

appeared. All in all, this was a great education for us, and a hopeful one as well, because of the diverse efforts under way by critical teachers. We thank the educators in this book who experimented and tested limits in these hard times for teachers and students. We also thank Lisa Luedeke of Heinemann for her wise help in bringing this material to print and Vicki Kasabian for her careful supervision of production.

Ira Shor
Caroline Pari

1

What Is Critical Literacy?

Ira Shor

We are what we say and do. The ways we speak and are spoken to help shape us into the people we become. Through speech and other actions, we build ourselves in a world that is building us. We can remake ourselves and society, if we choose, through alternative words and dissident projects. This is where critical literacy begins—words that question a world not yet finished or humane.

Critical literacy thus challenges the status quo in an effort to discover alternative paths for social and self-development. This kind of literacy—words rethinking worlds, self dissenting in society—connects the political and the personal, the public and the private, the global and the local, the economic and the pedagogical, for reinventing our lives and for promoting justice in place of inequity. Critical literacy, then, is an attitude toward history that sees language as symbolic action, as Kenneth Burke (1984) might have said; a dream of a new society against the power now in power, as Paulo Freire proposed (Shor and Freire 1987); an insurrection of subjugated knowledges, in the ideas of Michel Foucault (1980); a counterhegemonic structure of feeling, as Raymond Williams (1977) theorized; a multicultural resistance invented on the borders of identities, as Gloria Anzaldua (1990) imagined; or language used against fitting unexceptionably into the status quo, as Adrienne Rich (1979) declared.

From this perspective, *literacy* is understood as social action through language use that develops us inside a larger culture, while *critical literacy* is understood as “learning to read and write as part of the process of becoming conscious of one’s experience as historically constructed within specific power relations” (Anderson and Irvine 1993, 82). Consequently, my opening question, What is critical literacy? leads me to ask, How have we been shaped by the words we use and encounter? If language helps make us, how can we use and teach oppositional discourse so as to remake ourselves and our culture?

These questions on reconstructing self in society invite each of us to examine our own development, to reveal the subjective position from which we

make sense of the world. All of us emerge from local cultures set in global contexts where language from multiple sources shapes us. In my case, until I left home for an elite university in 1962, I grew up in a Jewish working-class neighborhood in the South Bronx of New York City. In this treeless, teeming area, moms and dads held steady jobs but always spoke of needing money; chimneys coughed out toxic garbage smoke daily, yet no one imagined stopping it; abundant ethnic foods with names like *kishke* and *kugel* were occasions for passionate conviviality in kitchens filled with talk and stories; Eastern European accents were common and sometimes ridiculed, while non-Standard English was typical even among the native-born; televisions were always on and newspapers were delivered daily to our doors, teaching us a version of the world beyond the neighborhood; and the N-word was spoken casually on gray blocks where only whites lived and only whites operated the small stores, except for one Asian family that slept and cooked in the back of the Chinese laundry run by a mom and a dad who spoke little English, unlike the African Americans I heard who had lots of English but no stores.

In that alleged Golden Age, black families and their own English were quarantined across the Bronx River Parkway in a housing project built in 1953 along with a junior high that straddled the racial border and became a home to gangs divided by color and ethnicity. My first September day there in 1957 was memorable for a noisy knife fight at dismissal time. During the next two years, I never went to the bathroom in that building. This was a preview of the coming attraction—the even more aggressive senior high nearby, which could have been the set for *Blackboard Jungle*, a famous urban flick at the time.

Like many American places then and now across the country, these gritty streets were a suburb of Hollywood. We kids went weekly to the local Skouras movie house under the roaring Pelham Bay el, paid forty cents to see a John Wayne cowboy or war saga along with twenty cartoons, and devoured teeth-destroying candy, like a chocolate treat we called “nigger babies.” It was a time when John D. Rockefeller’s grandson Nelson first ran for governor of New York, and my young ears noticed a change in one of my favorite jingles: Chock Full o’ Nuts, the heavenly coffee, stopped saying that “better coffee Rockefeller’s money can’t buy” and suddenly crooned that “better coffee a millionaire’s money can’t buy.” Could such a change help the famous grandson get elected? Were words that important?

Rockefeller took the State House in Albany while I was afraid to use the toilet in junior high, but before I got to that gang-divided school and the accelerated “special progress” class reserved for me and some white kids, I patiently made my way up the “one” track in my all-white elementary school (1–1, 2–1, 3–1, 4–1, etc.) set aside for supposedly “smart” kids who were being divided from their “ordinary” peers very early in life. I soon learned that a handful of selected white working-class kids were supposed to leave the others behind, which I did with the push of my mother, who insisted I stop cursing like my friends and speak proper English (“he doesn’t,” not “he don’t”).

Racially, in the desegregated 1950s, my elementary school changed ever so slightly when a single, perfect black girl mysteriously appeared—Olivia was her name. One day, our third-grade teacher asked us how many of our fathers went to work in suits and ties. Few hands went up, not mine or Olivia’s. The teacher’s question confused and embarrassed me because my dad—a sheet-metal worker and high-school dropout—wore his only suit for special occasions, perhaps as did Olivia’s father. In my neighborhood, suits were for bar mitzvahs, weddings, funerals, lodge gatherings, or union meetings. The teacher’s question that morning invited me to be ashamed of my family and our clothes, which, like our thick accents and bad table manners, marked us as socially inferior, despite the white skin that gave us some decisive privileges over Olivia’s family, such as my dad’s union wages, apartments on the “better” side of the Parkway, segregated classes for us white kids in junior high (internal tracking), and moms who could hire black cleaning ladies on Saturdays while they went off to the local beauty parlors to get a perm.

Perms were a small weekly luxury in this neighborhood, where suits, “proper” English, and good table manners were rare. Still, I did see in those days a grown-up wearing a tie and jacket to work—the elementary school principal. One morning, this suit called me to his office to let me know he was banning the little school newspaper I had started with my best friend, Barry. We called it “The Spirit of ’93” to play on “the spirit of ’76” we had read about in the American Revolution unit in class, and to honor our public school that had a number but no name. When the principal abruptly ended our literate venture, I learned that eleven-year-olds in our democracy can’t publish a paper without prior official approval. The suit’s word was power and law. Our kid’s word vanished.

Thirty years later, unfortunately, the Supreme Court’s Hazelwood decision confirmed the right of public schools to censor sponsored student publications. More recently, my memory of childhood censorship was stirred when a New Jersey principal stopped my colleague Maria Sweeney’s class from performing its original antisweatshop play (Nieves 1997; Karp 1997/1998). The suit this time was worn by a female who suggested that fifth graders can’t really understand such issues as sweatshops, and besides, the kids weren’t being fair to Nike and Disney. Maria, with some parents and theatre people, stood by the eleven-year-olds and their script, which the kids eventually performed onstage in Manhattan, so there was a happy ending to this story.

I could have used Maria Sweeney and activist parents in the ’50s. Students of all ages need adult coalitions to help them win language rights to free speech and to social criticism (the presidents at two City University of New York campuses recently nullified student government elections when dissident slates won). Adult support can keep restrictive authorities at bay, not only when a Broadway cause célèbre erupts like the sweatshop play, but also for the low-profile, everyday forms of silencing that researchers like John Goodlad (1984) and Michelle Fine (1987, 1993) found in mass schooling. Administrative rule

making and top-down curricula mean that authority is unilateral, not democratic, featuring standardized tests, commercial textbooks, mandated syllabi, one-way teacher talk, and fill-in-the-blank exams. As teachers well know, silenced students find ways to make lots of noise, in the unofficial spaces of halls, toilets, lunchrooms, yards, and streets, as well as during class when teachers attempt their lesson plans (a resistance called "underlife" by Robert Brooke [1987] and "infrapolitics" by James Scott [1990]). At many sites of mass education including public colleges, a culture war of discourses is apparently under way. In wars of words, can language and literacy be innocent? Can education be neutral?

Innocent or Neutral? Literacy and Pedagogy

If language and education were innocent or neutral, I suppose my school principal would have allowed the "Spirit of '93" to circulate in the building. (Why didn't he campaign against the circulation of the N-word among us kids and our parents?) If words and schooling were unpolitical, I suppose Maria's class would have been able to perform its sweatshop play for classes at their Jersey school instead of crossing the Hudson River to do an exile gig. (Why didn't their principal support the campaign against sweatshop apparel instead of declaring the students unfair to corporate America?) All in all, if words in classrooms were in fact nonpartisan, this nation's schools and colleges would not display the conflicted histories recorded by various scholars (Ravitch 1974, 1983; Karabel and Brint 1989; Dougherty 1994; Tyack and Cuban 1995; Berliner and Biddle 1995). Consider, for example, the case of the Boston authorities in 1826, who decided to open an all-girls high school to match the all-boys one started a few years earlier. So many girls applied that the Brahmin city fathers chose to kill the project rather than to meet the demand for female equality. For the time being, patriarchy was protected. If education were indeed neutral, boys and girls of all colors and classes would have had equal access as well as equal monies invested in their development, something this democratic nation never provided and still doesn't ("Quality Counts" 1998, 20-21, 54). Racially, in fact, schools have become resegregated since the 1954 decision, according to recent studies (Orfield 1993; Orfield and Easton 1996; Orfield et al. 1997).

While segregation and unequal funding remain fixtures in American education, inequality rules daily life as well. For example, the Hunger Action Network, the Department of Agriculture, and the Food First group estimate that five million senior citizens and more than four million children go to bed hungry every day in this food-rich country (Sarasohn 1997; Lieberman 1998). Can anyone doubt that hungry students are at a disadvantage in the classroom? The response of a humane society would be to simply feed everyone with the vast food surplus already available, but distribution in a market-driven society is

based on income, not need. On June 25, 1998, *Marketplace* on National Public Radio reported a "problem" for farmers in the Northwest: "too much wheat and too few customers." This sorry saga of separating hungry kids from plentiful food includes a bizarre attempt during the Reagan administration to declare ketchup a vegetable to save money on school lunch programs. You don't need a Ph.D. to know that ketchup is a condiment and not a vegetable, but such rhetorical maneuvers mark conservative politics in recent decades (Bracey 1995). Critical literacy is food for thought and feeling (symbolic nourishment), not real calories. In this wealthy society, as General Electric reports a record \$8.2 billion profit (Smart 1998) and General Motors sits on \$14 billion in cash (Moody 1998), should it be necessary to say that real food must be guaranteed each child to support her or his academic learning?

Food-rich America has the highest child poverty rate in the industrialized world: 20.8 percent (Bureau of the Census 1997, Table 739). Black and Hispanic kids are more than twice as likely to live in poverty as are white kids (Bureau of the Census 1997, Table 737). Conversely, in a high-tech age, white students are three times more likely to have computers at home than are black or Hispanic youth ("Technology Counts" 1997, 8, 10; Zehr 1998). A child whose parents earn \$70,000 or more (top quartile) has an 80 percent chance to graduate college by age twenty-four while a child whose family earns \$22,000 or less (bottom quartile) has about an 8 percent chance (Mortenson 1995; Viadero 1998). White median family income is about \$41,000, which is remarkably higher than that of blacks (\$24,698) or Hispanics (\$24,318), indicating that white supremacy is still firmly in the saddle (Bureau of the Census 1997, Table 727). Education and literacy are situated in these larger conditions, where the economy is the "decisive" factor influencing school policy and outcomes, as John Kenneth Galbraith (1967) suggested some time ago.

The good news is that from the 1970s to mid-1980s, black students substantially narrowed test score gaps between them and their white peers (Department of Education 1997, Table 128; Williams and Ceci 1997). The bad news is that these gains slowed or stopped by the 1990s, as economic and educational policies increasing inequality gained momentum ("Quality Counts" 1998, 10-13). Further, black unemployment has remained about twice the white rate, virtually unchanged through boom and bust periods (Bureau of the Census 1997, Table 656), despite the black achievement of near-parity with whites in average levels of education (Department of Education 1997, Table 8). Similarly, the income advantage of white families over minority households mentioned above has also remained steady during this recent period of improving nonwhite educational achievement (Henwood 1997). Additionally, in higher education, black and Hispanic graduation rates severely lag behind white student rates despite a notable narrowing of the racial gap in high school completion and test scores (Gose 1998). Further, in higher education, only 3 percent of full professors are black and only 2 percent of all faculty are Hispanic

(Schneider 1998a). While the racial gap in wages has not narrowed, inner cities have become more segregated and minority families there more impoverished and isolated ("Quality Counts" 1998, 14–15; Anyon 1998).

Like black students' (stalled) test score gains, females made historic advances in college attendance and degrees, yet have not been able to translate their higher credentials into wage parity. As the Department of Education (1997) noted, "despite large gains in educational attainment and labor force participation, significant differences in earnings persist between females and males, even at similar levels of education" (18). Female high school grads earn about a third less than male grads the same age; female college grads earn about 80 percent of what their male counterparts receive. Further, few women are getting Ph.D.s in the high-paying fields of science and technology still dominated by white men, who also continue to dominate the high-salaried professions of medicine and law. Instead, women collect in low-wage doctorates and "helping" professions such as education, social work, and library science (Department of Education 1997, Tables 272, 299–304). Finally, women hold only 18 percent of high-wage full professorships but about 70 percent of low-salary schoolteacher jobs (Schneider 1998a).

Besides the race and gender divides, mass education continues to have widening gaps between social classes (Hershey 1996; Perez-Pena 1997). People of all colors and genders have gained more educational credentials every decade, yet the bottom 80 percent of wage earners saw no growth in their share of national income since the 1970s, while the top 20 percent took home higher wages (Holmes 1996; "Wealthiest Americans" 1997). In a single year, 1996–1997, the number of billionaires in the United States increased from 135 to 170, according to *Forbes* magazine's annual report on the richest Americans (Sklar and Collins 1997). The top 1 percent now control about 40 percent of the country's wealth, the highest percentage in our history even though high-school diplomas and college degrees are more widely distributed today than ever (Boutwell 1997). What Lester Faigley (1997) called "the revolution of the rich" means that class inequity is growing, not declining, at a moment when mass education is at its greatest reach.

Such inequities in school and society have been constant sources of critique as well as conflict. For example, Christopher Jencks (1972) concluded in a landmark study that progress toward equality would occur at the speed of *glaciers* (his metaphor) if we depended on education to level disparities. What would move equality faster? Jencks proposed reducing wage differences and rotating jobs within occupations to give all people access to all competencies in a field or industry. An income/employment policy plus progressive taxation to redistribute wealth would be far swifter equity mechanisms than mass education, he argued, because they would directly create more wages from the bottom up. Shortly after Jencks proposed changing the economic system to achieve equities impossible from school reform, Bowles and Gintis (1976) agreed in their own monumental study that "Education over the years has never

been a potent force for economic equality. . . . Schools foster types of personal development compatible with the relationships of dominance and subordination in the economic sphere" (8, 11). Several decades later, as I write, Jencks' original analysis still holds, I would argue, insofar as economic inequality is the primary problem needing change to build community foundations for school achievement (Anyon 1998; Mickelson and Smith 1998).

All in all, perhaps these are a few good reasons to question the status quo, including the myth of education as a "great equalizer," Horace Mann's hope, which I discuss further shortly. Critical literacy is a pedagogy for those teachers and students morally disturbed by the above "savage inequalities," as Jonathan Kozol (1991) named them, for those who wish to act against the violence of imposed hierarchy, restrictedness, and forced hunger.

Literacy for Equity: Transforming Words in the World

In many ways, the project of critical literacy fits the savage and hopeful time in which it emerged. In recent decades, America has been moving left and right at the same time, though not in the same way or at the same speed, I would say. In this long period of polarization, when the liberal "center" declined dramatically, Democrats and Republicans virtually fused on the right. Humane hope has resided in challenges to inequality made on various fronts of the left—challenges that have been met by powerful reactionary efforts to maintain tradition and privilege (Faludi 1991; Ingalls 1998; Morris 1998; Shepard 1998). To state the obvious, the past thirty years have witnessed intense culture wars in school and society over gender, race, class, and sexual preference. Since the 1960s, these culture wars—a long-term questioning of the unequal status quo—have disturbed traditional language arts (phonics and grammar drills) and mainstream discourse (such as the practice of only using the masculine pronoun *he* to refer to people in general). In response to egalitarian pressures from below, "political correctness" charges and other conservative education projects have attempted to turn back the clock through various mechanisms: career education, back-to-basics, the literacy crisis, steep tuition increases, public sector budget cuts, increased testing at all levels, restrictions on open access to higher education, "cultural literacy" proposals steeped in Eurocentric facts and didactic lecturing (Hirsch 1987, 1989; Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil 1988), and "bell curve" arguments justifying the subordination of minorities (Herrnstein and Murray 1994; Gould 1995; Williams and Ceci 1997). This counteroffensive to defend the status quo, which I call "the conservative restoration" against the democratic opening of the 1960s (see Shor 1992a), included corporate conglomeration of the mass media as well as high-profile attempts to muzzle criticism, such as progressive Jim Hightower's removal from national talk radio; *Time* magazine's refusal to run essays on welfare reform, militarism,

and the death penalty by its own columnist Barbara Ehrenreich; Oprah Winfrey's famous "free speech" beef case in Texas; and the industry lawsuit against Cornell researcher Professor Kate Bronfenbrenner, who publicly criticized labor-law violations of Beverly Enterprises, a health-care provider. The broad defense of the status quo also brought attacks on affirmative action, which had begun in earnest with the 1978 Bakke case in California (see Sandman [1998] and Hill [1997] for more recent events); on welfare, best epitomized by the punitive W-2 program in Wisconsin and cheap-labor "workfare" in New York (see Coniff [1998] on the "mirage" of welfare reform and Gordon [1994] on "how welfare became a dirty word"); on labor unions, such as the 1998 corporate attempt to end labor financing of political campaigns through Proposition 226 in California; on abortion rights, such as restrictive access sanctioned by the Supreme Court and vandalism, murders, and bombings; on school-equity, including the refusal of states like New Jersey and Texas to equalize student funding despite three decades of lawsuits and one court order after another; and on gay rights, like the banning of the Indigo Girls from some high-school concerts because of their lesbian identification (Strauss 1998) and the attempt to drive Terrence McNally's new play *Corpus Christi* out of the Manhattan Theater Club (Blumenthal 1998).

In this embattled period, when the status quo mobilized to defend tradition, hierarchy, and the market system, culture wars have been particularly sharp in the field of English. Consider the bitter conflict fought by Linda Brodkey (1996) at Austin when she tried to redesign freshman comp with diversity issues; Maxine Hairston's (1992a) denunciation of critical theorists in composition and the responses it provoked; the growing dispute between entrenched literary study and subordinated writing instruction (the "comp-lit split" [Schneider 1998b]); the rescue of the SAT as a tool for measuring literacy despite twenty years of criticism against its cultural bias (Weissglass 1998); and the long-term contention between phonics and whole language (Daniels, Zemelman, and Bikar 1998).

The specific area of culture war relevant to this book involves literacy and pedagogy in the field of writing instruction. The papers in this volume ask, What methods help develop students as critically thinking citizens who use language to question knowledge, experience, and power in society? This social context for education joins a long discussion dating back to John Dewey and in some ways to Horace Mann before him.

(Briefly) Looking Back: Reform and Reformers

In the year John Dewey was born in Vermont—1859—an ailing sixty-three-year-old Horace Mann delivered his final commencement address as president of Antioch, which he had helped found six years earlier as the first coed college in the country. It also admitted blacks as well as whites, though Oberlin broke the race barrier a decade before. Mann, known as the Father of the Common

School for his prodigious efforts to set up free public schooling in Massachusetts from 1837 to 1849, had helped rescue Antioch from near bankruptcy soon after it opened (Williams 1937). Now, on a June day in Ohio, he ended his last address with an extraordinary challenge to students, "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity." A zealous reformer, he succumbed to illness that August, ending a controversial career primarily devoted to mass education, which he hoped, in part, would solve growing class divisions in nineteenth-century America. If education remained private, Mann thought, "Intellectual castes would inevitably be followed by castes in privilege, in honor, in property" (188).

Dewey, more secular than Mann, argued in *Democracy and Education* ([1916] 1966) that the curricular split between elite and mass education was passed down from the class divisions of ancient Greece, where leisured rulers could study philosophy and evade useful labor, supported by the majority who were marked inferior precisely because they worked with their hands. A class-based curriculum deemed subject matters dealing with utility and labor lesser than those relating to philosophy. Dewey thus saw the new mass curriculum of his own time (the three Rs and job training) deriving from ancient class inequities, where the study of abstract liberal arts remained a leisure class privilege, while basic skills and occupationalism were relegated to society's subordinates:

The idea still prevails that a truly cultural or liberal education cannot have anything in common, directly at least, with industrial affairs, and that the education which is fit for the masses must be a useful or practical education in a sense which opposes useful and practical to nurture of appreciation and liberation of thought. . . . The notion that the "essentials" of elementary education are the three Rs mechanically treated, is based upon ignorance of the essentials needed for realization of democratic ideals. (257, 192)

Education separated from experience and usefulness on the one hand, and from philosophy on the other, was a dead end for learning in a democracy, he argued. Dewey thus affirmed a holistic curriculum based simultaneously in experience and philosophy, in working and thinking, in action and reflection.

Accordingly, from such an integrated curriculum, Deweyan education seeks the construction of a reflective democratic citizen. In this curriculum, the class-based division between the ideal and the real, the liberal arts and the vocations, is collapsed into a unified learning field. Language use in such an egalitarian field is the vehicle for making knowledge and for nurturing democratic citizens through a philosophical approach to experience. For Dewey, language use is a social activity where theory and experience meet for the discovery of meaning and purpose. In this curricular theory and practice, discourse in school is not a one-way, teacher-centered conduit of class-restricted materials and "language arts" is not a separate subject for the transfer of correct usage or grammar skills to students. "Think of the absurdity of having to teach language

as a thing by itself," Dewey proposed in *The School and Society* ([1900] 1971c). To him, children are born language users, naturally and eagerly talking about the things they do and are interested in. He continued,

But when there are no vital interests appealed to in the school, when language is used simply for the repetition of lessons, it is not surprising that one of the chief difficulties of school work has come to be instruction in the mother-tongue. Since the language taught is unnatural, not growing out of the real desire to communicate vital impressions and convictions, the freedom of children in its use gradually disappears. (55–56)

With vital interests disconnected from classroom discourse, the students lose touch with the purpose of human communication. When they lose touch with purpose in speaking or writing, they struggle to mobilize their inherent language competencies. They lose their articulateness along with their motivation, Dewey suggested, compelling the teacher "to invent all kinds of devices to assist in getting any spontaneous and full use of speech" (56).

Dewey's hundred-year-old observations remain relevant today for the ongoing campaign against drilling in grammar and rhetorical forms (like comparison and contrast, description, narration, and so on), and against "cultural literacy" transmission models that E. D. Hirsch has promoted (see also Stunkel [1998] for a traditional defense of "the lecture"). Since the 1960s, dialogic and student-centered methods from expressivist, feminist, and other critical teachers have foregrounded the personal and the social as the subject matters Dewey called for in his reference to "vital impressions and convictions." The remarkable growth of composition studies in the last few decades has led to substantial alternatives to skill drills, such as writing across the curriculum, ethnography as syllabus, writing process methods, service learning, journal writing, community literacy approaches, literacy narratives, mainstreaming basic writers, portfolio assessment, and collaborative learning, with many classrooms redesigned as writing workshops. These forward-looking developments in language arts coexist with the regressive dominance of grammar books and workbooks, and the rise of more standardized testing and more mandated syllabi in public schools, as well as the greater exploitation of adjunct teachers in higher education (Shor 1997). Top-down authority in school and society has aggressively reasserted itself against bottom-up efforts for democratic language arts.

In this conflicted milieu, recent developments include the emergence of critical literacy as one approach to pedagogy and language use. Critical literacy can be thought of as a social practice in itself and as a tool for the study of other social practices. That is, critical literacy is reflective and reflexive: Language use and education are social practices used to critically study all social practices including the social practices of language use and education. Globally, this literate practice situates discourse in the larger cultural context of any specific situation. "Only as we interpret school activities with reference to the larger circle of social activities to which they relate do we find any standard for

judging their moral significance," Dewey wrote ([1909] 1975, 13). Oriented toward self in social context, critical literacy involves questioning received knowledge and immediate experience with the goals of challenging inequality and developing an activist citizenry. The two foundational thinkers in this area are certainly Dewey and Freire, but the work of Lev Vygotsky is also central. Some contemporary critical educators have made exceptional contributions: theorists and practitioners like Elsa Auerbach, Jim Berlin, Bill Bigelow, Patricia Bizzell, Stephen Brookfield, Linda Christensen, Jim Cummins, Nan Elsasser, Marilyn Frankenstein, Moacir Gadotti, Henry Giroux, Patricia Irvine, Donaldo Macedo, Peter Mayo, Peter McLaren, Richard Ohmann, Bob Peterson, Arthur Powell, Peter Roberts, Roger Simon, and Nina Wallerstein; feminists like Carmen Luke, Jennifer Gore, and Kathleen Weiler; and multiculturalists like Alma Flor Ada, Jim Banks, Antonia Darder, Deborah Menkart, Sonia Nieto, Nancy Schniedewind, Christine Sleeter, and Carlos Torres.

The diverse paths to critical literacy represent it as a discourse and pedagogy that can be configured in feminist, multicultural, queer, and neo-Marxist approaches. As mentioned earlier, it invites students and teachers to consider options to fitting quietly into the way things are. Disturbing the status quo is certainly not easy, transparent, or risk-free—for example, try questioning Nike's use of sweatshop labor to students who are "Nike'd" from head to toe and for whom Michael Jordan is an airborne god or questioning such ventures as the Gulf War of 1991 among students with military relatives ordered to the front in Iraq. Coming to critical literacy is a rather unpredictable and even contentious process filled with surprises, resistances, breakthroughs, and reversals (Shor 1996). It's no easy or open road for a number of reasons that I've been defining in various books. The forces that need questioning are very old and deeply entrenched, while student experience is remarkably complex, sometimes too complicated for the interventions of critical pedagogy in a single semester. But, as Horton and Freire (1990) put it, we make the road by walking, and for teachers reporting in this volume, the critical road has produced some very interesting results and some still unresolved problems.

Do Not Walk Gently into That Status Quo: Alternative Roads for Development

As I've been arguing, critical literacy belongs to Deweyan constructivist education, which has also been associated with *activity theory*. As David Russell (1995) defined it in a masterful essay:

Activity theory analyzes human behavior and consciousness in terms of *activity systems*: goal-directed, historically situated, cooperative human interactions, such as a child's attempt to reach an out-of-reach toy, a job interview, a "date," a social club, a classroom, a discipline, a profession, an institution,

a political movement, and so on. The activity system is the basic unit of analysis for both cultures' and individuals' psychological and social processes. . . . Activity systems are historically developed, mediated by tools, dialectically structured, analyzed as the relationship of participants and tools, and changed through *zones of proximal development*. (54–55)

Activity theory in general, and the “zone of proximal development” specifically, derive from cognitivist Lev Vygotsky (1962, 1978), who proposed that such zones exist when a less developed individual or student interacts with a more advanced person or teacher, allowing the student to achieve things not possible when acting on her or his own. The relationship with the more developed person pulls the less developed one forward, a dynamic similar to the curriculum Dewey described that began from student experience and was structured forward into organized reflective knowledge of the kind teachers have. In posing experience as the starting point of a reflective process, Dewey asked, “What is the place and meaning of subject-matter and of organization within experience? How does subject-matter function? Is there anything inherent in experience which tends towards progressive organization of its contents?” ([1938] 1963, 19).

A critical writing class is a zone where teachers invite students to move into deepening interrogations of knowledge in its global contexts. The main differences between critical literacy as I propose it here and Vygotsky's zone of proximal development are first that critical literacy is an activity that reconstructs and develops *all* parties involved, pulling teachers forward as well as students (whereas Vygotsky focused on student development), and second that dissident politics is foregrounded in a critical literacy program, inviting democratic relations in class and democratic action outside class (whereas Vygotsky did not foreground power relations as the social context for learning). I want here to emphasize the mutual and dissident orientations of critical literacy's zone compared to the ZPD of Vygotsky. Again, one key departure is that *all* participants in a critical process become redeveloped as democratic agents and social critics. Critical teaching is not a one-way development, not “something done for students or to them” for their own good (Freire 1989, 34). It's not a paternal campaign of clever teachers against defenseless students. Rather, a critical process is driven and justified by mutuality. This ethic of mutual development can be thought of as a Freirean addition to the Vygotskian zone. By inviting students to develop critical thought and action on various subject matters, the teacher herself develops as a critical-democratic educator who becomes more informed of the needs, conditions, speech habits, and perceptions of the students, from which knowledge she designs activities and integrates her special expertise. Besides learning in-process how to design a course *for* the students, the critical teacher also learns how to design the course *with* the students (cogovernance). A mutual learning process develops the teacher's democratic competence in negotiating the curriculum and in sharing power. Overall,

then, regarding the Freirean addition to the Vygotskian zone, the mutual development ethic constructs students as authorities, agents, and unofficial teachers who educate the official teacher while also getting educated by each other and by the teacher.

Though he highlighted mutuality in his two foundational works, Freire (1970, 1973) was not a libertarian educator of the “Summerhill” kind. He believed in rigor and structure. For Freire, critical education as a group process was neither permissive nor agnostic (Shor and Freire 1987, 75–96). That is, on the one hand, students and teachers were not free to do whatever they wanted whenever they wanted, and on the other hand, the conceptual knowledge of the teacher was not denied but rather posed as a necessary element. The teacher must be expert and knowledgeable to be a responsible critical-democratic educator, Freire thought.

Yet, teacher knowledge and authority could also contradict dialogue and thus destroy mutuality in this critical process. A central problem for Freirean mutuality is how and when a teacher should use authority and expertise to promote rather than to silence student agency. Saying too much or too little too soon or too late can damage the group process. The problem of adjusting to dialogic practice is complicated because students and teachers have already been deeply socialized by prior “banking” models, that is, one-way teacher talk and nonnegotiable syllabi. Critical literacy has to develop mutual inquiry in a field already crowded with anticritical monologue. No wonder, then, that in Freire's “culture circle,” the first problem of education was reconciling the student-teacher dichotomy (1970, 57–60). Freire (1973) complained early on that “liberatory” educators were themselves too often poor practitioners of dialogue and too infected with the old habits of one-way communication:

A major problem in setting up the program is instructing the teams of coordinators. Teaching the purely technical aspects of the procedure is not difficult. The difficulty lies rather in the creation of a new attitude—that of dialogue, so absent in our upbringing and education. (52; see also Shor [1992b, 85–111])

While being a democratic authority is a teacher's challenge in a dialogic program, there is also the opposite dilemma, that is, of the teacher *not* having enough authority. In some cases, the *lack* of authority interferes with a teacher's ability to initiate a critical and power-sharing process. On the one hand, there are classrooms where some students' disruptive behavior overwhelms other students and the teacher's authority, making control the issue instead of power sharing. On the other hand, the authority teachers bring to class varies according to the teacher's gender, race, age, condition of employment (full- or part-time), physical stature and ability, regional location, grade level, discipline or subject matter, type of institution (elite or mass), and other factors. Similarly, the students' varying ages, genders, races, classes, ethnicities, and so forth, equally affect their authority as well as that of the teacher. Students who develop

socially subordinate identities can possess too little authority for them to join an unfamiliar critical process. Put simply, there is no universal teacher authority uniformly empowered in front of standard students. Teachers, students, and settings differ. The same teacher can have more authority in one class and less in another because few classes are alike. In sum, difference in an unequal society means that teachers possess uneven authority when they address students. Consequently, while all teachers need to establish their authority in class, some are at a distinct advantage both in taking charge and in sharing power: White males who are tall, older, full-time, long-employed, and able-bodied generally have the most authority, though teachers of color tend to have more authority than whites in inner-city schools with minority populations.

These differences complicate the mutual ethic of critical literacy. The risk and difficulty of democratizing education should be apparent to those who read these lines or to those who have attempted critical literacy, perhaps encountering the awkward position of distributing authority to students who often do not want it or know how to use it. Still, the long history of this mutual ethic makes it a landmark responsibility of democratic teachers. Mutuality certainly goes back to Dewey ([1938] 1963), who was preoccupied with the cooperative development of social feeling and with the democratic involvement of students:

There is, I think, no point in the philosophy of progressive education which is sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which direct his activities in the learning process, just as there is no defect in traditional education greater than its failure to secure the active cooperation of the pupil in construction of the purposes involved in his studying. (67)

Dewey saw cooperative relations central to democratic education and society. To him, any social situation where people could not consult, collaborate, or negotiate was an activity of slaves rather than of free people. Freedom and liberty are high-profile "god-words" in American life, but, traditionally, teachers are trained and rewarded as unilateral authorities who transmit expert skills and information, who not only take charge but stay in charge. At the same time, students are trained to be authority-dependent, waiting to be told what things mean and what to do, an alienating position that encourages passive-aggressive submission and sabotage.

In this difficult project, I knew Freire as an optimist aware of the limits. His was a pedagogy of hope that saw critical action bringing the future to life in the present (Shor and Freire 1987, 184–87). Before Freire, Dewey was himself optimistically focused on pragmatic "agencies for doing" ([1916] 1966, 38). Dewey proposed that a curriculum must have "the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past" (191). As did Freire, he recognized the power embedded in the ordinary to impede change as well as to promote it. Dewey even quantified this everyday power with a metaphor by saying that "An ounce of experience is better than a ton of

theory" (144), certainly a strong statement for this man of sober words. Only in experience, Dewey argued, does theory have any "vital and verifiable significance." Reflection on experience, he thought, could yield extensive theory while theory alone was "a mere verbal formula, a set of catchwords" that obscured critical thinking. Freire later agreed, referring to theory-based action/action-based theorizing as "praxis."

The notion of praxis—reflective action—works off the difference between *theorizing practice* and *theorizing theory*. Consider the phrase "theorizing practice" and how it can be reversed to "practicing theory." This is what praxis meant to Freire: a close relationship between words and action, between the symbolic and the concrete—theorizing practice/practicing theory. If we try this linguistic reversal with the phrase "theorizing theory," we lose praxis; we wind up with the same phrase we began with—"theorizing theory"—because the participle and the noun in that phrase have the same root, referring to the same thing, theory alone, words without the world (as Freire might have said). Beginning and staying in theory keeps the word and the world abstractly apart, making discourse into a "conceptual ballet" or "dance of the concepts," as Freire called it (Shor and Freire 1987, 147). Yet, in elite academic life, the more abstract a discourse, the more prestige the speaker represents. However, from Freire and from Dewey before him, the praxis of critical literacy involves language in and for action beginning from the everyday words and knowledge students bring to class, an approach shared with expressivism (see Elbow [1991] on the students' need to use their own language for writing development).

Praxis that begins from student themes and connects to the global evolves what I have called "the third idiom," that is, a local critical discourse synthesized in the immediate zone for the purposes undertaken there, different from the everyday language of students and from the academic language of the teacher (Shor 1992, 169–99). The emergence of a situated third idiom indicates that some of the power conflicts between students and teacher are being worked through. In this regard, Patricia Bizzell's forthcoming work in "hybrid discourses" is very helpful in identifying new idioms as egalitarian options to traditional academic discourse.

Working Through the Writing Class

I have argued, discourse in general, education in particular, and literacy classes specifically are agencies for making self in society. Kenneth Burke's (1966) notion of language as symbolic action not only defined discourse as a material force in history, but also that language is "suasive," that is, a force that socially pulls individuals to develop one way or another. On the one hand, we make ourselves in the world according to the way we learn to think and talk about society and our place in it. On the other hand, however, thought, language, and action are never fully under control, never fully determined by the status quo. The opposite to determinism is the potential for alternative agency; we can speak and

act critically to change ourselves and the world. We can critique the way things are, imagine alternatives, hypothesize ways to get there, act from these plans, evaluate and adjust our actions. Consider Dewey's problem-solving method ([1933] 1971a); Stephen Brookfield's (1987) social theory of critical thinking; and Freire's connection to Gramsci and activist adult education (Mayo 1994), which suggest the potential of critical discourse for alternative growth.

Because critical writing classes propose social and personal alternatives to the status quo, the stakes are high. Why else would so much controlling regulation and administration be directed at writing and reading practices in school and society? Power is obviously involved in the "sponsorship of literacy," as Deborah Brandt (1998) wrote:

everybody's literacy practices are operating in differential economies, which supply different access routes, different degrees of sponsoring power, and different scales of monetary worth to the practices in use. In fact, the interviews I conducted are filled with examples of how economic and political forces, some of them originating in quite distant corporate and government policies, affect people's day-to-day ability to seek out and practice literacy. (172)

The power issues specifically circulating in language education were described like this by John Rouse (1979):

language learning is the process by which a child comes to acquire a specific social identity. What kind of person should we help bring into being? . . . [E]very vested interest in the community is concerned with what is to happen during those years, with how language training is to be organized and evaluated, for the continued survival of any power structure requires the production of certain personality types. The making of an English program becomes, then, not simply an educational venture but a political act. (1)

Rouse noted that a writing program can help produce people "acceptable to those who would maintain things as they are, who already have power," which Dick Ohmann ([1976] 1996, 1987) saw as the official function of composition. Ohmann and Rouse anticipated Jim Berlin's idea that when we teach writing we are teaching a version of the world and the students' places in it. Berlin (1996) said that a curriculum

is a device for encouraging the production of a certain kind of graduate, in effect, a certain kind of person. In directing what courses will be taken in what order, the curriculum undertakes the creation of consciousness. The curriculum does not do this on its own, free of outside influence. It instead occupies a position between the conditions of the larger society it is serving—the economic, political, and cultural sectors—and the work of teacher-scholars within the institution. (17)

Berlin's orientation was concretely tied to a pedagogy for critical consciousness by Tom Fox (1993), who proposed a composition class that

interrogates cultural and political commonplaces . . . refuses to repeat clichéd explanations for poverty, racism, sexism, homophobia . . . explores and embodies conflicts . . . critiques institutional inequities, especially in the immediate context of the classroom, the writing program, the department, the university, but also in the institutions that have played an important role in students' lives . . . demonstrates successful practices of resistance, that seeks historical evidence for possibilities and promise . . . self-consciously explores the workings of its own rhetoric . . . and seeks to reduce the deafening violence of inequality. (43–44)

While Fox stipulated goals for questioning the status quo, Robert Brooke (1987) defined writing per se as an act of resistance:

[Writing] necessarily involves standing outside the roles and beliefs offered by a social situation—it involves questioning them, searching for new connections, building ideas that may be in conflict with accepted ways of thinking and acting. Writing involves being able to challenge one's assigned roles long enough that one can think originally; it involves living in conflict with accepted (expected) thought and action. (141)

Brooke offered an intelligent argument that writing itself was synonymous with divergent thinking. Still, I doubt this direct link of composing with resisting. Some kinds of writing and pedagogy consciously disconfirm the status quo, but not composing and instruction in general. Think of all the books written from and for the status quo. Further, it is also easy to find composition classes that reflect traditional values and encourage status quo writing ("current-traditional rhetoric"; see Ohmann [(1976) 1996] as well as Crowley [1996]). Human beings are certainly active when writing, and all action involves development and agency of some kind, but not all agency or development is critical. Critical agency and writing are self-conscious positions of questioning the status quo and imagining alternative arrangements for self and society (Brookfield 1987).

This perspective on literacy for questioning society is markedly different from Erika Lindemann's (1995) definition of writing as "a process of communication that uses a conventional graphic system to convey a message to a reader" (11). From a different point of view than Lindemann's rhetorical functionalism, Louise Phelps (1988) acknowledged writing as a rich cultural activity, not a set of basic skills: "the potential for composing becomes the principle of reflection . . . and especially the critical spirit" (67), echoing Brooke above and endorsing Shirley Brice Heath's (1983) idea of writing as a complex social activity. Phelps also embraced Ann Berthoff's (1981) notion, which was taken up as well by Knoblauch and Brannon (1984) and John Mayher (1990), that "Writing is an act of making meaning for self and for others" (70). Related to activity theory and to cultural context, Marilyn Cooper and Michael Holtzman (1989) proposed that "Writing is a form of social action. It is part of the way in

which some people live in the world. Thus, when thinking about writing, we must also think about the way that people live in the world" (xii). They reflected Brian Street's (1984) and Harvey Graff's (1987) arguments that all language use is socially situated, against what Street called the myth of autonomous literacy, that is, language use falsely posed as techniques independent of social context. One of the more complex and ambitious efforts to place language learning in a social context is the community literacy project organized by Linda Flower, which seeks an "alternative discourse" for "social change, . . . intercultural conversation, . . . new strategies for decision making, . . . [and] inquiry" (Peck, Flower, and Higgins 1995, 205; Flower 1998).

The social context and making-of-meaning schools of literacy go back not only to Vygotsky's activity theory but also to Dewey's definition of "education" as increasing the ability to perceive and act on meaning in one's society (Dewey [1916] 1966, 76ff). To Dewey, the goal of education was to advance students' ability to understand, articulate, and act democratically in their social experiences. This definition of education as meaning-making social action prefigures the epistemic approach to composition, which Kenneth Dowd (1980) described as "the activity of making some sense out of an extremely complex set of personal perceptions and experiences of an infinitely complex world. . . . A writer (or other language-user), in a sense, composes the world in which he or she lives" (66). Maxine Hairston (1992b) also featured the epistemic nature of "writing as a way of learning" (reiterating Brooke's ideal that writing per se is critical): "Writing helps us absorb new information . . . discover new information . . . [and] promotes critical thinking" (1).

Berlin, Ohmann, and Fox would agree with the epistemic definition of writing as a way of making meaning, but they distinguish their critical position by foregrounding and historicizing the power relations at any site where meaning is made. Specifying the political forces in any rhetorical setting is a key distinction of critical literacy, separating it from other writing-to-learn proponents and epistemic rhetoricians. Critical literacy, then, is a discourse that foregrounds and questions power relations; such a discourse was called "social-epistemic rhetoric" by Berlin (1988, 1996). Foregrounding and questioning the ideologies in any setting links critical educators who may be feminists, multiculturalists, queer theorists, or neo-Marxists. These various dissident approaches expose and disconfirm dominant ideologies in the rhetorical settings that construct self in society. Because there are multiple ideologies informing dominant culture and converging in experience (for example, male supremacy, white supremacy, corporate supremacy, heterosexism), the positions or identities for contesting the status quo also need to be appropriately multiple. Critical literacy not only embraces and examines identity differences but also acknowledges that every difference will be used against us in a society where an elite minority maintains power by a divide-and-conquer strategy, among other mechanisms.

Identity, Difference, and Power: Literacy in Contact Zones

Critical literacy classes focused on difference have also been construed as "contact zones" by Mary Louise Pratt (1991): "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power . . ." (34). Pratt proposed rhetorical arts in a critical pedagogy to explore difference and resist dominant culture, including two useful alternatives to mimicking elite discourse in writing classes. These two alternatives for producing texts offer students and teachers options to assimilating uncritically into academic discourse:

Autoethnography: a text in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them. . . .

Transculturation: the processes whereby members of subordinated or marginal groups select and invent from materials transmitted by a dominant or metropolitan culture. . . . While subordinate peoples do not usually control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to varying extents what gets absorbed into their own and what it gets used for. (35, 36)

These literate practices ask students to take critical postures toward their own language uses as well as toward the discourses dominating school and society. Further, from Pratt's contact zone theory, we can extract and summarize more pedagogy that questions power relations and encourages critical literacy:

- 1. Structure the class to include "safe houses" (group caucuses within the larger class where marginalized "others" can develop autonomous positions).
- 2. Offer exercises in oral and written storytelling and in identifying with the ideas, interests, histories, and attitudes of "others."
- 3. Give special attention to the rhetorical techniques of parody, comparison, and critique so as to strengthen students' abilities to resist their immersion in the literate products of the dominant culture.
- 4. Explore suppressed aspects of history (what Foucault referred to as "disqualified" or "unqualified" narratives relating popular resistance).
- 5. Define ground rules for communication across differences and in the midst of existing hierarchies of authority.
- 6. Do systematic studies of cultural mediation, or how cultural material is produced, distributed, received, and used.

Finally, Pratt enumerated other "critical arts" of the contact zone that could encourage a rhetoric of resistance: doing imaginary dialogues to develop student identity to create diverse subjectivities in history, writing in multiple dialects

and idioms to avoid privileging one dominant form, and addressing diverse audiences with discourses of resistance to invite students to imagine themselves speaking to empowered and disempowered groups both. Pratt's contact zone approach has been extensively developed for writing classes by Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg (1996). In general, contact zone theory has a friendly fit with the critical literacy I defined elsewhere as

Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse. (1992b, 129)

My definition is also consistent with Aronowitz and Giroux's (1985) notion that

critical literacy would make clear the connection between knowledge and power. It would present knowledge as a social construction linked to norms and values, and it would demonstrate modes of critique that illuminate how, in some cases, knowledge serves very specific economic, political, and social interests. Moreover, critical literacy would function as a theoretical tool to help students and others develop a critical relationship to their own knowledge. (132)

With this kind of literacy, students "learn how to read the world and their lives critically and relatedly . . . and, most important, it points to forms of social action and collective struggle" (132). This activist agenda was also central to Joe Kretovics' (1985) definition:

Critical literacy . . . points to providing students not merely with functional skills, but with the conceptual tools necessary to critique and engage society along with its inequalities and injustices. Furthermore, critical literacy can stress the need for students to develop a collective vision of what it might be like to live in the best of all societies and how such a vision might be made practical. (51)

Critical Literacy and Visions for Change

Envisioning and realizing change were key goals of Freire's literacy teams in Brazil before they were destroyed by the military coup of April 1964.

From the beginning, we rejected . . . a purely mechanistic literacy program and considered the problem of teaching adults how to read in relation to the awakening of their consciousness. . . . We wanted a literacy program which would be an introduction to the democratization of culture, a program with human beings as its subjects rather than as patient recipients, a program which itself would be an act of creation, capable of releasing other creative acts, one

in which students would develop the impatience and vivacity which characterize search and invention. (Freire 1973, 43)

Freire's method included trisyllabic exercises for decoding and encoding. Even though this project had explicit political intentions, Freire's culture circles deployed a practical pedagogy focused on writing, reading, and dialogue, not on didactic lectures. Freire thus developed pragmatic "agencies for doing," to use Dewey's phrase. The students' literacy skills emerged through concrete exercises on generative themes displayed in drawings, or "codifications," from their lives (Dewey's vital subject matter as the context for developing language abilities).

Freire's much-read reports of dialogic pedagogy for illiterate Brazilian peasants and workers offer an instructive comparison to the inspiring literacy narrative of Mike Rose (1990), who chronicled his life and work among basic writers at UCLA and elsewhere. Rose, based at a high-profile campus dominated by academic discourse, developed and taught a rhetorical form of critical literacy: "framing an argument or taking someone else's argument apart, systematically inspecting a document, an issue, or an event, synthesizing different points of view, applying theory to disparate phenomena . . . comparing, synthesizing, analyzing . . . summarizing, classifying . . ." (188, 194, 138). Rose's definition of critical literacy echoes Mina Shaughnessy's (1977) earlier force for teaching rhetorical habits to basic writers. By naming these literate habits and by asking students to learn them through complex cases drawn from across the curriculum, Rose responded to the academic needs of basic writers at UCLA. In Freire's case, even before he became secretary of education for the city of Sao Paulo in 1989 and responsible for an impoverished school system of about seven hundred thousand students, he too proposed that standard forms be taught to nonelite Brazilian students in the context of democratizing schools and integrating the themes of their lives:

Finally, teachers have to say to students, Look, in spite of being beautiful, this way you speak also includes the question of *power*. Because of the political problem of power, you need to learn how to command the dominant language, in order for you to survive in the struggle to transform society. (Shor and Freire 1987, 73)

Freire reiterated this point a few years later in *Pedagogy of the City* (1993): The need to master the dominant language is not only to survive but also to fight for the transformation of an unjust and cruel society where the subordinate groups are rejected, insulted, and humiliated" (135). In the United States, the argument for teaching standard usage to black youth has been taken up strenuously by Lisa Delpit, who also produced a special anthology defending *Ebonics* in the classroom (*The Real Ebonics Debate*, with coeditor Theresa Terry), which includes an essay by Geneva Smitherman, the longtime proponent for using African American English in writing and teaching. A bidialectal

or contrastive rhetoric approach is being suggested here, for honoring and using the students' community language while also studying Standard English. However, for Freire, standard usage, rhetorical forms, and academic discourse make democratic sense only when taught in a critical curriculum explicitly posing problems about experience and power. In such a program, clearly against inequality, many tools and resources can be useful, including standard usage, bidialectalism, bilingualism, contrastive translations of texts from community language into academic discourse, and so on. In a critical program, the teaching of standard form is thus embedded in a thematic curriculum oriented toward social questioning for democratic development. By themselves, taught in a curriculum that emphasizes isolated skills and rhetorical forms, academic discourse and Standard English are certainly not democratic roads to critical consciousness or oppositional politics, as Pat Bizzell (1992) recognized after her long attempt to connect the teaching of formal technique with the development of social critique.

Another oppositional approach merging technique and critique is Gerald Graff's (1992) "teach the conflicts" method, which has been developed thoughtfully for writing classes by Don Lazere (see Chapter 16 in this book). Lazere provides rhetorical frameworks to students for analyzing ideologies in competing texts and media sources. The specific rhetorical techniques serve social critique here, insofar as the curriculum invites students to develop ideological sophistication in a society that mystifies politics, a society in fact where "politics" has become a repulsive "devil-word." Lazere uses problem posing at the level of topical and academic themes (social issues chosen by the teacher and subject matters taken from expert bodies of knowledge and then posed to students as questions) rather than generative themes (materials taken from student experience and language). (See Shor 1992b, 2-5, 46-48, 73-84.) My Deweyan and Freirean preference is to situate critical literacy in student discourse and perceptions as the starting points, but the "teach the conflicts" method of Graff and Lazere is indeed a critical approach worthy of study, especially because it teaches us a way to pose academic subject matters as complex problems, questions, and exercises rather than to merely lecture them to students.

Merging the study of formal technique with social critique is not simple, as the following chapters show, but this project is no more and no less "political" than any other kind of literacy program. The claim of critical literacy is that no pedagogy is neutral, no learning process is value-free, no curriculum avoids ideology and power relations. To teach is to encourage human beings to develop in one direction or another. In fostering student development, every teacher chooses some subject matters, some ways of knowing, and some ways of speaking and relating instead of others. These choices orient students to map the world and their proper place in society. Burke (1966) put it like this: "I take it for granted that any selection of terms used for explanatory purposes is, in effect, a 'point of view'" (vii).

Every educator, then, orients students toward certain values, actions, and language with implications for the kind of society and people these behaviors will produce. This inevitable involvement of education with values was called "stance" by Jerome Bruner (1986):

the medium of exchange in which education is conducted—language—can never be neutral. . . . [I]t imposes a point of view not only about the world to which it refers but toward the use of mind in respect of this world. Language necessarily imposes a perspective in which things are viewed and a stance toward what we view. . . . I do not for a minute believe that one can teach even mathematics or physics without transmitting a sense of stance toward nature and toward the use of the mind. . . . The idea that any *humanistic* subject can be taught without revealing one's stance toward matters of human pith and substance is, of course, nonsense. . . . [T]he language of education, if it is to be an invitation to reflection and culture creating, cannot be the so-called uncontaminated language of fact and "objectivity." (121, 128, 129)

Also denying the neutrality of language and learning, poet Adrienne Rich (1979) said of her work in the Open Admissions experiment at the City University of New York that "My daily life as a teacher confronts me with young men and women who had language and literature used against them, to keep them in their place, to mystify, to bully, to make them feel powerless" (61). Rich ended her tribute to the cultural democracy of Open Admissions by connecting the writing of words to the changing of worlds:

[L]anguage is power and . . . those who suffer from injustice most are the least able to articulate their suffering. . . . [T]he silent majority, if released into language, would not be content with a perpetuation of the conditions which have betrayed them. But this notion hangs on a special conception of what it means to be released into language: not simply learning the jargon of an elite, fitting unexceptionably into the status quo, but learning that language can be used as a means for changing reality. (67-68)

Thus, to be for critical literacy is to take a moral stand on what kind of humane society and democratic education we want. This is the ethical center of what was proposed many years ago by the patron saint of American education, John Dewey, who insisted that school and society must be based in cooperation, democratic relations, and egalitarian distribution of resources and authority. Progressive educators since Dewey, such as George Counts, Maxine Greene, and George Wood, have continued this ethical emphasis. Freire openly acknowledged his debt to Dewey and declared his search "for an education that stands for liberty and against the exploitation of the popular classes, the perpetuation of the social structures, the silence imposed on the poor—always aided by authoritarian education" (Freire 1990, 94).

The papers in this volume show some teachers' efforts to avoid fitting students quietly into the status quo. We can see in these reports attempts to invent what Dick Ohmann (1987) referred to as a "literacy-from-below" that questions the way things are and imagines alternatives, so that the word and the world may yet install a dream of social justice, bringing to life what Paulo Freire called the power not yet in power.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Gary L., and Patricia Irvine. 1993. "Informing Critical Literacy with Ethnography." In *Critical Literacy: Politics, Praxis, and the Postmodern*, edited by Colin Lankshear and Peter L. McLaren, 81-104. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1990. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Anyon, Jean. 1998. *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Applebome, Peter. 1997. "Schools See Re-emergence of 'Separate but Equal.'" *New York Times*, 8 April, A10.
- Aronowitz, Stanley, and Henry Giroux. 1985. *Education Under Siege*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin-Garvey.
- Berlin, James A. 1987. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- . 1988. "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class." *College English* 50 (5): 477-94.
- . 1996. *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Berliner, David, and Steven Biddle. 1995. *The Manufactured Crisis*. New York: Addison-Wesley/Longman.
- Bernstein, Aaron. 1996. "Is America Becoming More of a Class Society? New Data Show That, Increasingly, Workers at the Bottom Are Staying There." *Business Week*, 26 February, 86-91.
- Berthoff, Ann. 1981. *The Making of Meaning*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Bizzell, Patricia. 1992. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- . 1999. "Rhetorics of 'Color': The Example of *Bootstraps*." In *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition*, edited by Keith Gilyard. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. 1996. *Negotiating Difference*. Boston: Bedford.
- Blumenthal, Ralph. 1998. "Discord Mounts After Play Is Canceled." *New York Times*, 27 May, E1, E3.
- Boutwell, Clinton E. 1997. *Shell Game: Corporate America's Agenda for the Schools*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic.
- Bracey, Gerard. 1995. "The Right's Data-proof Ideologues." *Education Week*, 25 January, 48.
- Brandt, Deborah. 1998. "Sponsors of Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 49 (2): 165-85.
- Brodkey, Linda. 1996. *Writing Permitted in Designated Areas Only*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Brooke, Robert. 1987. "Underlife and Writing Instruction." *College Composition and Communication* 38 (2): 141-53.
- Brookfield, Stephen. 1987. *Developing Critical Thinkers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- . 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1986. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1966. *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1984. *Attitudes Toward History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Caffery, Ruth. 1998. "Welfare Miracle, or Mirage?" *New York Times*, 7 March, A29.
- Casper, Marilyn, and Michael Holtzman. 1989. *Writing as Social Action*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Chomsky, George. 1932. *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* New York: John Day.
- Crawley, Sharon. 1996. "Around 1971: Current-Traditional Rhetoric and Process Models of Composing." In *Composition in the Twenty-first Century: Crisis and Change*, edited by Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White, 64-74. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Daniels, Harvey, Steven Zemelman, and Marilyn Bikar. 1998. "Teacher Alert! Phonics Fads Sweep Nation's Schools." *Rethinking Schools* 12 (4): 3, 13.
- Davis, Lisa. 1995. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Davis, Lisa, and Theresa Perry. 1998. *The Real Ebonics Debate*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dewey, John. [1938] 1963. *Experience and Education*. Reprint, New York: Collier.
- . [1916] 1966. *Democracy and Education*. Reprint, New York: Free Press.
- . [1933] 1971a. *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. Reprint, Chicago: Regnery.
- . [1900] 1971b. *The Child and the Curriculum*. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . [1900] 1971c. *The School and Society*. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . [1909] 1975. *Moral Principles in Education*. Reprint, Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Donoherty, Kevin J. 1994. *The Contradictory College: The Conflicts, Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community Colleges*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Dowst, Kenneth. 1980. "The Epistemic Approach: Writing, Knowing and Learning." In *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*, edited by Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland, 65–85. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Elbow, Peter. 1991. "Reflections on Academic Discourse: How It Relates to Freshmen and Colleagues." *College English* 53 (1): 135–55.
- Faigley, Lester. 1997. "Literacy After the Revolution." *College Composition and Communication* 48 (1): 30–43.
- Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Anchor.
- Fine, Michelle. 1987. "Silencing in Public Schools." *Language Arts* 64 (February): 157–64.
- . 1993. *Framing Dropouts*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Flower, Linda. 1998. *Problem-solving Strategies for Writing in College and Community*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge*, edited by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon.
- Fox, Tom. 1993. "Standards and Access." *Journal of Basic Writing* 12 (1): 37–45.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- . 1973. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Seabury.
- . 1978. *Pedagogy-in-Process*. New York: Continuum.
- . 1985a. *The Politics of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- . 1985b. "Reading the World and Reading the Word: An Interview with Paulo Freire." By David Dillon. *Language Arts* 62 (January): 15–21.
- . 1990. Interview by Murray Cox. *Omni* 12 (April): 74–94.
- . 1993. *Pedagogy of the City*. New York: Continuum.
- . 1996. *Letters to Cristina*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, Paulo, and Antonio Faundez. 1989. *Learning to Question*. New York: Continuum.
- Galbraith, John K. 1967. *The New Industrial State*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Goodlad, John. 1984. *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gordon, Linda. 1994. "How 'Welfare' Became a Dirty Word." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20 July, B1–B2.
- Gose, Ben. 1998. "Minority Enrollment Rose by 3.2% in 1996." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 June, A32–A41.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1995. "Ghosts of Bell Curves Past." *Natural History*, February, 12–19.
- Graff, Gerald. 1992. *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton.
- Graff, Harvey J. 1987. *The Labyrinths of Literacy*. London: Falmer.
- Greene, Maxine. 1988. *The Dialectic of Freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hairston, Maxine. 1992a. "Diversity, Ideology, and Teaching Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 43 (2): 179–193. See also "Counterstatement" (1993) by John Trimbur, Robert G. Wood, Ron Strickland, William H. Thelin, William J. Rouster, Toni Mester, and Hairston's "Reply" in *CCC* 44 (2): 248–56.
- . 1992b. *Successful Writing*. 3d edition. New York: Norton.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. 1983. *Ways with Words*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Henwood, Doug. 1997. "Trashonomics." In *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, edited by Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, 177–97. New York: Routledge.
- Hernstein, Richard, and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve*. New York: Free Press.
- Hershey, Robert D. Jr. 1996. "In Turnabout for Workers, Wages Grow More Slowly." *New York Times*, 30 October, D1.
- Hill, Heather C. 1997. "The Importance of a Minority Perspective in the Classroom." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7 November, A60.
- Hirsch, E. D. 1987. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- . 1989. *A First Dictionary of Cultural Literacy: What Our Children Need to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hirsch, E. D., Joseph F. Kett, and James Trefil. 1988. *The Dictionary of Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Holmes, Steven A. 1996. "Income Disparity Between Poorest and Richest Rises." *New York Times*, 20 June, A1.
- Horton, Myles, and Paulo Freire. 1990. *We Make the Road by Walking*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Horton, Myles, with Judith Kohl and Herb Kohl. 1990. *The Long Haul*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hopfl, Zoe. 1998. "'The Eye of the Storm' at New Paltz." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 May, A10.
- Jacks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephen Michelson. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic.
- Jarbel, Jerome, and Steven Brint. 1989. *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Joy, Stan. 1997/1998. "Banned in Jersey, Welcomed on Broadway." *Rethinking Schools* 12 (2): 14–15.
- Kachula, C. H., and Lil Brannon. 1984. *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Korol, Jonathan. 1991. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York: Crown.
- Kravits, Joseph R. 1985. "Critical Literacy: Challenging the Assumptions of Mainstream Educational Theory." *Journal of Education* 167 (2): 50–62.
- Lane, Donald. 1992. "Teaching the Rhetorical Conflicts." *College Composition and Communication* 43 (2): 194–213.

- Lieberman, Trudy. 1998. "Hunger in America." *The Nation*, 30 March, 11-16.
- Lindemann, Erika. 1995. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mayher, John. 1990. *Uncommon Sense: Theoretical Practice in Language Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Mayo, Peter. 1994. "Synthesizing Gramsci and Freire: Possibilities for a Theory of Radical Adult Education." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 13 (2): 125-48.
- Mickelson, Roslyn Arlyn, and Stephen Samuel Smith. 1998. "Can Education Eliminate Race, Class, and Gender Inequality?" In *Race, Class and Gender*, 3d edition, edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins, 328-40. New York: Wadsworth.
- Moody, Kim. 1998. "On the Line in Flint." *The Nation*, 13 July, 6.
- Morris, Bonnie J. 1998. "Women's Studies: Prejudice and Vilification Persist." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 19 June, A56.
- Mortenson, Thomas G. 1995. "Post-secondary Education Opportunity: The Mortenson Report on Public Policy Analysis of Opportunity for Post-secondary Education." Mortenson Research Letter, November, Iowa City.
- Nieves, Evelyn. 1997. "Pupils' Script on Workers Is Ruled Out." *New York Times*, 26 June, B1.
- Ohmann, Richard. [1976] 1996. *English in America*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- . 1987. *Politics of Letters*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Orfield, Gary. 1993. "The Growth of Segregation in American Schools: Changing Patterns of Separation and Poverty Since 1968." Report of the Harvard Project on School Desegregation to the National School Boards Association, Washington, DC.
- Orfield, Gary, and Susan Easton. 1996. *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. New York: The New Press.
- Orfield, Gary, et al. 1997. "Deepening Segregation in American Public Schools." Civil Rights Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Peck, Wayne Campbell, Linda Flower, and Lorraine Higgins. 1995. "Community Literacy." *College Composition and Communication* 46 (2): 199-222.
- Perez-Pena, Richard. 1997. "Study Shows New York Has the Greatest Income Gap." *New York Times*, 12 December, A1.
- Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. 1988. *Composition as a Human Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1991. "Arts of the Contact Zone." In *Profession 1991*, 33-40. New York: MLA.
- "Quality Counts—1998: The Urban Challenge—Public Education in the 40 States." 1998. *Education Week*, 8 January.
- Ravitch, Diane. 1974. *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973*. New York: Basic.
- . 1983. *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980*. New York: Basic.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1979. *On Lies, Secrets, and Silences*. New York: Norton.
- Rose, Mike. 1990. *Lives on the Boundary*. New York: Penguin.
- Rouse, John. 1979. "The Politics of Composition." *College English* 41 (1): 1-12.
- Russell, David R. 1995. "Activity Theory and Writing Instruction." In *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*, edited by Joseph Petraglia, 51-77. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sandman, Jessica L. 1998. "California Colleges Going All Out to Woo Minority Students." *Education Week*, 29 April, 6.
- Sarasohn, David. 1997. "Hunger on Main St." *The Nation*, 8 December, 13-18.
- Schneider, Alison. 1998a. "Bad Blood in the English Department: The Rift Between Composition and Literature." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 13 February, 14-15.
- . 1998b. "More Professors Are Working Part-time, and More Teach at Two-year Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 13 March, A14-A15.
- Scott, James. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shughnessy, Mina. 1977. *Errors and Expectations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shepard, Scott. 1998. "In Civil Rights Shift, EEOC Helps White People Most." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 4 March, A13.
- Shor, Ira. 1992a. *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration, 1969-1991*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1992b. *Empowering Education: Critical Teaching for Social Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996. *When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1997. "Our Apartheid: Writing Instruction and Inequality." *Journal of Basic Writing* 16 (1): 91-104.
- Shor, Ira, and Paulo Freire. 1987. *A Pedagogy for Liberation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Shor, Holly, and Chuck Collins. 1997. "Forbes 400 World Series." *The Nation*, 20 October, 5-6.
- Smith, Tim. 1998. "GE '97 Profit Hits a Record \$8.2 Billion." *Washington Post*, 23 January, G3.
- Spence, Neil. 1998. "Girl Power Is Squelched." *New York Times*, 27 May, E3.
- . Brian. 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stankel, Kenneth R. 1998. "The Lecture: A Powerful Tool for Intellectual Liberation." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26 June, A52.
- Technology Counts." 1997. *Education Week*, 10 November, 8, 10.
- "The Educational Progress of Black Students." 1995. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.