 1984; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983) have pointed to the tensions caused by homophobia and sexism in many communities of colour and racism in the women's movement and feminist scholarship. Hence to claim that p.c. is broadly shared by these various communities of resistance erases many of the contradictions and conflicts which arise both between and among these constituencies.
serves to replicate the racist discourse analyzed by Edward Said (1978) which founded Western ideology on a distinction between the civilized and rational Westerner and the barbarian and irrational "other".

The *Newsweek* piece also makes a number of unsubstantiated claims about political correctness by claiming that politically it is "Marxist" in origin and that it is a "totalitarian" philosophy which is "intellectually" informed by Derridean "deconstructionism". Given the confidence with which these statements were made, a brief evaluation of them is necessary. First, the use of appellations such as "Marxist" and "extreme left" immediately conjure up negative images in the minds of many people. (Lee & Solomon,1990:40) The proclamation that p.c. thinking, alleged to be rampant on campuses, has Marxist origins also perpetuates the myth that universities are largely populated by Marxist scholars and is demonstrated by the following passage.

The failure of Marxist systems throughout the world has not noticeably dimmed the allure of left-wing politics for American academics. (Adler et al.,1990:53)

This statement is indicative not only of the rabid anti-Communism common in the U.S. media (Winter,1992), but also points to the erroneous practice of equating Marxism with the political regimes that had been in existence in the former Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries - by no means examples of the classless society Marx envisioned. Furthermore, it ignores the evidence (discussed in a previous chapter) which indicates that fewer than five per cent of academics identify themselves as being on the Left.
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Raskin (1992) maintains that referring to p.c. as totalitarian is not only an over-dramatization but reveals a contempt for historical meaning and memory - a contempt, I may add, rampant in mainstream media reporting. The term totalitarianism itself was developed to describe Stalinist and Nazi societies in which the state controlled all aspects of social life, destroyed dissent and elevated racism, anti-Semitism and imperialism to official state dogma. (Raskin, 1992:37) To equate totalitarianism with the various attempts by so-called p.c.'ers to increase tolerance is, as Raskin (1992:37) suggests, "a brazen lie". Moreover, to ask whether any of these assertions (p.c. as totalitarian, Marxist and deconstructionist) can even be validated is, according to Berube (1992:139), to miss the point, for what

...Newsweek's really saying is that p.c. is bad stuff plus more bad stuff. In Orwell's famous phrase, it's doubleplusungood.

On a theoretical note, it is imperative to point out that conflating Marxism with deconstruction ignores the fierce debates being waged between these two very different theoretical camps.107 This, however, is hardly surprising given that Newsweek does not even offer an explanation of how p.c. is part of the deconstructionist domain, except to say that deconstruction is a famously "obscure" theory which rejects notions of "hierarchy". Since few readers of the popular press are in a position to recognize misrepresentations

---

of complex academic theories, journalists and critics wishing to debunk them in a column inch or two are freed of the responsibility of doing their homework. Moreover, claiming that p.c. is rooted in an obscure literary theory makes it even less palatable to the average reader who would in all likelihood dismiss it as academic gobblygook. It is also important to note that critiques of regnant academic discourses are in no way restricted to the goal of dehierarchization; nor for that matter are they exclusive to deconstructionists' discursive decodings. While much of what passes for critique in the academy today is limited to the prison house of language games, critical pedagogists have focused much attention on the power structures which constrain oppositional agency both within and outside of discursive regimes. Indeed, critical pedagogists argue that progressive educational reform is not simply accomplished by a change in "language" or the addition of the cultural products of the "other" to the curriculum. Rather, they advocate a pedagogy which interrogates capitalist social organization and global structures of historical forces. (McLaren, 1994; Zavarzadeh, 1991) This more radical view of education is however not represented in the mainstream media. In their attempts to maintain the myth of balanced reporting - telling "both" sides - and to circumscribe what Chomsky (1991) refers to as the "bounds of the expressible", the views of moderate "reformers" are presented as the "other" side. The spectrum of allowable opinion is thus curtailed and radical views are effectively excluded.
The issue of multiculturalism, condemned in the texts of both D'Souza and Kimball, resurfaces in *Newsweek* which claims it is a key tenet of the p.c. agenda. Similar to the narratives offered in *Illiberal Education* and *Tenured Radicals*, multiculturalism is described as being...

...an attack on the primacy of the Western intellectual tradition, as handed down through centuries of great books. (Adler et al., 1990:54)

This multicultural attack, we are told, is also being generously funded. The authors point out that in 1990, the Ford Foundation gave "grants totalling $1.6 million to 19 colleges and universities for diversity" (Adler et al., 1990:53) yet they remain conspicuously silent about the millions which have been spent in financing the backlash and the conservative networks supporting the anti-p.c. crusade. Rather than providing an explanation of multiculturalism and its relation to pedagogical practices, the article focuses on the arguments of renowned African American professor Molefi Asante which they decontextualize and distort. We are told that what Asante and other advocates of multiculturalism want to do is replace the Eurocentric view of the world with an Afrocentric curriculum which would "be one of many such ethnic-specific curricula". (Adler et al., 1990:54) To insinuate that what is being posited is the abandonment of the Eurocentric curriculum blatantly obscures Asante's pedagogical project. Had the authors bothered to read any of Asante's work rather than regurgitating the misinformed opinions of conservative academics, they would have discovered that Asante does not advocate forsaking the
Eurocentric perspective, but rather suggests that it must not be regarded as superior to "other" perspectives. He writes,

There is space for Eurocentrism in a multicultural enterprise so long as it does not parade as universal. No one wants to banish the Eurocentric view. It is a valid view of reality where it does not force its way. Afrocentricity does not seek to replace Eurocentricity in its arrogant disregard for other cultures. (Asante, 1992[a]: 303)

In this sense, he seeks to transcend the hierarchical relations established by the Western tradition and its accompanying dualisms (i.e. dominant/subordinate) which relegate the knowledges of the "other" to a subservient status. Asante (1992[b]: 230) advocates "cultural pluralism without hierarchy" - something quite different than what the Newsweek article suggests. In the same way that deconstruction was presented to us as an example of "radical" new developments in the academy, so too is Asante's left-liberal interpretation of multiculturalism. As was discussed in chapter three, the advocacy of cultural pluralism which would not be regarded as radical from a critical multiculturalist perspective is transformed by media accounts into the extreme position challenging the traditional academy. Once again the spectrum of debate is conveniently circumscribed. In their attempt to convince readers that p.c. really is a new form of McCarthyism, a variety of examples of professors "who have been left in doubt" as to whether or not they will be "allowed" to teach specific courses are cited. One case in point is Professor Vincent Sarich of the University of California at Berkeley who in his illustrious career had held some controversial views regarding the relationship
of brain size to intelligence. The professor however, was not fired or blacklisted as were many of the professors during the McCarthy era. Professor Sarich appears to be the American counterpart to our own Philippe Rushton who also retains his position at the University of Western Ontario.\(^{108}\)

Another example of p.c. repression offered as evidence by Newsweek and deemed one of the "most controversial" p.c. initiatives, took place at the University of Texas at Austin. Indeed, the case of English 306 at Austin has been one of the most recycled examples of the evils of p.c. and as such demands further investigation.

Proposed changes to the syllabus for a required writing course in the faculty of English there incited an imbroglio which drew the attention of the Houston Chronicle, conservative Washington Post columnist George Will and Newsweek among others. The authors of the Newsweek article dutifully reported that Paula Rothenberg's book Racism And Sexism: An Integrated Study, described as a "primer of p.c. thought", had displaced the classics in Austin's English department. What they fail to report, due largely to negligence and their dependence on unreliable sources however, is that Rothenberg's anthology had been dropped by the syllabus-writing committee at Austin in June - six months prior to Newsweek's December publication of the story.\(^{108}\) Also neglected was the fact that the proposed changes to the syllabus and the course entitled "Writing About Difference" never made it to the classroom for they were targeted and became

\(^{108}\)Rushton's case will be discussed in more detail.
a "casualty of a disinformation campaign". (Brodkey & Fowler, 1991:3) Not surprisingly, some of the most outspoken critics of "Writing About Difference", ultimately instrumental in its demise, were members of the NAS. The apparent influence of the NAS disinformation campaign coupled with the fact that no substantive changes were made in the faculty of English at Austin therefore begs the question of who the real thought police are.\footnote{For a thorough account of what transpired at the University of Texas at Austin regarding English 306, see the article entitled "Political Suspects" in The Village Voice, April 23, 1991 by Linda Brodkey and Shelli Fowler. The authors were incidentally, members of the policy and syllabus committees in the faculty of English at Austin. Their article explains the demise of the progressive proposals in greater detail.} In a collection of essays about p.c. edited by Paul Berman, Paula Rothenberg, author of the anthology which was subjected to a barrage of anti-p.c. condemnation and media distortion, argues that the real repression and policing of thought is emanating not from the Left but from the Right (1992:267) whose efforts are undoubtedly being nourished by the media's one-sided coverage of issues. The fact that Newsweek's description of what actually happened to English 306 was so completely incorrect not only demonstrates its shoddy research but is reflective of its underlying ideological commitments.

A number of critical observers (Berube, 1992; Graff, 1992) have pointed out that because the media have reported misinformed opinions as if they were established truths, the picture the public has received of academic developments has come almost entirely from the most strident detractors of
these various developments. The case of English 306 and the misrepresentation of Molefi Asante's work to name just two, appear to affirm this claim.

Five months after *Newsweek* ran its cover story and three weeks following George Bush's now infamous anti-p.c. speech at the University of Michigan, *Maclean's* - Canada's weekly "newsmagazine" decided that p.c. was a newsworthy item and devoted a prominent portion - including the cover story - of its May 27, 1991 edition to political correctness. Doug Smith (1991:8) maintains that this instance was yet another example of *Maclean's* "news verification" function. The decision to run the p.c. controversy as the lead story could also be construed as part of what Faludi(1991) calls "trend journalism". As she points out, a trend reported in one publication "sets off a chain reaction". The actual existence of the alleged trend has nothing to do with the accuracy of the reportage but rather is the result of the journalistic propensity to repeat and copy one another. The trend story is not always labelled as such but certain characteristics give it away: an absence of factual evidence or hard numbers; a tendency to cite only three or four cases and the use of vague qualifiers like "there is a sense that" or "more and more", etc. (Faludi,1991:79-81) Indeed, the *Maclean's* articles qualify for such a classification.

Framed by a foreboding cover photograph and a caption using words like "silencers" and phrases like "stifling expression", the blurb on the inside cover suggests that academics and others across North America are under
attack by the "politically correct movement". Like \textit{Newsweek}, \textit{Maclean's} described p.c. as a movement, which seems to intimate some degree of organization, yet the authors of the articles were apparently unable to uncover any central organization of 'politically correct' activists and strategists nor for that matter, anyone espousing the extreme views they attribute to the "movement". As with communists during the McCarthy era, people who actually profess "political correctness" are not so easy to find - though their conservative critics would have you believe that this doesn't mean they don't exist.

\textbf{Maclean's Misclaims}

\textit{Maclean's} cover story consisted of three articles spanning nine pages. The lead article entitled "The Silencers" with a subtitle proclaiming that "A New Wave Of Repression Is Sweeping Through The Universities" sets the tone. This wave of repression is then, at the outset, established as a given rather than as something which could be debated.

The article begins by recounting the story of Jeanne Cannizzo, a "respected anthropologist" who \textit{departed} [emphasis mine] from her teaching job at the University of Toronto after some protesters had denounced an exhibition she had curated in the summer of 1990, as being racist. The fact that the Cannizzo affair was several months old didn't seem to bother the authors of this article who transformed the story into a "springboard from which to attack a variety of hitherto unrelated social reform and action movements under the rubric of 'political correctness'". (Smith, 1991:8)
The reporters inform us that after the incident at the exhibition, Cannizzo began lecturing at the University of Toronto’s Scarborough campus where “students disrupted her class and hurled insults at her.” No information about how these alleged disruptions erupted, under what circumstances, or in what context, is provided. Nor are we provided with details about the nature of the “insults” except for a brief reference to how she had previously been condemned as a racist for her part in the exhibition. It may be that Cannizzo was indeed guilty of making racist remarks but in the absence of adequate information we are not able to draw our own conclusions. Rather, the conclusions are drawn for us by the authors.

Relying on Desmond Morton, a “prominent” Canadian historian, Fennell et al. (1991:40) point out that university authorities did nothing to help Cannizzo because “under a new, rapidly unfolding moral order, it is considered unacceptable for a white person to be critical of minority groups”. This statement serves two purposes. First, it asserts without question that there is a “new” moral order which, secondly, restricts the “rights” of “whites” to speak freely. The p.c.er’s (feminists, gay activists, minority rights advocates and many others with “Leftist” tendencies) are apparently demanding that “seemingly disparaging references to colour, sex or sexual preference be banned”.

We are then told that many of these groups believe that “male dominated Western civilization” is the source of societal malaise “from violence against women to environmental pollution.” However, the authors did not
consult any member of these groups to affirm what they do in fact, believe. What they are thought to believe is derived from their "critics". In fact, throughout the course of three articles, the various reporters seem virtually incapable of finding anyone to articulate the p.c. agenda despite the "fact" that p.c. had allegedly swept the academic world. Politically correct "reformers" had, according to this report, "launched attacks in Canada on a wide range of targets" in months prior.

The saga of Alex Colville,\textsuperscript{110} described as an "internationally renowned" artist, who had allegedly come under feminist fire for the "sexist" nature of his work, is lumped together with critiques of Shakespeare (for being racist and sexist) and the case of Phillipe Rushton.

In recent months, the politically correct reformers have launched attacks in Canada on a wide range of targets. In a speech in Winnipeg in March, internationally renowned artist Alex Colville described how feminists at Acadia University in Wolfville, N.S., protested the use of his paintings to illustrate the university calendar because, they said, the work reflected a sexist attitude towards women. In the same month, at a gathering in Vancouver of leading North American Shakespearean scholars, some feminists criticized the 16th-century playwright for being sexist and racist. At the University of Western Ontario in London, controversial psychology professor Philippe Rushton...is the target of student protesters who want him suspended.\textsuperscript{110}(\textit{fennell et al., 1991:40-41})

\textsuperscript{110}Colville’s work had apparently come under attack by "feminists" at Acadia University who claimed that a picture used in the university calendar reflected a sexist attitude towards women. Yet if one looks at the picture in question (see Appendix II) the woman in Colville’s painting titled \textit{Western Star} resembles a prostitute.
Rushton became the target of protest after he presented a paper outlining his racial theories which argue that Orientals rank highest in intelligence, followed by Whites, and then Blacks who are, in Rushton's view the least intelligent. Despite the fact that many demanded his suspension, Rushton continues to teach and conduct research at the University of Western Ontario. While meshing the Rushton affair with the Colville story and allegations that Shakespeare is racist and sexist is peculiar in and of itself, what is particularly striking about this example is that no effort was made to locate any one of the many scientists who have stated that Rushton's work is not only morally questionable but academically suspect: including a number of researchers whom Rushton himself cites as evidence for his theory.

Rather, things are turned on their head: a racist, bogus academic such as Rushton is portrayed as a victim of persecution and is quoted as saying that "The thought police with their codes of conduct are just around the corner." A scholar (and I use that term loosely when referring to Rushton) who claims that Blacks have small brains and an overactive libido which is evidenced by large penises and reflected in large "litters" of offspring is protected by the academic establishment and Maclean's which reduces the issue to one of academic freedom.

Having given us a taste of some of the p.c. episodes in Canada, the reporters then proceed to tell us that the p.c. "movement" has been felt more pronouncedly at American universities where the study of the classic "great books" is being abandoned, where professors are being run out of their
classrooms and where language and freedom of expression are being censored by the politically correct. The implication that such excesses are rampant however, is largely illusory. A few extreme incidents are repeatedly cited as if they represent the norm on North American campuses. Indeed, the mainstream media in general, and the enemies of p.c. in particular, have scored their points by repeating and recycling a handful of supposedly shocking anecdotes which are passed off as the "truth". For example, we are informed that under "pressure" by the "reformers",

...at least 16 major colleges have abandoned the teaching of traditional courses...and have replaced them with so-called social justice courses on such subjects as feminism and Third World studies. And in some cases, professors who object to the new conformity are heckled into submission or refused full-time professorships. (Fennell et al., 1991:41)

If this sounds familiar it is because it is essentially the same line offered by D'Souza, Kimball, and the authors of the Newsweek article. Maclean's fails to name the colleges and universities which have presumably abandoned the teaching of these traditional courses. However, this is not surprising given that this charge is, for the most part, a fallacious one constructed by new Right spokespersons.\(^{111}\) Furthermore, even if it were true, sixteen colleges out of the vast network which constitutes the American system hardly seems to suggest that changes have been as widespread as we are led to believe.

We are then informed that "critics" of p.c. say that the "movement" is "growing steadily more influential" in Canada. The "reformist leaders" are

\(^{111}\)While this was discussed in the previous chapter, I will return to this issue.
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"lecturers or junior professors" [READ: UNTENURED] who are supported by "many students" who say "they fully support the call for change." This admission would seem to undermine the very charge that p.c. has "powerful" foundations. Non-tenured faculty members and students hardly brandish the institutional clout that administrators and tenured professors possess in the academic hierarchy. In reality, the fate of non-tenured professors is often dependent upon how well they conform to conservative orthodoxy and to the perspectives of their tenured colleagues.

In the attempt to muster some semblance of "balance", the reporters cite Alex Roslin, an undergraduate editor of McGill's student newspaper, as saying that the debate over p.c. is "really over left-wingers squeezing out right-wingers". To reiterate, quoting a student does not carry with it the credibility associated with high-ranking members of the academy. Yet this instance deserves special attention for there is much more involved. In their meagre attempt to represent the "other" side, what in fact was accomplished by Maclean's inclusion of Roslin's comments ends up lending credence to the anti-p.c. argument. By quoting this student as saying that "left-wingers are squeezing out right-wingers", we are left with the impression that the Left has indeed, taken over!

Dennis Forcese, a vice-president of academic affairs at Carleton University is then summoned for his comments and claims that he is disturbed by student acceptance of the p.c. line which lends itself to forms of "censorship". Those challenging entrenched orthodoxies are conveniently
labelled censors and thought police. To augment this charge, University of Waterloo professor Judy Wubniq, one of the most vocal opponents of p.c. (Wubnig is part of a coalition of Canadian scholars who banded together to fight p.c. and was a panellist for the anti-p.c. "side" on TV Ontario's Imprint Show which was devoted to the issue) is chosen to remark on the presence of the "new" orthodoxy. She is quoted as saying that members of "university teaching staffs now are careful [emphasis mine] not to make jokes or unguarded statements about women, homosexuals, or members of racial minorities" which seems to suggest that such behaviour is acceptable except for the fear of being "denounced as racist, sexist or biased against homosexuals". The views of Greta Hofman Nemiroff, a white, liberal feminist are then offered as a counterpoint to Wubniq's assertions. She tells the reporters that she hopes some "real changes" will emerge but acknowledges that "we may be seeing a 'backlash' against the forces of political correctness". Once again, implicit in this quote is that there are indeed powerful "forces" behind p.c.

Codes of conduct become the next topic addressed in the article. We are notified that a number of Canadian and American universities have begun to "introduce codes of conduct" which some professors say will "restrict what teachers can say, or not say" but Maclean's can only provide us with the example of the University of Western Ontario which at the time, was the lone Canadian university with such codes. The article quotes a professor at
Western who claims that he has to now "measure" his words "carefully". Yes indeed, we all best quiver in our boots.

Issues surrounding employment equity programs and the "feminist" presence on campuses next emerge as targets. It is implied that a lot of the "pressure for change on campuses is coming from women", who are filling more university positions partly "because of federal and provincial employment equity programs". We are also told that "feminist" studies is rapidly growing as field of inquiry. Employment equity, high on the list of Right-wing targets, makes a good club with which to beat university "reformers" since the hostility towards it among the general public allows reporters to offer a familiar target to those who do not follow theory and canons. It also helps to perpetuate the myth that white men are victimized by affirmative action policies. There is also a subtext here which insinuates that campuses would not be in such a state if women, especially the feminist variety, were not being hired. In lay terms, the neighbourhood is suffering now that the riff-raff has moved in!

Moreover, the very use of the signifier "feminist" in a culture marked by a 'backlash' mentality helps to invoke negative images and connotations. In his dictionary of doublespeak, Edward Herman (1992:139) contends that in the contemporary context, the label feminist signifies "an aggressive, uppity member of the weaker sex, compensating for personal inadequacies by disturbing the peace". In addition, the Maclean's article repeatedly makes generalizations about what feminists "think", as if they are a monolithic, homogeneous group cut from the same ideological swathe, yet it quotes only
one "feminist" - Greta Hofman Nemiroff who holds senior appointments in the women's studies programs at both Ottawa and Carleton universities, but who is not introduced with the glowing epithets used to describe anti-p.c. scholars.

We are then reminded that even Shakespeare himself cannot escape the fury of feminists who now use "great writing" to teach about "the evils of male-dominated Western society". The Colville and Cannizzo disputes then resurface as does the Rushton fiasco. Obviously lacking an adequate number of p.c. occurrences, the reporters felt the need to repeat the same examples twice in the same article. After this brief interlude, hiring quotas are once again brought to the fore.

Despite the declaration that the sexual balance among university professors is "rapidly changing", Smith (1991:10) points out that the change has occurred at a glacial pace. From 1969 to 1985, the number of full-time women faculty members at Canadian universities had increased only marginally. In a study published in 1969-70 by the Canadian Association of University Teachers, women accounted for thirteen per cent of all full-time university teachers. In 1985, a Statistics Canada study indicated that this figure had risen to seventeen per cent - hardly a rapid increase.

Some male academics, it is reported, "claim that hiring quotas are destroying merit as the principle basis for hiring and promotion". A University of Alberta Professor is quoted as saying that hiring quotas are "tribalizing the university". Once again, we are subjected to the bromidic "standards" argument whose subtext implies that the "other" - in this particular instance,
women - are a tribalizing, barbaric force who, by virtue of their ascribed gender have been granted undeserved positions in the academy. This contention reiterates the dualistic constructs of Western epistemology whereby male/female, mind/body, reason/emotion binarisms are upheld. In other words to assert that merit is being sabotaged as the criterion for employment in universities as a result of equity programs seems to suggest that women, historically constructed in patriarchal discourse as incapable of reason, are hired only because of their gender.

In yet another feeble attempt to furnish a guise of "objectivity", the reporters include another token pro-p.c. viewpoint - Gregory Sewell, a student editor of the University of Toronto's official campus newspaper. Sewell tells Maclean's that students "will no longer accept a traditional curriculum based on the assumption that male-dominated Western civilization is unassailable". The implication that most students are embracing a project of change seems to contradict much of the literature which maintains that today's youth seem to be more concerned with employment issues than social justice.(See chapter two)

To conclude the article on a note that reinforces the tone of the text, the authors dutifully report that critics fear the "new reformers will stifle democratic processes - and bury a rich cultural tradition in the name of equality". To buttress this claim, the wisdom of University of Alberta's Cameron Mackenzie is elicited. He is quoted as saying that the reformists who exhibit a "hatred" of the Western tradition pose a "threat to democracy". The
now familiar anti-West v.s. pro-West argument evident in D'Souza and Kimball rears its ugly head again. Ironically, but not surprisingly, progressives interested in democraticizing the curriculum by making it inclusive are transformed into enemies of democracy while conservatives dedicated to maintaining the tradition of exclusion as well as, their own positions of privilege come across as white knights defending freedom and democracy. This is a strategy also evident in the subsequent article.

"A War Of Words", the second article included in *Maclean's* focuses almost exclusively on how p.c. has allegedly infected American campuses. In the opening paragraph we are introduced to Donald Kagan, a Yale college dean (and well-known conservative) who had reputedly suffered at the hands of p.c. students for praising Western civilization. Apparently, "to praise Western civilization" is to challenge the "powerful" political correctness movement that has swept U.S. university campuses. Despite the fact that the reporters - D'arcy Jenish and Washington correspondent William Lowther - make the claim that p.c. is pervasive, they provide little, if any evidence to support it. For example, we are told that

proponents of what has become known as political correctness, primarily left-leaning academics, feminists, minority-group leaders and student activists, say that they want to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination against blacks, women, the disabled, homosexuals and members of other groups. (Jenish & Lowther, 1991:44)

No reference is made to anyone who has delineated this position. Furthermore, the honourable project of eliminating discrimination gets
constructed in this article as something negative and diametrically opposed to
democratic imperatives. Affirmative action programs and codes of conduct are
then invoked inadvertently, to explain the "sweeping" changes on campuses.

Seeking to convince the audience that freedom of speech, "one of the
cornerstones of American democracy" is being jeopardized by earnest p.c.e.r’s,
George Bush’s remarks at the University of Michigan commencement exercises
in May of 1991 are quoted by the reporters. Smith (1991) points out that it is
bizarre to see a man, whose presidency was based on intolerance and blatant
disregard for the freedoms of some, being cited as a champion of free speech
opposed to "censorship". Indeed, in retrospect it is almost laughable that
Bush emerge as the defender of democratic principles.

In the attempt to prove a p.c. takeover has indeed occurred, Glenn
Ricketts, research director of the notorious NAS is quoted as saying that the
p.c. movement which is "sinister because of its flat-out totalitarianism" is
geared towards changing "the entire curriculum". It is paradoxical that
Maclean’s could not find a single spokesperson of the p.c. "movement" and yet
had no problem locating a spokesperson from the NAS. Furthermore, no
examples of the supposed wide-ranging changes in curricula are provided at
this juncture. Later in the article however, the Stanford debacle (discussed in
chapter three) is cited as evidence of these changes.112

Balance in this article is presumably achieved by referring to Stanley
Fish who is described as one of the "leading advocates of the changes now

112This will be addressed subsequently in this chapter.
sweeping through American campuses". Fish claims that p.c. is a form of "intergenerational anxiety" and that some people are feeling "uncomfortable" by the presence of new voices in the university. A well-known deconstructionist whose work is undoubtedly interesting, Fish is hardly a "radical" by any stretch of the imagination. The critiques in his work (1980, 1992) are restricted to texts located in discursive domains, which do not tease out the implications of the broader social context.

The reporters then employ a familiar strategy to discredit p.c. proponents. By focusing on extreme examples where instances of "ageism" and "lookism" have been deemed as identifiable "crimes", many of the more substantive issues which progressives have brought up are undermined by Maclean’s foregrounding of trivial ones.

Jenish and Lowther rely on the Thernstrom case at Harvard to demonstrate the effects of the "new McCarthyism". The Thernstrom case, which had at the time already been recycled countless times by the U.S. media (after it appeared in D'Souza's book), is once again referred to in Maclean's. As I argued earlier, anti-p.c. advocates have scored their points by repeatedly citing the same incidents. Stephen Thernstrom, a "respected author and historian" had decided to "discontinue his undergraduate course on the 'Peopling Of America'" after students objected to his use of the word "Indian" rather than "native American" on the grounds that it was racially insensitive. Despite the fact that he had simply decided to stop teaching the course on his own, Thernstrom seems to think that today's campus atmosphere is
reminiscent of the McCarthy era. In reference to being called racially insensitive, Thernstrom is quoted as saying that "It's like being a commie in the 1950's". Later, Thernstrom offers his rendition of p.c. and states that it

...is a new McCarthyism. It is more frightening than the old McCarthyism, which had no support in the academy.(cited in Jenish & Lowther, 1991:45)

No support in the academy!!! Obviously, the "respected" historian's memory of McCarthyism is a bit lacking, for many academics who were identified as communists by their colleagues, were fired by acquiescent administrations. They were not allowed the opportunity to simply decide not to teach a particular course.

Nonetheless, determined to prove the point that some professors are being victimized and refused jobs as a result of a p.c. campaign, Jenish & Lowther use the example of Thomas Pangle, currently a professor at the University of Toronto, who "in the late 1970s...was denied tenure at Yale largely because of his beliefs". Details of the case are not provided so in the absence of concrete evidence, Pangle himself is quoted as saying that the denial of tenure occurred because he was "regarded as too conservative". Lacking a more recent example, Pangle's case from the 1970s is offered as proof of the 90s scourge of political correctness. Indeed, a timely illustration. Not only is the Pangle case a ridiculous example it also serves to perpetuate the popular myth that universities are fortresses of radicalism patrolled by Left-wing academics. In fact, this myth was succoured by a recent "expose" in the Globe And Mail. Under the blazing headline "Young Bucks Of The New
Right. Miro Cernetig (1994) explains the woes of "white males" victimized by hiring quotas, "liberal" university establishments, and an intellectual diaspora dominated by Left-leaning scholars.\textsuperscript{113}

In the \textit{Maclean}'s article, Jenish & Lowther also cite, as another illustration of p.c. repression, the experience of University of Michigan's Reynolds Farley who had apparently suffered the same fate as Thernstrom when "he withdrew [emphasis mine] his course on race relations" after the course content had been "criticized" by students. It is indeed a remarkable feat on the part of conservatives to successfully depict "critique" as a form of thought control and censorship.

We are then told that the "belief" that Western culture has historically been responsible for the oppression of various subaltern groups has led some universities to "abolish the formerly required courses on the rise of European and North American society". To prove this point, the case of Stanford's 'Culture, Ideas and Values' course is summoned. Evidently, this course which, in addition to compelling students to study the "traditional great [emphasis mine] theories" also requires them to read \textit{I, Rigoberta Menchu}, an "autobiographical work by a Guatemalan peasant woman who became a supporter of socialism and feminism". If feminism is as Herman (1992) suggests a signifier with negative connotations in contemporary society, one can surmise that "socialism" conjures up an even more dreadful connotation.

\textsuperscript{113}I will return to some of the issues in this article.
The discussion of the Stanford case in the previous chapter clearly demonstrated that actual changes to the curriculum were minimal. Given that, one could only presume that rather than gathering or for that matter checking "facts", Jenish and Lowther read D'Souza's chapter "Travels With Rigoberta" before penning this contribution to Maclean's. The fact that the Stanford case had been described, inaccurately I may add, in so many mainstream media accounts may be yet another inevitable consequence of trend journalism which as Faludi (1991:79) suggests,

attains authority not through actual reporting but through the power of repetition. Said enough times, anything can be made to seem true.

Following the brief portrait of the Stanford fiasco, NAS research director Ricketts is cited again in order to expound the myth that "tenured academic:" who were "students during the 1960s, a decade of protest, dissent and intellectual ferment" now "possess substantial power within the universities". Ricketts is, along with his Right-wing counterparts, concerned with the "growing politicization of American campuses". That Ricketts comments are almost identical to those of D'Souza, Kimball and other Right-wing spokespersons who have virtually commanded public discourse on the issue of p.c. should, at this point, be painfully obvious to the reader.

To add fuel to the fire, the reporters conclude their article with comments from none other than Camille Paglia. Paglia, whose anti-feminist rhetoric has made her a media darling, is quoted as saying that p.c. is "fascism" of the Left and that its advocates "behave like Hitler youth".
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"Saying 'No' To Old Ways", the final article in Maclean's p.c. trilogy is the piece de resistance. And while no explicit reference is made to "political correctness", the implicit relation to the previous articles is undeniable for we are instructed in the lead article to refer to it as further evidence of the changes occurring in our culture.

In virtually a fact-free story which links together everything from anti-smokers, animal rights activists and exercise fanatics, Maclean's reporter Rae Corelli complains that personal habits - right down to one's diet - are under attack by "new puritans". Of course, equating the "extremists" described in this article to those arguing for pedagogical reform is not only preposterous but also serves to undermine the significance of the issues being raised with respect to educational praxis. Moreover, to implicitly conflate the examples described in Corelli's article with the Left is merely another attempt to portray it as a fanatical lunatic fringe.

The tales of anguish begin with pipe-smoking University of Toronto professor Jack McLeod who "may be forced to resign from the job he has held for 31 years if he does not mend his ways". The culprit behind McLeod's distress is a campus-wide smoking ban which had rendered him a victim of a "narrow-minded kind of misplaced zealotry". Smokers are however, not alone for we are told that the "personal habits, beliefs, attitudes and lifestyles of millions of North Americans have come under attack by an expanding legion of special-interest groups". The targets of these special interest groups, some of which are "moderate", others "aggressive", range from "smoking, drinking
and medical experimentation on animals to garbage disposals. conventional
English usage and logging". Quite a smorgasbord to lump together! Corelli,
without actually citing a source, informs us that groups like the "4,000
member Non-Smokers' Rights Association and the 15,000 member Animal
Alliance of Canada...claim [emphasis mine] that they have helped persuade
governments to pass laws that have improved public health and human and
animal rights".

Critics however, have allegedly suggested that "single-interest
movements are often puritanical and self-righteous". To buttress this
assertion, *Maclean's* columnist and neo-con media commentator George Bain
(who hardly appears to be a barrel of laughs) tells Corelli that

we really are all messed up in this sort of
puritanism and we sure as hell are not having a lot
of fun.

The article proceeds to inform us that everywhere on the streets of
Canadian and American cities people "say that they are constantly being
harangued or induced to change". It is not clear however, who, if anyone,
Corelli spoke to. In the same paragraph the antics of animal rights activists,
medical researchers' warnings of a "cholesterol rich" diet and brewers of light
beer are placed under the same puritanical umbrella as the author proclaims
that

[b]ehind every push for good health, clean air, pure
water, the humane treatment of animals, minority
rights and womens' and homosexual rights, there is
at least one special interest group.(Corelli,1991:49)
It would appear that Winter’s (1992) assertions about the real meaning of "special interests" holds true here. Drawing upon the work of Noam Chomsky, Winter claims that in the lexicon of mediaspeak, "special interests" translates into meaning anything which threatens to disrupt the hegemony of the dominant class - anything, in other words, which contrasts with the "national [corporate] interest".

Opponents of these special interest groups apparently claim that some are "so extreme that they border on the bizarre". No doubt, this popular perception has been fostered, to some degree, by the mainstream media and Corelli’s article is a case in point. To demonstrate the "extremities", readers are offered the case of Andrea Dworkin who presumably shocked academics at a conference on violence against women. Despite the fact that no source is cited, we are told that Dworkin had said that "if the law cannot jail wife-beaters, then women should kill them". Whether or not this is actually what Dworkin said remains a mystery in the absence of her own voice or a source attributing those remarks to her. This example of portraying feminists as extremists and violent fanatics is precisely the kind of image which perpetuates the backlash against women in general, and feminists in particular.

Beleaguered U of T professor Jack McLeod and his crusade against the zealotry of anti-smokers, who are reported to be one of the most "single-minded" special interest groups, is reintroduced. McLeod is quoted as saying that the notion of "equal rights" has been "bypassed" by the social fascists who
have left him no choice. McLeod no longer keeps office hours, meets students by appointment only "outside" weather permitting or in "some sheltered walkway". His plight is meant to invoke sympathy for McLeod - a victim of the evils of "social fascism".

Desmond Morton, who was introduced in the lead article as a "prominent Canadian historian" appears in Corelli's report offering the following words of wisdom.

We have witnessed the return of the puritans. You're not allowed to sin against ethnic equality, you're not allowed to sin against gender equality.

The vault from smokers' rights to Morton's comments on not being allowed to sin against ethnic and gender equality seems like a large one. However, it serves an interesting purpose for it demands that people ask themselves a question - if sins can be committed against a white male smoker, why can't sins be committed against women and people of colour? There must be a double standard at work and ironically it appears as if it is the white male who is being victimized - indeed a clever ploy to lend plausibility to anti-p.c. rhetoric.

Corelli's article also makes reference to the Cannizzo affair which had appeared in previous articles. In fact, Corelli's reference to it marks the third time that this example has been used - this time to augment Morton's assertion that certain "sins" are not being tolerated.

Psychologist Harvey Moldofsky, communications professor Martin Laba, Mordecai Richler, Dr. John Savage and George Bain - all white males - are
summoned by Corelli as voices of authority who tell us that the new
puritanism is really a form of "totalitarian righteousness" and "intolerance"
emanating from people who "seem to be very humourless and rather
dangerous". Bain claims that special interest groups flourish because of the
media's complicity with their forms of extremism. He says that journalists
often "make gods of certain subjects - cleaning up the environment, improving
public health" while ignoring as "reactionaries", the people critical of various
initiatives.

We deny critics the voice that should be available to
question all sorts of propositions. (Bain cited in
Corelli, 1991:49-50)

Bain couldn't have possibly been referring to Maclean's reporters' coverage of
p.c. who in the span of three articles were unable to unearth anyone who
actually articulated the perspectives attributed to the "politically correct" and
the "new puritans". In the final analysis, Maclean's relied on twenty-three
anti-p.c. sources, twenty-one of whom were male and, from what I could
gather, predominantly white. The other two are white female academics whose
views are explicitly anti-feminist. The pro-p.c. side (and even that description
is debatable as earlier demonstrated) was represented by four people - two
undergraduate students, one white liberal feminist and Stanley Fish who, as
I have explained is in fact a long-time Republican. Moreover, in the span of
nine pages of text, the "pro" p.c. side was allotted approximately four
paragraphs in total.
In light of this, Bain's claims are ludicrous yet the function which they fulfil is profound. In his suggestion that the media often champion the causes of special interest groups, Bain helps to maintain the myth that the media are bastions of liberalism which exclude conservative voices.

This common illusion was reinforced in the aforementioned *Globe And Mail* article on the conservative young bucks who were said to be fighting a liberal establishment and a climate in which public discourse has been muzzled by the forces of political correctness. (Cernetig, 1994:D1) Arguing that there is a lack of conservative forums in Canada, young neo-conservatives are said to be dedicated to creating a national "network of new conservatives". Ideally to be modelled on its American counterpart, the new conservative Canadian infrastructure would seek to formulate an "intellectual argument" that would illuminate how the "Sixties" was an "experiment gone awry" - an experiment which fostered social trends that have been "catastrophic". The "lamentable legacy" of that decade would presumably be condemned in a Canadian version of the *National Review* or the *American Spectator*. If this sounds frightening perhaps one could find solace in the fact that no mention was made of developing a Canuck rendition of the Rush Limbaugh Show!

The *Maclean's* article then wraps up with a brief reference to "feminist" demands for changes in language and vocabulary but not one woman is cited. The report concludes by pointing out that even comedy clubs are not immune from the rancour of those demanding gender and racial equality and ends with
Jack McLeod defending individual liberty and freedom against the pervasive pressure to conform.

Overall, Maclean's coverage of political correctness in this issue reveals its ideological commitments and its obvious bias. All of the media strategies discussed previously are clearly evident in these three articles. Most of the sources are white males who are critical of p.c.; the same examples appear repeatedly: little evidence is provided; critical voices are absent; issues are framed in typical Manichean fashion and decontextualized and a variety of concerns and issues which bear little relation to one another are carelessly lumped together and placed under the rubric of an all-encompassing definition of p.c. A brief review of two recent articles will demonstrate that balance and responsible reporting are still not high on the priority list of Canada's national newsmagazine.

Political Correctness Revisited

In their attempt to persuade Canadians that groupthink is thriving rather than subsiding on campuses, recent evidence of p.c. tyranny is reported to us in the November 29, 1993 issue of Maclean's.

In an article entitled "Conflict On Campus" reporters Brian Bergman and Kim Honey document the case of the University of New Brunswick's "obscure" mathematics professor Matin Yaqzan. The controversy surrounding Yaqzan began when his views on date rape were published in the student newspaper The Brunswickian on November 5, 1993. In that publication, Yaqzan had boldly declared that young males
are unable to restrain their sexual impulses - and that date rape is sometimes a necessary outlet for those urges. (cited in Bergman & Honey, 1993:16)

Shortly after his article appeared in the student newspaper, Yaqzan was suspended for a week while the university administration conducted an inquiry into his professional conduct. Yaqzan's suspension was subsequently lifted by the administration but not before the case attracted international attention. The Maclean's reporters write that the "tranquil", "tree-lined" campus in downtown Fredericton was disrupted by "cameras from Atlanta-based CNN" and New York talk show producers all focusing attention on one of the "hottest issues in university life today - date rape". Ironically, Maclean's does not deal with date rape since the focus is quickly shifted to one of free speech. Yaqzan becomes the latest victim of p.c. thought and speech police.

The issues raised by the incident are among the thorniest facing university administrators - including the limits, if any, on the right of professors to speak their mind. (Bergman & Honey, 1993:16)

These questions, we are told, are particularly "explosive" because feminists, gays and ethnic minorities are "quick to take offence" in an atmosphere of "political correctness" which has "placed a chill on freedom of expression".

Remarkably, Yaqzan is constructed as the "victim" while the plight of many thousands of women who have suffered the trauma of date rape is conveniently excluded. Free speech becomes the issue. Hence, Yaqzan's right to freedom of expression takes precedence over the safety of women who may be attacked by men who agree with Yaqzan's perspective and who undoubtedly receive succour from the publication of his views.
In this article and an accompanying account of another professor supposedly victimized by p.c.'ers, *Maclean's* relies almost entirely on anti-p.c. spokespersons. Of the six anti-p.c.er's cited, two (Judy Wubnig and Camille Paglia) had been used in the previously discussed *Maclean's* articles. They are obviously on the rolodex of authorized knowers. The lone voice of what could loosely be called dissent in this article comes from UNB student union safety coordinator Tammy Yates who is critical of Yaqzan's beliefs and who claims that they condone violence against women. This is the extent to which date rape is addressed in this report as the authors situate the fulcrum of the debate to p.c. oppression.

In order to affirm the claim that p.c. orthodoxy rules, Wubnig is quoted as saying that

> [t]here is an attack on the foundations of free thinking going on...and it is steadily getting worse and worse.

The assessment of Yaqzan's case offered by Camille Paglia to the *Saint John Telegraph-Journal* is recycled in the pages of *Maclean's*. Paglia, obviously craving the media attention she thrives on was quoted as saying that Yaqzan's case represented an "outrageous infringement on a professors' civil liberties" and that UNB's administration had "acted like fascists". Of course one would expect Paglia to defend Yaqzan since she holds similar views on date rape.

Yaqzan apparently had a number of defenders, including, as the reporters point out, some from "unlikely quarters". University of Toronto's sexual harassment officer Paddy Stamp claimed that the Yaqzan fiasco was
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outrageous and her comments inadvertently ended up defending his right to
free speech rather than addressing date rape. One is left with the impression
that Yaqzan was indeed the victim. After all, a female sexual harassment
officer even supports him!

In the same article we are offered another "clear example of the kind of
intolerance that the critics of political correctness fear". Harold Lief, a
professor emeritus at the University of Pennsylvania, was speaking at a public
forum at Montreal’s McGill University about "false memory syndrome" - a
theory which suggests that poorly trained therapists sometimes "push patients
into recalling incidents of childhood sexual abuse that never happened". The
reporters explain that Dr. Lief’s lecture was quickly interrupted by "about 20
of the 200 people in the audience" who supposedly "drowned him out with
jeering, whistling and chants". The forum was reluctantly shut down by the
organizers one of whom told the protesters that the issue was one of academic
freedom and that they were "suppressing an idea". Lief was then quoted as
saying that he was not totally surprised by the reaction since "research into
controversial matters...has been deemed beyond the pale by some feminists".
He deprecates the so-called trend of political correctness and says that "freedom
of expression is much more important than finding politically correct solutions
to controversial issues". However, the article fails to mention that Lief was a
founding member and spokesperson for the False Memory Syndrome
Foundation whose "experts" routinely "testify at trials involving childhood
sexual abuse" and which serves as a "resource centre for accused
parents". (Small, 1994:34) The FMSF experts work at "invalidating and spreading doubts about children's testimony about abuse" and publish a newsletter "full of examples of children allegedly being led to falsely accuse their parents" of abuse. (Small, 1994:34) It is also important to point out that Lief's FMSF is part of the larger backlash movement which has been addressed in this thesis. According to Small (1994:35) the FMSF is another reactionary organization not unlike the Heritage Foundation and the Reform Party. Child abuse allegations are, according to the FMSF, an "attack on the family" and Lief's theory itself is really an attempt to deny "well over 90 per cent of the violence within the most violent of social institutions, the nuclear family." (Small, 1994:36) Moreover, while most of the "protestors" at Lief's lecture were Montreal-area feminist, anti-psychiatry and abuse survivor activists (Small, 1994:34) their "voice" was conveniently excluded in the article.

Another incident involving University of Western Ontario professor Heinz Klatt is reported to us by Maclean's reporter Victor Dwyer. Klatt was investigated by the university administration after a few students complained he had used "sexually oriented remarks" in his class. Apparently, Klatt had used words like "perky", "bodacious" and "exuberant" to describe women's breasts in a lecture on child development. Why the discussion of a woman's anatomy would even be raised in a developmental psychology class is in itself a bit curious. What is even more peculiar in this brief report is that we are never told whether Klatt actually made the remarks. Dwyer does not pose that
question to the professor so what is implicit in the article is that he did make the statements but obviously saw them as innocuous.

In the end Klatt was exonerated, reimbursed for legal fees and granted a year's paid leave. The report concluded with a comment from Klatt who describes his ordeal as "a classic witch hunt, plain and simple".

Like the other case cited in this article, men are portrayed as victims of p.c. fanaticism and women are negatively characterized as thought police intent on curtailing free expression. In the following issue however, the task of castigating "feminist" women and the "politically correct" was turned over to "liberal" columnist Alan Fotheringham.

In his dramatic opening salvo, Fotheringham proclaims:¹¹⁴

They are everywhere around us. They creep soft-footed, stealthy in their vigilance. They emerge from the woodwork. They hide behind the hedges. They now have us surrounded. They are the Political Correctness Police...They are on 24-hour watch.

Given the theatrical preamble and the accompanying caricature of a rather large, unattractive, club-wielding female in military garb, one would expect a far more engrossing tale of "thought control" than the one Fotheringham subsequently provides. In a tone of exasperated frustration, we are informed that earlier in the week Fotheringham's editor had replaced his use of the word "females" with "women". Given Fotheringham's intonation of outrage, readers

¹¹⁴Fotheringham's column entitled "Done In By The PC Police" appeared in the December 6, 1993 issue of Maclean's.
are apparently expected to read this as a manifestation of p.c. militancy. Editors have allegedly caved in to p.c. demands.

Fotheringham, a perceived "liberal" columnist, then proceeds to provide readers with his account of how the lexicon of appropriate words is being diminished by "Political Correctness Police" yet only provides us with one other example - how gender is now used in place of sex. He laments that while editing used to be done from the top down it is now done from the bottom up. This is presumably because

most editors, being of that dreadful species known as the mature white male, are terrified of those beneath them, especially of the feminist variety...

Newspapers and magazine articles are now polished "not for the readers but for the alert PCP" who lurk at "copy desks and cafeterias and next-door pubs".

Fotheringham briefly refers to the Yaqzan incident as the inevitable result of out-of-control p.c. police and suggests that what happened at the University of New Brunswick "proves" that "not only are the UNB heads cowards and hypocritical" but that the "students are ignorant and intolerant". While decrying what he perceives as the emergence of an Orwellian universe, Fotheringham sarcastically suggests that newspapers and magazines seeking p.c. approval should perhaps "sack all those old dolts with white skins and replace them with the PCP approved candidates" - whoever they may be.

Fotheringham's strategy of depicting "white males" as victims and portraying them as the last defenders of "free speech" has become standard in the mainstream media reports of political correctness. Reducing complex and
multifaceted issues in typical Manichean-like fashion, to a pro-free speech v.s. anti-free speech stance has emerged as one of the most successful strategies to demonize those challenging traditional orthodoxy. Undoubtedly, campuses are expected to be bastions of free expression and diverse viewpoints but freedom has not been stifled by the Left’s so-called authoritarianism but rather, by those Right-wing ideologues who wield the charge of p.c. like a cudgel to squelch dissenting voices.

How is it that those attempting to increase the number of voices allowed into academic discourse are being called thought police? How is it that those demanding an end to discriminatory behaviour and speech are regarded as opponents of free expression? Is it possible for any reasonable person to defend as the mere exercise of free speech, cross burnings, swastikas painted on building walls, screams of "nigger" and "faggot" from dormitory windows and the Yaqzans of the world who claim that date rape is needed for the sexual gratification of all male students? Where are we to draw a line? Should lines be drawn? These sensitive issues necessitate serious consideration in a manner that does not reduce the debate to anti v.s. pro free speech. Undoubtedly, such issues will emerge as the debate rages over the zero tolerance guidelines outlined by the Rae government. While this is an issue I will not explore here it is worth considering the implications which these guidelines may have. Indeed, they are double-edged since in all likelihood they could easily be used to further suppress progressive voices. After all, advocating the rights of subaltern groups may be construed as offensive to
some - especially at a time when youth seem to be moving to the Right.(Cernetig.1994:D1)

Moreover, one need only look at some of the infamous cases in the United States (i.e. Robert Mapplethorpe's case) to see how various laws and policies have been used to enforce the conservative morality of the new Right. In his essay "The Fine Art Of Regulation", Andrew Ross (1993) argues that the Right-wing restoration has served to curtail the freedoms of Leftists who have become "vulnerable targets" in the "red-baiting campaign".

Ross (1993:260) cleverly points out however, that contemporary debates over p.c., free speech and culture in general which have raged on campuses, shatter the mythical perception of the university as an "ivory tower milieu that is comfortably removed from public life". It is this recognition which I believe offers progressive educators and activists a glimmer of hope. To avoid a digression here, I will return to this point in the conclusion.

The examples provided in this chapter clearly indicate the mainstream media's complicity in promulgating the illusion that political correctness and left-wing repression have emerged as alarming trends on campuses and in society at large. The coverage provided by Newsweek and Maclean's fuelled the myth that campuses are occupied by left-wing thought police and helped to demonize progressive activists as suppressors of free speech. But perhaps even more insidious was the latent message contained in their reporting.

In vilifying what could loosely be described as the Left as an agent of thought control, the media effectively obscured the part they play in patrolling
the boundaries of allowable discourse. In defining p.c. as the enemy of free expression, media organizations were, at the same time, able to portray themselves as guardians of those freedoms committed to identifying those in violation of that privilege. The relentless defense of free speech by media pundits, however, is not surprising since it is they who assist in sustaining the myth of a free and open society - the "necessary illusion" fundamental to "thought control" in "democratic" societies.

Given this context, progressive intellectuals and activists must engage in a relentless effort to expose those oppressive aspects of social reality that are continually obfuscated by hegemonic intellectuals and the mainstream media.
Conclusion

To say that the past few years have been a tumultuous period in education is to state the obvious. For progressive educators and those committed to social justice it has been a time of struggle and contestation. Engaged in a project of re-imagining the world and its contours, progressives have become the targets of an insidious backlash committed to dismantling many of the breakthroughs, both pedagogical and political, achieved by the social movements of the Sixties. The "roots" of this backlash have been outlined in this thesis as have the various strategies employed to undermine progressive initiatives.

Despite the fact that this text has focused on the terrain of schools, clearly, the struggle over what is considered valid knowledge goes much deeper than issues of educational curricula - this struggle represents the battleground for the very soul and character of society. While the forces of the new Right are pervasive, in order for the "Left" to intervene meaningfully in this struggle it will have to overcome the dual crisis which it faces. Both aspects of this crisis have been discussed in this thesis.

The first is evident in the rise of the new Right, the scope and depth of its influence; its economic and ideological assaults on education and progressive politics in general. The advent of the "political correctness" fury fuelled by the complicity of the mainstream media has undoubtedly, augmented the Right's hegemony. The Right-wing command of the public
sphere has also helped to demonize Leftists as the new McCarthyites and suppressors of free expression which in turn, has served as an effective ploy to recruit liberals to the anti-p.c. trenches. Analytical critique and debate have been constructed by conservatives and media pundits as forms of censorship and fanaticism. Hence, despite the Right-wing complaints about a Left-wing takeover, radicals have, in effect, been further marginalized.

The second aspect of this crisis is, so to speak, internal. It centres on the failure of Leftists to move beyond critique, to articulate a set of visions and strategies to counteract the Right-wing offensive. This lack of vision has undeniably been exacerbated by the fragmented nature of what is called "leftist" discourse. Indeed, much of what passes for "critique" in the bourgeois academy today amounts in the end, to nothing more than discourse wars far removed from the materiality of everyday life. Various manifestations of ludic theory which focus solely on texts succeed in wresting them from their context, thus obscuring their social, historical and material situatedness. Others equate "resistance" with the politics of pleasure and the excesses of jouissance while others declare the death of the subject and bury with them any notion of agency - any belief that people may, as political actors, intervene in making history.

In addition to the emergence of ludic theoretical formulations, the postmodern penchant for "identity" politics has also impeded efforts to foster a shared vision of political struggle. This however, should not be read as an invitation to dismiss difference or negate the importance of specificity and
experience. Rather, it is a plea to embark on what Raymond Williams (1983) has so eloquently called the journey of hope toward the long revolution. Such a journey compels progressives to take up the challenge of building alliances which go beyond the legitimacy of identity/experience alone and the mere celebration of difference.

Following Albrecht & Brewer (1990), alliance formation is conceptualized here as an on-going, long-term arrangement for far-reaching structural change. A theoretical map which would embrace difference while simultaneously locating alterity in the broader historical, political, economic and cultural landscape would serve as the initial step in a project of alliance building. While difference has often been used to perpetuate a divide and conquer strategy (Freire, 1971; Lorde, 1984), when freed from the discourse of control, difference becomes a positive and powerful force which as Lorde (1984:111) maintains “can spark like a dialectic.” Lorde (1984:112) also argues that in the repressive society which we occupy we

have been taught either to ignore our differences or to view them as causes for separation and suspicion rather than as forces for change.

As a force for change, alterity must be positioned within a broader terrain. In other words, “specificity” must be grounded firmly in its context. This requires that the concept of totality not be abandoned or dismissed entirely. Not all forms of totalization are democratically “lacking”, nor for that matter do they decimate diversity. Lorde (1984) convincingly argues that building broad-based alliances does not mean shedding difference or abandoning local
struggle. It simply means that we not lose sight of enunciating a strategy of fundamental structural change. Jameson (1989:386) is particularly insightful on this issue. He writes,

Local struggles...are effective only so long as they remain figures or allegories for some larger systemic transformation. Politics has to operate on the micro - and the macro - levels simultaneously.

Ebert (in press) also underscores the idea of viewing difference and the "particular" from a wider political lens. Difference, according to Ebert, needs to be understood as social contradictions, as difference in relation. Systems of difference also involve patterns of domination and relations of exploitation, oppression and marginalization which require a firm grasp of the inner workings of capitalist social organization.

Such a formulation also demands that we intervene in the social rather than limiting critique to the discursive realm. It means that cosmetic alterations in language not be equated with substantive social change. With respect to this matter, Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1991:11) is worth quoting.

...while discursive categories are clearly sites of political contestation, they must be grounded in and informed by the material politics of everyday life, especially the daily struggles for survival of...those written out of history.

In the contemporary context, this also points to the need to move beyond the politics of "political correctness". The demands for inclusivity and representation made by those various constituencies which have been labelled as "politically correct" are welcome and indeed, necessary advancements. The
challenge to Western legacies of colonialism, imperialism, racism and sexism which emerge through the inclusion of hitherto suppressed and/or marginalized discourses are undoubtedly central to a critical project of empowering education. However, given current circumstances such a project runs the risk of co-optation and depoliticization. There is also the danger that such a stance will lend itself to new forms of liberal pluralism - a concern taken up in the discussions of liberal and left-liberal multiculturalism contained in this text. It is also important at this point, to keep in mind that changes which have been made are anything but "sweeping" as evidenced in this thesis.

Leftist educators and activists must move beyond those types of "reform" which satisfy themselves with linguistic revisions and simple inclusion and instead must attempt to build the bridges necessary for substantive pedagogical and social transformation. In this thesis I have attempted to demonstrate how critical pedagogy may contribute significant insights to theorizing the construction of those bridges. The transdisciplinary nature of its trajectory and its emphasis on linking theory and praxis is especially crucial at a time when the influence of the new Right is spreading. The call for "academic" radicals to cross borders and engage in the concrete world of political action poses a fundamental challenge to those "leftists" who have surrendered their role as political actors by limiting critique to universities and scholarly journals. The insistence on uniting a discourse of critique with one
of hope and possibility provides a refreshing alternative to the cynicism and nihilism which has gripped many on the so-called Left.

Crossing borders, building bridges and forming alliances in the present also demands that we acknowledge and understand the past. I have argued that the Sixties provide progressives with an indispensable frame of reference and reservoir of hope. I agree with hooks (1991) and Lorde (1984) that history (especially that of the Sixties) provides a powerful pedagogical tool for guiding current and future political praxis by both illuminating possibilities and revealing limitations. The task of course, is to resuscitate the revolutionary spirit which guided many of the 60s movements. It also requires that history be rescued from the throes of capitalist commoditization and distorted media renditions. In a culture distinguished by its collective social and historical amnesia, where reality is served up in soundbites and frozen images and interpreted by talk show hosts, progressive educators must illuminate the political relevance of radical history.

Revealing the ideological imperatives which undergird various pedagogical, cultural and media texts is yet another necessary task which progressives must undertake. I have attempted here, to uncover the underlying agenda of the new Right's assault on p.c. as well as, the mainstream media's coverage of the issue. The analysis provided here is without a doubt, limited in its scope and yet it clearly indicates the necessity of engaging in such exercises since the debates over p.c., curriculum reform and "free speech" continue to rage and will, in all likelihood, be played out in
the mainstream media. Indeed, in between the Bobbitt penis slashing, the Harding-Kerrigan fiasco and most recently, the O.J. Simpson saga, issues of so-called "political correctness" continue to attract the attention of media pundits on the lookout for stories of Left-wing oppression and abuse.

While critical analysis and interpretation is essential, perhaps the most important responsibility of progressive intellectuals and activists is delineating new paths for theoretical and political praxis. I would argue that critical/resistance multiculturalism coupled with a powerful critique of capitalism (which is, at times lacking in critical pedagogy) could potentially provide an approach better able to grasp the complexity of temporal social relations. Such an approach could also serve as a basis for rethinking political strategizing and alliance building. I agree with Kelner (1993:18) who has recently argued that Marxism "continues to provide indispensable resources" for a radical project. The advancement of a radical theoretical and political vision depends to a large extent, on the fusing of a class and cultural politics with the new social movements. Progressive intellectuals must avoid what Cornel West (1991) refers to as the trendy trashing of Marxist thought which as he points out, is often based on overly economistic readings of Marx or fundamental misconceptions of his thought. A comprehensive and dialectical analysis of the economic and political realms and their linkages to education, culture and everyday life would reveal the contradictions between and within these spheres that provide the critical spaces from which political interventions could be launched. Such analyses would also illuminate both
the possibilities and limitations which educational institutions possess as locales of struggle. As hooks (1992[b]:51) maintains,

...we cannot give up on academic settings, even as we cannot behave as though these are the only relevant locations for discussion and dialogue. The effort to radicalize is equally important within and outside of the academy...we must resist widespread anti-intellectualism by showing, in practical ways, how we improve the quality of our lives through analysis and critique, through oppositional work.

Following hooks, I have argued that universities, while circumscribed by their political and economic context, still embody the capacity for the production of oppositional knowledge. They also represent terrains where political struggles may flourish as the examples of the Sixties clearly indicate.

In the current climate, dominated as it is by conservative hegemony and a backlash mentality, Leftists must respond to the challenges present in the historical juncture. They must begin a search to find a common cause which would motivate people to action. This common cause, I believe, should be firmly rooted in an anti-capitalist project which addresses the problems of sexism, racism, homophobia, xenophobia and misogyny. Such a project can be realized if committed intellectuals and activists take the discourses of critical multiculturalism and Marxism seriously and only if they dedicate themselves to the ideal of changing the world rather than merely interpreting it.
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