States and in Western democratic capitalist societies. Such transformative intellectual work is being replaced by an instrumentalist orientation to politics and social issues. Many social activists have become increasingly impatient with speculative reason. No doubt these groups may attempt to mobilize their constituents to protest and resist policies established by dominant power blocs and advance proposals to solve current problems caused by the state and corporate leaders and visited upon communities and workplaces. But most rarely engage in reflective thought about the various lifeworlds they inhabit or about their own social practice. As a result the often heroic and self-sacrificing work of political organizers in various sectors tends to follow what C. Wright Mills once called the "main drift" in which public activity is severely circumscribed and forced into channels that Michael Harrington once described, approvingly, as "the left wing of the possible."

In this context, Aronowitz describes his critical pedagogy as necessarily utopian because "I urge my students to place themselves in the right-wing of the impossible." It is right wing, he says, because he believes that knowledge should have a practical intent, that is, directed to changing the conditions of everyday life and addressing the problem of power even if its uses are deferred to an indefinite future. In this work, Aronowitz found a kindred spirit in Paulo Freire—whom he knew and worked with on a personal basis. In his writings Aronowitz insists that Freire's "pedagogy" was not primarily a "method" of teaching but a radical democratic philosophy of education. It was radical because it sought to enable the excluded, not only in economic terms but also in political and social terms, to take control over their own lives.

Freire, Aronowitz maintains, elaborated on Marx's reminder that representative government is heteronomous and that classes/social movements form when people refuse to be represented by others and insist on their autonomy and their sovereignty. Influenced by Freire's educational philosophy, Aronowitz reminds his readers and students that Freire's critical pedagogy is deeply shaped by Marxism, by phenomenology, and by psychoanalytic theory. Freire constantly reminded the multitude of his acolytes and admirers, Aronowitz points out, that education was an activity that entailed, among other things, the critical appropriation of the best social thought. Such entailment connotes a necessary dimension that, sadly, has been occluded as his ideas have migrated

from revolutionary situations to the corroded environments of the leading Western countries.

Exercising his profound insight about the development and use of critical pedagogy, Aronowitz insists that in the twenty-first century we live in a period when the need for new concepts has never been more urgent. The rush of contemporary events has challenged the old formulae of socialist revolution, the primacy of the industrial working class, and the certainties of Marxism and anarchism. At the same time, he continues, we are witnesses to a torrent of right-wing **pronunciamentos of "endings"** combined with smug statements from our state intellectuals that this America is "the best of all possible worlds." In this new world of the twenty-first century, Aronowitz issues a challenge to those of us who believe that world can and should be transformed. We have an obligation, he tells us, to revisit the doctrinal verities inherited from the past and to abandon those ideas that no longer advance an understanding of the present and future. Thus, the significance of critical pedagogy for Aronowitz resides, in the first place, in its blunt declaration that education is a political practice. This political practice involves, among other things, the act of assisting the oppressed and exploited from every social stratum to articulate—linguistically as well as politically—their own demands and create their own forms of social and political organization, and of course, to render their own critique of their lifeworlds and of the larger social forces shaping them (Aronowitz, 1973, 1981, 1988, 1992, 1993, 2001; Aronowitz and DiFazio, 1994).

pronunciamentos of "endings" referring to the notion that history, ideology, and political evolution have ended because liberal democratic capitalists states have produced a social order that can never be improved.

Henry Giroux

It is with Giroux's work in the late 1970s and 1980s that the concept of critical pedagogy as we know it today takes shape. Bringing together Freire's work, the cultural capital of Pierre Bourdieu, the radical democratic work of Aronowitz, and the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, Giroux establishes critical pedagogy as a domain of study and praxis. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, radical educational scholarship had fallen victim to a reductionistic determinism that maintained that schools were hopelessly subordinate to the dictates of social, political, and economic power. While correcting liberal educational analysts who simplistically celebrated the democratic functions of schooling,

Giroux chastised the radicals for reducing schooling to its oppressive functions in a capitalist society. Giroux sought an avenue out of determinism by illustrating how schooling can be a force for both domination and emancipation. In the spirit of a democratic pedagogy, Giroux searches for those instances in classroom, when conscientization is possible. Thus, the critical pedagogy Giroux establishes is a discourse of educational possibility.

No romantic, Giroux has a hard-boiled sense of possibility that always takes place within an understanding of a logic of domination that in the late twentieth century was deployed into every social sphere, no matter how private. It is in this context that the work of Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, and Herbert Marcuse became so important to Giroux's delineation of critical pedagogy. Critical theory provided Giroux in the early 1980s with a mode of critique that reshaped and extended the notion of the political. The political domain in the critical theoretical tradition moves into both everyday social relations and the realm of consciousness and psyche. This move was necessary for critical educators to make sense of the way power was beginning to operate in popular culture via the register of affect and emotion. Indeed, this understanding changed the topography of critical scholarship well into the twenty-first century.

Giroux's passion revolves around the struggle for a critical democracy both in the United States and the world at large. This critical or radical democracy, as he employs the term, involves the effort to expand the possibility for social justice, freedom, and egalitarian social relations in the educational, economic, political, and cultural domains. Thus, Giroux's critical pedagogy deploys both critique and possibility in the struggle to expose the forces that undermine education for a critical democracy. In the age of Ronald Reagan, Giroux's introduction of Frankfurt School critical theory into educational scholarship struck a responsive chord with those offended by the right-wing use of schooling and other social institutions to reeducate Americans. This reeducation project involved countering the liberation movements that emerged from the anticolonial rebellions in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Adeptly using critical theory to expose the right wing's use of education in this larger project, Giroux in the early 1980s exposed modes of domination tacitly operating in educational spaces both in and out of school.

culture of postivism
Positivism asserts that natural science constitutes all legitimate human knowledge. In this context, the culture of positivism refers to a "way of seeing" dominance in American culture that employs positivist science as a means of social regulation. Education in this culture becomes a tool of dominant power that operates to peressure the status quo.

Giroux understood that somewhere in the relationship among power, ideology, and schooling the crisis of historical consciousness was intensified. With the help of the work of Horkheimer and Adorno, Giroux described a **culture of positivism**—an irrational rationality marked by an emphasis on prediction and technical control. When combined with the rejection of the interpretive dynamics of hermeneutics, this culture of positivism mutated into a dominant ideological form of oppression. Only one way existed to interpret the meaning of a text or to present information to students—and that one way was the perspective of dominant forms of power. In this culture of positivism, schooling emerges as a form of social regulation that moves individuals toward destinies that preserve the world as it now is. Reflection on how identity is shaped by power or analysis of "what is" via "what should be" is subverted by positivistic culture. The development of consciousness of historical forces and their relationship to the classroom and everyday life in general has no place in the technocratic rationality of the culture of positivism.

In this same period Giroux's theoretical infrastructure was taking shape. Throughout the 1980s, as his familiarity with the emerging postdiscourses deepened, Giroux fine-tuned his insights concerning the ways individuals deal with power and the relationship of these dynamics to the production of subjectivity. His early fascination with British cultural studies—especially the work of Raymond Williams, Richard Johnson, and Stuart Hall—led Giroux to connect his study of subjectivity, power, and pedagogy to issues of language, discourse, and desire. He made use of the best of twentieth-century educational scholarship—including the progressivism of John Dewey, the transgressive pedagogy of Paulo Freire, and the insights of William Pinar and the curriculum reconceptualists—to transcend the notion that power is merely the distribution of political and economic resources. Employing and extending this battery of theoretical sensibilities, Giroux conceptualized power as a concrete set of practices that produces social mechanisms through which distinct experiences and personal identities are shaped.

By the end of the 1980s, Giroux was working with cultural studies scholars in the effort to legitimize popular culture as an academic concern. As a primary producer of pleasure, popular culture is a powerful pedagogical agent for representing the world

in ways that both disempower and empower. Frankfurt School critics had long maintained that culture is a political entity. Operating on this assumption, Giroux set out to bring cultural studies insight into the analysis of popular culture as a pedagogical locale. Refusing to merely mimic cultural studies' emphasis on the popular, Giroux refocused cultural studies around his long-time concern with radical democracy. He thereby moved to the center stage of cultural studies, as his innovative work within the field raised larger questions of justice, liberty, and equality.

Using the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary tools of cultural studies to translate theory into democratic practice, Giroux expanded the intellectual envelope in his search for new modes of academic enterprise. In this way, his work in the 1990s and first decade of the twenty-first century has provided new understandings of the pedagogical process, new insight into pleasure, new maps of desire, and fresh interpretations of the relation among reason, emotion, and domination. Ironically, Giroux helped return cultural studies to its pedagogical roots—as exemplified by Raymond Williams's studies of adult education and the roles of democracy and social change in the academic process. No understanding of critical pedagogy is complete without insight into the seminal role of Henry Giroux (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1991; Giroux, 1981, 1983, 1988, 1992; Giroux and McLaren, 1989; Giroux and Simon, 1989).

Michael Apple

The inequity of American society has always been a dominating concern in the life of Michael Apple. From the time he worked as a volunteer in literacy programs for southern African American children whose public schools had been closed to avoid the possibility of court-ordered integration to his multifaceted work in the twenty-first century, Apple has been convinced of the need to study the effects of power and inequality in education. Schools, Apple has consistently contended, cannot be separated from political and economic life. Indeed, he argues that the entire process of education is political in

- the way it is funded
- its goals and objectives
- the manner in which these goals and objectives are evaluated

- the nature of the textbooks
- who attends and who doesn't
- who has the power to make these and other decisions.

Because of this political dimension, Apple contends that schools will always be positioned in political struggles concerning the meaning of democracy, whose culture is legitimate, and who should benefit from governmental actions. With these concerns at the forefront of his work, Apple has made central contributions to critical scholarship in curriculum studies and teaching as well as in educational theory and policy.

In his work in curriculum and teaching in the 1980s, Apple studied education as a process of labor. In this context he analyzed the ways that particular right-wing reforms operated to deskill teachers, removing the need for professional decision making and diagnostic expertise in technicist forms of rationalized practice. In this pedagogical context Apple studied curricular forms of knowledge and their relationship to larger political, economic, social, and cultural dynamics. How did school forms of knowledge reflect power in these domains, he asked. How does curricular knowledge get validated in the commerce of everyday life in capitalist societies? What is the role that such knowledge plays in maintaining extant social, economic, political, and cultural arrangements? After rigorous study of these and other questions, Apple contends that education in the United States works not only to benefit the privileged socioeconomic classes but also to extend gender hierarchies and the privilege of diverse groups already in power. Teachers' attempts to address this inequity are mitigated, he posits, by external modes of control of pedagogies and materials by external regulatory agents.

Operating in a context marked by a conservative resurgence in Western societies, Apple has worked tirelessly to provide his students and his readers with an understanding of the political right. The moving force behind so-called neoconservative and neoliberal educational policy is not so new at all. Instead, Apple contends, it evolves from an age-old conservative belief in the value of social hierarchy. Conservatives, whether in neoconservative or neoliberal suits, believe we live in a meritocratic society that appropriately rewards educational excellence and economic ingenuity. Those who do poorly in schools and in their economic life simply do not have "the right stuff" and have nobody to blame

but themselves. Thus, in this right-wing articulation, inequality is fair. According to Apple, conservatives have been overwhelmingly successful over the last twenty-five years in promoting this perspective in the educational conversation. Their success, he argues, can be best understood as a "conservative restoration."

This conservative restoration has been made possible by a coalition of market economists, old humanists calling for a reassertion of the Euro-canon in the curriculum, and neoconservative intellectuals. A central feature of the restoration in education involves an attack on democratic schooling in the framework of a larger free-market privatization project. What is sobering about the restoration, Apple argues, is that it is the most powerful and successful political reeducation movement of the last century of American life. In this context, in the twenty-first century right-wing elites now possess the hegemonic ability to establish once and for all what constitutes official knowledge via their political economic power. Corporations now firmly control both the media and the production of school textbooks. In this control they have established a knowledge industry that emphasizes the traditional family, free-market economic policy, a narrow view of patriotism, Christianity, and a business needs-driven school curriculum.

In light of the theoretical dimensions of critical pedagogy, Apple has promoted these perspectives, maintaining along the way that educational theorists should never "academize the political." Theory, he contends, should never become an academic pursuit of its own. There are positive dimensions to theorizing, Apple asserts: "We absolutely need to constantly interrogate our accepted perspectives," he writes. But Apple grows impatient with such theorizing when it is not explicitly connected to the most central political, economic, and cultural issues of the day. In this context, he warns, we should never theorize from on high, above the fray of everyday educational experiences and human suffering. The linguistic turn of the theoretical postdiscourses, he concludes, may have empowered us to view the world as a text. This, however, does not imply that we should ever lose sight of the gritty dimensions of life and the human pain that inevitably accompanies them (Apple, 1979, 1982, 1988, 1999; Apple and Weis, 1983; Carlson and Apple, 1998).

bell hooks

Born in rural Kentucky, bell hooks as a child was aware of the degradation and devaluation of black women. Racist and sexist stereotypes, she maintains, continue to play a significant role in constructing the identity and behavior of African American women in the United States. With these understandings embedded in her consciousness, hooks as a young woman began to examine the racial dynamics of the women's movement. Arguing that no common bond among all women existed, hooks took the women's movement of the 1970s to task for ignoring the role of racism in the oppression of women. Because the white and often upper-middle-class orientation of the early feminist movement had turned off many women of color, hooks worked with a number of other black women to help refocus white feminist attention. In this context, hooks and other women of color moved many feminists toward an effort to challenge an entire system of domination. The problem for many women, she wrote, is not simply male gender prejudice but their placement in a larger oppressive system. In theoretical terms hooks maintained that feminism must be more than a call for equal rights for women. In the contemporary context it must be able to identify and eradicate the ideology of domination that expresses itself along the axes of race, class, sexuality, colonialism, and gender.

hooks's theoretical concerns have made a profound impact on the development of critical pedagogy. Her own pedagogy, she contends, is informed by anticolonial, critical, and feminist theories. There is no way one can or should separate feminist theoretical notions of pedagogy from Freirean theory and pedagogy. Weaving feminism and Freirean thought together, hooks is unsure where one stops and the other begins. Freire, hooks contends, was far more concerned with the plight and the needs of the disenfranchised than were many of the white bourgeois feminists I encountered. This once again illustrates the idea that one's actions in pursuit of resistance to oppression are more important than one's race, class, or gender—one's positionality. In an era in which we see a regeneration of white supremacy, a growing apartheid that separates white people from people of color, the well-to-do from the have-nots, and men from women, hooks's admonitions strike a resonating chord. Advocates of

critical pedagogy cannot call for justice in one domain and remain oppressors in another.

With these notions in mind, hooks encourages educators to appreciate the narrow boundaries that shape the way knowledge is produced and transmitted in the classroom. Such processes reflect the ideology of domination that has undermined American claims to democracy for centuries. Students, she posits, are more than ready to break through these ideological barriers to knowing. They are excited by the possibility of relearning the world and exposing the ideological filters that perverted their studies the first time around. In this context hooks calls for teachers to teach in a manner that works to transform consciousness and creates an atmosphere of open expression that is the mark of an emancipatory education. Such an exciting pedagogy can emerge only when teachers and educational leaders develop loyalties that transcend their race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, religion, and nation. In such a context teachers develop a global perspective that allows one to see self as others see it. Such a perspective encourages teachers to criticize one's ethnicity, class, religion, or nation when it is complicit with oppression. In the twenty-first century, hooks's perspectives become more important than ever (hooks, 1981, 1984, 1989, 1991, 1994).

Donaldo Macedo

Donaldo Macedo has been a central figure in critical pedagogy over the last twenty years. His work with Paulo Freire broke new theoretical ground in its attempt to develop a critical understanding of the ways in which language, power, and culture contribute to the positioning and formation of human experience and learning. He is known as Freire's chief translator and interpreter in English. Macedo's published dialogues with Paulo Freire are considered classic work for their elucidation not only of Freire's own theories of literacy but also for the way in which they have added a more critical and theoretically advanced dimension to the study of literacy and critical pedagogy. His coauthored book with Paulo Freire, *Literacy: Reading the World and the Word,* is central to critical literacy in that it redefines the very nature and terrain of literacy and critical pedagogy.

In addition to his seminal work with Freire, Macedo has played a central role in constructing a literacy of power for use

in critical pedagogy. Contrary to popular belief and dominant ideology, schools do not always serve the best interests of their students. Schools as well as the cultural pedagogies of media and other social institutions too often perpetuate ignorance or, as Macedo puts it, stupidification. As schools and other institutions fragment knowledge and deny contextual understanding, students find their ability to make connections between school information, their lived worlds, and relations of power and privilege more and more difficult. Macedo's work directly challenges the educational experts who seek to keep issues of power and social struggle outside the purview of education. As Macedo argues, questions of power vis-à-vis socioeconomic class relations, gender dynamics, and racial discrimination are suppressed by many mainstream political and educational leaders. What does class analysis have to do with education, hegemonic educators ask, when we live in a classless society? Such positions, Macedo asserts, conveniently ignore questions of ethics. As long as such questions are suppressed and a literacy of power is ignored, schools will remain tools of the status quo.

emancipatory literacy involves revealing the ways dominant power operates in a manner that allows an individual and groups to act in resistence to its efforts to oppress them.

Macedo ties this literacy of power directly to what he describes as an emancipatory literacy. An **emancipatory literacy**, Macedo posits, involves students becoming knowledgeable about their histories, experiences, and the culture of their everyday environments. In addition, they also must be able to discern the dominant culture's codes and signifiers in order to escape their own environments. In an educational context shaped by an emancipatory literacy, therefore, teachers must constantly teach a dual curriculum. A language of possibility, Macedo argues, permeates this two-tier curriculum that both empowers students to make sense of their everyday life and gain the tools for mobility valued in the dominant culture. In this context, Macedo writes that students celebrate who they are while learning to deal with ways of seeing and being that are not their own. In this way students from marginalized backgrounds can make their own history (Freire and Macedo, 1987; Macedo, 1994; Macedo and Bartolome, 2001).

Peter McLaren

Beginning his career in education as an elementary school teacher in Toronto, McLaren achieved notoriety with the 1980