Introduction — Critical Pedagogy: Revitalizing and Democratizing Teacher Education

By Pepi Leistyna, Magaly Lavandez, & Thomas Nelson

Pepi Leistyna is an assistant professor in Applied Linguistics Graduate Studies at the University of Massachusetts, Boston; Magaly Lavadenz is a professor in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, California; and Thomas Nelson is a professor in the Benerd School of Education at the University of Pacific, Stockton, California. Nelson is editor of Teacher Education Quarterly and Leistyna and Lavadenz joined him as co-guest editors of this issue of the journal.

> The unveiling of reality falls within the space for possible change in which progressive and politically clear educators must operate. I believe that this space for change, however small, is always available.
>
> —Paulo Friere

Since President George W. Bush signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001, better known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), high-stakes testing has been officially embraced and positioned to be the panacea of academic underachievement in public schools in the United States. The Act engenders a hitherto unheard of transfer of power to federal and state governments, granting them the rights to largely determine the goals and outcomes of these educational institutions. It is ironic, to say the least, that this social movement has emanated from a political party that in the not so distant past called for dismantling the federal Department of

Education altogether. As a direct result of this new conservative agenda, school administrators, teachers, communities, and parents are stripped of any substantive decision-making power in the nation's public schools.

Under pressure to produce results on these standardized tests, or face the consequences of cuts in federal resources and funding, school closure, and in some cases law suits, many school administrators have been forced to drastically narrow their curriculum and cut back on anything and everything that is perceived as not contributing to raising test scores. In many cases, this includes the elimination of "two-way bilingual education programs, critical thinking, reading for enjoyment, cross-disciplinary studies, art, music, citizenship and community service programs, physical and health education, and last, but not least, multicultural curricula" (Berlak, 2003, pp. 7-8). Within this 'one size fits all' standards approach to schooling, the multifarious voices and needs of culturally diverse, low-income, racially subordinated, and linguistic-minority students are simply ignored or discarded.

Embracing what is in fact an old neoliberal approach dressed up as innovative reform, proponents of this market-driven educational model make use of words and phrases like equity, efficiency, and the enhancement of global competitiveness, to continue to sell to the public its agenda. However, this same political machinery — this synergy between government and the corporate sector — shrouds, in the name of 'choice', conservative efforts to privatize public schools. Devoted advocates of current legislation also effectively disguise the motivations of a profit-driven testing industry led by publishing power houses like McGraw-Hill, which is the largest producer of standardized tests in the country. In the end, corporate elites of the likes of Harold McGraw III, CEO of McGraw-Hill, who was appointed by President Bush to the Transition Advisory Committee on Trade, will be the only ones to gain from this national obsession with standardized assessment. Speaking at the Whitehouse, as part of a group of 'education leaders' invited by George W. Bush on his first day in office, McGraw III stated:

> It's a great day for education, because we now have substantial alignment among all the key constituents — the public, the education community, business and political leaders — that results matter. (as cited in Metcalf, 2002, p. 2)

The results that matter are that corporations like McGraw-Hill gain financially both by selling their materials on a grand scale, and by the ways that schools will now guarantee the production of a low and semi-skilled labor force that is in high demand in our now post-industrial service-oriented economy; especially since millions of more lucrative industrial and white collar jobs are being exported by U.S. corporations to nations that pay below a living wage and that ensure that workers have no protection under labor unions and laws that regulate corporate interests and power.

A key characteristic of the new "highly qualified teacher", according to NCLB, is their ability to pass a subject matter test administered by the state (U.S. Department

of Education, 2003). Reducing teacher expertise to a fixed body of content knowledge, middle and high school teachers are expected to meet an extremely narrow range of skill requirements under the new policy. Any concern with pedagogy — not what we learn, but how we learn it — has virtually disappeared.

As a direct consequence of this political climate, public schools are being inundated with prepackaged and teacher-proof curricula, standardized tests, and accountability schemes. But these educational practices are nothing new and in fact many of them have proven in the past to be unsuccessful. For example, research (Amrein & Berliner, 2002) has shown that in 28 states where high-stakes testing programs have been implemented, there have been no significant, systemic improvements in achievement. Nonetheless, the nation moves forward with the Bush plan.

Many Republicans, and Democrats alike, also embrace the national movement towards draconian English-only language and literacy policies and practices. In Massachusetts, where Ron Unz's initiative passed in a state-wide referendum, teacher education programs are scrambling to restructure their bilingual education services in order to prepare teachers to work in sanctioned, Structured English Immersion classrooms. With no defensible theory or body of research to support his claim, Unz, the spearhead of this movement, nonetheless maintains that linguistic-minority students require only one year of Structured Immersion in an English-only context in order to join native speakers in mainstream classes. However, as James Crawford (2003) notes:

> In 2002-2003, it [Ron Unz's Structured English Immersion] failed at least 1,479,420 children who remained limited in English. Only 42 percent of California students whose English was limited in 1998, when Proposition 227 passed, have since been redesignated as fluent in English — five years later! (p. 1)

With five years of watered down content, rather than intensive subject instruction in the primary language, these students will certainly be ill-prepared for high-stakes tests. In states like Massachusetts, students who do not pass the state's standardized test in high school will not graduate. Instead, they will be shown to the door and handed a Certificate of Attendance on their way out.

Conservatives insist, ad nauseam, that "scientifically-based research" inform and sustain the nation's educational practices, policies, and goals. Harold Berlak (2003) notes the term appears 111 times in the text of NCLB. However, the empirical studies that are used to buttress the Bush agenda, under close scrutiny, are easily stripped of any legitimacy. The well-funded think tanks that produce much of the research and literature to support conservative causes have an obvious, ideologically-specific take on these issues, one that is widely supported by mainstream corporate media whose ownership have similar interests (Haas, Molnar, & Serrano, 2002; McChesney & Nichols, 2002).

Perhaps the most strikingly fraudulent use of 'scientific research' is the official report signed and circulated by the Congressionally appointed National Reading

Panel, that informs Bush's Reading First literacy campaign, as it is replete with inconsistencies, methodological flaws, and blatant biases (Allington, 2002; Coles, 2003). For starters, Bush's educational advisor when he was the governor of Texas, G. Reid Lyon, headed the NRP. A staunch phonics advocate, Lyon hand selected the panel and made certain that virtually all of the participants shared his views. Curiously, there was only one reading teacher on the NRP. However, by the end of the group's investigation into effective literacy practices, she refused to sign the panel's final report, maintaining that it was a manipulation of data, and that the cohort failed to examine important research that did not corroborate its desired findings (Yatvin, 2002).

In the guise of benevolent reform, programs like Reading First feed into ultra-conservative hands by limiting federal Title 1 funds to programs and practices that are accepted by the power structure as being grounded in "scientifically-based research." This enables conservatives to push forward English-only mandates and a strictly phonics agenda. In other words, if the research that supports multilingual education and whole language instruction has been dismissed by these ideologically stacked panels as "un-scientific," then only non-bilingual and phonics-centered programs will receive federal funding. While there are over 150 studies that clearly support the effectiveness of Bilingual Education, including the government's own National Research Council Report (1997), and likewise, there is a mountain of work that attests to the limits of a rigid phonics approach to literacy development, this empirical work is rejected by those in power with a mere wave of the hand.

While the titles No Child Left Behind and English for the Children (the name of Unz's English-only movement) connote fairness, compassion, and equity, these political campaigns virtually disregard why inequities exist in the first place. If and when fingers are pointed at the causes of poverty and discrimination, these political forces readily blame progressive educational programs and democratic social policies for the country's plethora of problems: academic underachievement, high student 'drop out' rates, crime and violence, unemployment, a failing economy, and so forth.

As advocates of the corporate model of schooling hide behind positivist notions of science, objectivity, neutrality and 'universal' knowledge, what is largely missing from national debates and federal and state policies regarding public education is a recognition and analysis of the social and historical conditions within which teachers teach and learners learn; that is, how racism and other oppressive and malignant ideologies that inform actual educational practices and institutional conditions play a much more significant role in students' academic achievement than whether or not they have access to abstract content and constant evaluation.

Education does not take place in a vacuum and thus it cannot be understood outside of an analysis of the larger economically and politically generated social antagonisms, inequities, and injustices which are reflected in the classrooms and the hallways of this nation's schools. One in five children, and one in four racially subordinated children, grows up in poverty in the U.S. Seventy-five percent of all

linguistic-minority students reside in low-income, urban areas that have schools that are highly segregated and literally falling apart. So many students in public schools in the United States often face harsh racist and material conditions, incessant harassment, segregated school activities, limited classroom materials, ill-prepared teachers, poorly designed and unenforced policies, and indifferent leadership that dramatically disrupt their personal, cultural, and academic lives (Kozol, 1992, 1996; Leistyna, 2002). Nonetheless, the oppressive ideologies that inform dominant discourse in this country generally go unquestioned. In fact, conservative educators like Diane Ravitch, Lynne Cheney, and William Bennett — omnipresent spokespersons for the Republican Party — have and continue to argue that attempts to reveal the underlying values, interests, and power relationships that structure educational policies and practices have corrupted the academic environment. Such efforts to depoliticize the public's understanding of social institutions, especially schools, in the name of neutrality are obviously a reactionary ploy to maintain the status quo.

Recognizing that education is inherently political, it is precisely this lack of inquiry, analysis, and agency that a critical philosophy of learning and teaching works to reverse. The central questions that this special issue on teacher education and critical pedagogy asks and addresses are: What role could teacher education programs play in combating the conservative stranglehold on public policies, practices, and schools? and, What function could these institutional programs perform to revitalize and democratize public education and work to forge a more just, global society? The articles included in this Winter 2004 issue of Teacher Education Quarterly represent some of the best and most contemporary thinking about the impact that critical social theory could and should have on teacher education programs. The three co-editors of this special issue are honored to present among the authors some of the premier scholars on critical pedagogy.

Teacher Education with a Critical Twist: What's the Purpose?

The first section of this special issue opens with a look into the theoretical insights that critical pedagogy offers. Praxis — the ongoing relationship between theory and practice / reflection and action — is a core principle of critical education. However, unfortunately theory and theorizing are far too often neglected or dismissed in mainstream teacher education programs. Consequently, student-teachers are deskilled as they become uncritical receivers and consumers of existing theory, instead of active subjects in the generative process of understanding. This domesticating role of the academy is especially evident as nationally the university is increasingly falling victim to the kinds of corporate logic that package thought as a commodity for exchange in the marketplace rather than inspiring the kinds of inquiry that probe that very logic and use of public energy and space (Aronowitz,

2001; Giroux & Myrsiades, 2001; Reading, 1997). Within these corporate models of education, the production of technicians in teacher education programs comes at the expense of transdisciplinary thinkers and producers of social knowledge about the world. As students are diverted or lured away from critically reading historical and existing social formations, especially those that maintain abuses of power, they so often become the newest wave of exploited labor power and reproducers, whether they are conscious of it or not, of oppressive social practices.

Teacher education programs need to assist prospective teachers in developing critical languages to explain the world around and within them — the whys and how of what is happening in society. With the ever-growing trend of relying on empirical studies rather than theory in schools of education, documenting social reality has become an obsession in much of the research. However, descriptions, narratives, and numbers don't interpret themselves. Thus, we must ask ourselves: What are the ideological lenses that we use to read social reality? How can we better make sense of the social, political, economic, and institutional factors that shape our lives? How can we come to recognize and address the relationships and abuses of power that are so significant in schools and the larger society? These are some of the important questions that prospective teachers should be addressing, and it is imperative that educators offer activities that help students, whether they're in pre-service programs or K-12 classrooms, make sense of, name, and critique oppressive acts, conceptualize alternatives, and work to realize them.

In "Presence of Mind in the Process of Learning and Knowing: A Dialogue with Paulo Freire," teacher educators are challenged through the exchange between Paulo Freire and Pepi Leistyna to examine the ways in which we can avoid becoming mere technicians in the educational process. Freire, the leading pioneer of critical pedagogy, discusses the importance of apprenticing students of all ages into praxis, epistemological curiosity, and critical consciousness, and he encourages learners and teachers to become subjects of history who are equipped, able, and eager to read and act upon the world.

It is with Freire's notion of dialogue that critical pedagogy is able to generate self-empowering conditions. This discursive practice — in which theory is intended to work through learners and not simply on them — is encouraged to facilitate critical interaction that focuses on the kinds of analyses of knowledge and experience that can lead to political awareness, organizational strategies, community coalition building, and mass citizen actions against oppressive economic, political, and cultural institutions and structures, identities, social practices, public policies, and governments.

Paulo passed away in 1997 leaving behind a legacy of critical insight about democratizing schooling. However, he frequently maintained that educators should not regard his work as a recipe book to be followed. He demands that we critically appropriate from, recontextualize, and thus reinvent his ideas to fit the spaces and places where we work. As co-editors, we would like to dedicate this special issue

of Teacher Education Quarterly to Paulo for his wisdom, courage, and commitment to making the world a more just, equitable, and peaceful place to live. We feel that it is all of our jobs as educators to continue to carve out a path, together with others, that leads towards education for liberation and life-long learning rather than education for domestication and profit.

Critical pedagogy is transdisciplinary in nature and owes much of its foundations to such diverse camps of thought as Marxism, critical theory, feminism, post-colonialism, post-structuralism, media studies, cultural studies, anti-racist studies, and postmodernism. In "Critical Pedagogy and the Postmodern/Modern Divide: Towards a Pedagogy of Democratization," Henry Giroux encourages educators to critically appropriate from the vast wealth of existing theories that help people to better make sense of the power politics that are shaping the economic, social and cultural landscape. He himself works to reconcile the theoretical rifts between modernism and postmodernism and critically brings together in a complimentary way their important concerns over political economy, culture, representation, and identity.

Giroux frames his discussion around the dynamic nature of democratization and cogently points out that the conservative agenda is working vigilantly to dismantle and privatize the public sector. He suggests how educators as public intellectuals can be prepared to think and act as political agents and work against the neoliberal doctrine that is over-running teacher education programs and public schools. In making the political more pedagogical and the pedagogical more political, Giroux asserts that teacher educators have a serious responsibility to develop in their students the tools for building a more participatory, critical, and vibrant democracy.

Essential to any critical pedagogy is the exploration of the inextricable relationship among knowledge, ideology, and power. Within relations of power, how is knowledge produced, circulated, legitimated, consumed, and then reproduced or resisted? "The questions posed by critical pedagogues are: Whose values, interpretations, and goals constitute the foundation of public education — the "official" core curriculum — and how is this body of knowledge, which is often falsely presented as being objective and universal, imposed on the greater society" (Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996, p. 4)? Whose stories are told; whose are not? Who produces and chooses textbooks? Who selects classroom content, and whose interests are advanced with the promotion of this body of knowledge? As educational 'reform' is currently being spearheaded by conservative politicians and business leaders, this question is of particular importance.

In "The Knowledges of Teacher Education: Developing a Critical Complex Epistemology," Joe Kincheloe contends that educators need to address the kinds of knowledge that prospective teachers should to be exposed to in order to be prepared for the challenges of the classroom. He offers an outline of the types of knowledges that should be explored in every teacher education program, including but not limited to "empirical, experiential, normative, critical, ontological, and reflective-

synthetic" domains. This typology constitutes what he refers to as a "meta-epistemological package" which he argues helps us approach the contested concept of a "knowledge base for education." Kincheloe maintains that teaching is first and foremost epistemologically based, and as such, the goal of critical teacher education programs should be to have students understand how these different types of knowledge are produced, and subsequently examine the diverse ways they are taught and learned. In this way educators are better able to analyze the epistemological assumptions that are embedded in current classroom practices.

Raising Political Consciousness among Educators: Trials, Tribulations, and the Fruits of Victory

As action should never be disarticulated from theory, theory should never be disconnected from practice. While critical pedagogy encourages educators to engage in the ongoing process of reflection and action, what's far too often left out of progressive forms of teacher education, much like theory and theorizing are neglected by more mainstream programs, is the practice side of praxis. How do we develop critical consciousness in ourselves and in our students? What can we learn from teachers in the trenches doing important work? How can we expand these efforts in our own classrooms? And, how can we take our projects to combat social injustice outside of the schools and into the communities that we live?

First and foremost, any critical practice includes self-reflection and self-actualization. Instead of myopically focusing on content and assessment, as if they exist and can be taught and implemented in a vacuum, critical pedagogy calls for educators to examine the ideological posture that they maintain. This is important because one's own subject position — the place that a person occupies within a set of social relationships often shaped by such factors as nation, locale, social class, gender, race, language, religion, sexual orientation, age, and physical ability — influences the ways that one perceives students and acts in the classroom. This ideological framework should always be held in a critical light, not only for the purposes of continued self-actualization, but also so that the ethical stances that are taken on an issue allow a person to speak to particular problems and in solidarity with others rather than for people from different backgrounds. This evolving praxis is also intended to help educators understand the school's overall social relations and the asymmetries of power that exist within the institutions where they work. Such awareness allows educators to recognize the ideology of groups such as Teacher Unions and School Committees and how they shape and manage school life. It also helps them make sense of the ideological, pedagogical and materials conditions of the classroom, and how kids may respond to these institutional spaces.

The importance of critical inquiry in teacher development is highlighted in this special issue. In "Making the Road by Walking and Talking: Critical Literacy and/as Professional Development in a Teacher Inquiry Group," authors Cathy Luna,

Maria José Botelho, Dawn Fontaine, Kristen French, Kris Iverson, and Nélida Matos examine the ways in which collaborative inquiry called into question their "identities" as scholar-practitioners engaged in critical literacy practices. Through very honest and revealing dialogue, both experienced teachers and teacher educators share the process of discovering how dominant ideological perceptions about knowledge have influenced their prospective roles in the collaborative inquiry process, and how positions of privilege in the academy often compromise their intensions. Rather than collapsing into political paralysis because of the contradictions that they reveal, these educators continue to grapple with these issues, self-actualize, and move forward in the best interests of the people that they serve — their students and communities.

Despite the fact that the student population in public schools is getting more and more diverse, the overwhelming majority of pre-service teachers remain white, middle-class, and generally ill-prepared to work with these changing demographics. These teachers are also frequently ill-equipped to address the discriminatory conditions that subordinated students deal with on a daily basis — conditions that profoundly affect their academic performance, self-worth, and responses to schooling in general.

What are ways that teacher education programs can more effectively prepare prospective teachers to work with diversity, difference, and discrimination? Christine Sleeter, Myriam Torres, and Peggy Laughlin, in "Scaffolding Conscientization through Inquiry in Teacher Education," share how they, as teacher educators who teach similar sociocultural foundations courses, have used critical multicultural pedagogy to prepare pre-service students to successfully teach in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Their approach is based on Paulo Freire's problem-posing pedagogy which is used to examine individual and institutionalized racism, sexism, and poverty, as well how marginalized communities resist and act against abuses of power. A particularly important lesson here is how these authors deal with students who resist the idea that society is fundamentally undemocratic and unjust. These educators reveal how what they refer to as "scaffolded inquiry," even in the midst of student resistance, is a useful pedagogical tool for helping prospective teachers question the assumptions that inform their classroom perceptions and practices. They also share insights into the ways in which they incorporated participatory research into their teacher preparation courses.

While conservative politicians and business leaders have for the most part written teachers' perceptions and concerns out of national debates as well as the actual educational process (Metcalf, 2002), critical pedagogues find the voices of educators in the trenches indispensable for creating more productive classroom practices. Lilia Bartolomé, in "Critical Pedagogy and Teacher Education: Radicalizing Prospective Teachers," shares research that she and a colleague conducted in a high school in California that has had great success in working with racially subordinated, low-income, and linguistic-minority students. By examining

the political beliefs and behaviors of exemplary educators — information extracted form extensive interviews, she identifies important pedagogical principles that should be made part of teacher education coursework and field experiences. Bartolomé urges teacher educators to engage prospective teachers in comparing their values, beliefs, and assumptions with those of the dominant society to see how they may be reproducing discriminatory and exclusionary practices in the schools and classrooms where they work. The author argues that teacher education programs need to encourage student-teachers to develop what she describes as "political and ideological clarity" so that, much like the educators in her research study, they can develop counter-hegemonic strategies that are essential to democratizing schools and ensuring the success of all students.

Critical pedagogy hopes to forge policies and institutional practices that move beyond mere accommodations and compromises to existing power structures. Social transformation of this sort happens on many levels and on many fronts. While the larger vision of most critical pedagogues includes the revolutionary transformation of society, the smallest political acts of resistance and transgression are — or as the authors of this next article argue, should be — embraced. In "Embers of Hope: In Search of a Meaningful Critical Pedagogy," William Ayers, Gregory Michie, and Amy Rome suggest that there is much to learn from the everyday victories, however small, that teachers achieve in the face of inequities and injustice. They share anecdotes of teachers that are doing important work in schools, and they also suggest that pre-service and novice teachers may respond more positively to critical theory if we provide them with both a "language of resistance" as well as a "language of possibility" — that is, a language that moves us forward in eradicating oppressive powers, rather than one that just holds them at bay.

Globalization and Teacher Education: Theory, Coalition Building, and Democratic Participation

This special issue on critical pedagogy and teacher education takes very seriously the material, structural, political, cultural, and educational effects of capitalism. As capital has gone global and only about 500 transnational corporations control 80 percent of global investment and 70 percent of trade, imperialist governments, like the current administration in the U.S., in the name of neoliberalism and deregulation, are applying diplomatic and military pressure on other nations in order to secure unlimited access to cheap labor, raw materials, and new areas of investment. National sovereignty is under siege by these economic forces in many countries making it that much easier for invading corporate interests to smash democratic grassroots movements, environmental protections, and social policies and institutions developed to help secure the public's well being.

In "Teaching in and against the Empire: Critical Pedagogy as Revolutionary Praxis," Peter McLaren, Gregory Martin, Ramin Farahmandpur, and Nathalia

Jaramillo confront neoliberalism and its economic, social, and educational policies. Linking corporate globalization to U.S. imperialism, these authors address the current crisis of capitalism as it relates to educational reform. They maintain that as teacher educators we must ask hard questions of ourselves and of our students about how to counter new forms of imperialism both locally and globally. Projecting a far more radical vision of education, these authors also critique the ways in which critical pedagogy and multicultural education have been politically domesticated in that their vision of political struggle is limited to creating more harmonious social relations, and equal opportunities, but outside of any critique of capitalist social relations or call for the redistribution of wealth in the society. This is how these authors differentiate between 'revolutionary critical pedagogy' and 'progressive education' — the revolutionary model calls for the abolition of capital. These critical educators and activists make no apology in demanding radical teacher education reform that is global minded and capable of forging in prospective teachers, and thus in public schools internationally, the tools to combat capitalism and imperialism and to build a participatory, democratic socialist society.

Ken Saltman, in "Coca-Cola's Global Lessons: From Education for Corporate Globalization to Education for Global Justice," also explores how transnational corporations are undermining public institutions. Tracing the devious agenda of Coca-Cola's corporate elites to turn school curricula and buildings into billboards, Saltman focuses on the how the lethal influences of corporate ideology work to shape the ways that public institutions of education serve the interests of the corporate sector and its effort to shape how the society — the globe for that matter — sees work, consumption, culture, and politics. He examines some of Coca-Cola's educational projects, and explains how these efforts are related to corporate globalization. Saltman holds that teacher education programs and progressive educators can play a significant and international role in challenging these corporate pedagogies with more critical, participatory, and democratic ones, and he offers practical classroom resources and strategies that can work against the corporate assault on youth and that teach for global justice. Saltman also calls for critical coalitions across national borders in order for people to recognize that they have common struggles against common enemies — that there is a link between labor activists getting murdered by Coca-Cola-supported paramilitaries and teacher unions under assault in the U.S.

There is much that we can learn from international efforts to democratize schooling. Luis Armando Gandin and Michael W. Apple provide an international lens to the application of critical pedagogy in education. In "New Schools, New Knowledge, New Teachers: Creating the Citizen School in Porto Alegre, Brazil," the authors describe and analyze the policies of the "Popular Administration" in Porto Alegre, Brazil. They specifically focus on the "Citizen School" and on proposals that are explicitly designed to radically change both the municipal schools and the relationship between communities, the state, and education. This set of polices and the accompanying processes of implementation are constitutive parts

of a clear and explicit project aimed at constructing not only a better school for the excluded, but also a larger project of radical democracy. The authors illustrate the ways in which a set of policies has had substantive and long lasting effects because they are clearly connected to a much larger national effort of social transformation. This movement is also strategically bound with the goal of changing the mechanisms of the state and the rules of participation in the formation of state policies. The transformations taking place in Porto Alegre, while still in early stages of development, have important implications for teacher education and for how we might think about the politics of education policy and its role in social transformation.

Conclusion:
The Risk of Being Bystanders

In the concluding chapter of this special issue, "We Change the World by Doing Nothing," Suzanne SooHoo examines the internal and external factors that generate human apathy in the face of injustice. She reveals some of the forces that instill and maintain conformity in society, and how dominant ideology functions to silence people and gain the consent of those being exploited. The author looks at how the dominant culture works to discourage speaking out against social injustice, and she points out how even more progressive teacher education programs don't equip prospective teachers with the practical tools that that need to build, from the theoretical blueprint that they have drafted in their studies, a more caring and democratic society. SooHoo closes this special issue with an ominous warning: that oppression, violence, and tragedy will continue in the world if we choose — and it is a choice — to remain ill-formed and inactive.

While No Child Left Behind is dressed in a language of fairness, compassion, and equity, it in fact leaves so many of this nation's youth in the cold to fend for themselves. To combat this type of callous, mean-spirited, profit-centered, and now entrenched federal mandate, critical educators need to take advantage of the cracks of radical agency that still exist in the academy in teacher education programs. As Freire argued in the opening quote of this introduction, "this space for change, however small, is always available." The question is, are we as educators willing to take the risk to help forge a more critical, participatory, and vibrant democracy?

The form of critical pedagogy that this special issue embraces is that which takes seriously the connection between the university and everyday life, one that understands that the projects that drive critical education and teacher education programs should be established in light of how the larger social order affects people's lives, and not inspired by rigid standards, narrow and depoliticized curricula, and an indifference to pedagogy and the harsh realities that so many people face. Readers of this special issue are encouraged to evaluate, based on their own experiences, expertise, and insight, the strengths and weaknesses of the conceptual and practical movements presented here and recontextualize and

reinvent their possibilities for one's own predicaments, while also considering expanding such efforts in order to create new global coalitions and collective responses. If we are committed to doing the long and hard work necessary to revitalize and democratize teacher education, this special issue is offered as a stepping-stone in that direction.

References

Allington, R. (2002). Big Brother and the National Reading Curriculum: How Ideology Trumped Evidence. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Amrein, A.L. & Berliner, D. (2002). The Impact of High-Stakes Tests on Student Academic Performance. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory.

Aronowitz, S. (2001). The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning. Boston: Beacon Press.

Berlak, H. (2003). The "No Child Left Behind Act" and Teaching Reading — Policy Brief. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory.

Coles, G. (2003). Reading the Naked Truth: Literacy, Legislation, and Lies. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Crawford, J. (2003). A Few Things Ron Unz Would Prefer You Didn't Know about English Learners in California. Available online at: http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/castats.htm

Friere, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). Literacy: Reading the Word and the World. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, p. 126.

Giroux, H. & Myrsiades, K. (2001). (Eds.) Beyond the Corporate University. Lanham, ND: Rowman & Littlefield.

Haas, E., Molnar, A. & Serrano, R. (2002). Media Impact of Think Tank Education Publications 2001 — Research Report. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory.

Kozol, J. (1992). Savage Inequalities. New York: Perennial.

Kozol, J. (1996). Amazing Grace: Lives of Children and the Conscience of a Nation. New York: Perennial.

Leistyna, P. (2002). Defining and Designing Multiculturalism: One School System's Efforts. New York: State University of New York Press.

Leistyna, P. & Woodrum, A. (1996). Context and Culture: What is Critical Pedagogy? In Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy. (Eds.) P. Leistyna, A.Woodrum & S. Sherblom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

McChesney, R. & Nichols, J. (2002). Our Media, Not Theirs: The Democratic Struggle against Corporate Media. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Metcalf, S. (2002). Reading between the Lines. The Nation. Available online at: www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20020128&s=metcalf

National Research Council Report (1997). (Eds.) D. August & K. Hakuta. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Reading, B. (1997). The University in Ruins. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2003). A Tool Kit for Teachers. Available online at: www.ed.gov/teachers/nclbguide/nclb-teachers-toolkit.pdf

Yatvin, J. (2002). Babes in the Woods: The Wanderings of the National Reading Panel. Phi Delta Kappan. January, pp. 364-369.