Critical Studies of Education 2

Mary Frances Agnello
William M. Reynolds *Editors*

Practicing Critical Pedagogy

The Influences of Joe L. Kincheloe

Springer

Critical Studies of Education

Volume 2

We live in an era where forms of education designed to win the consent of students, teachers, and the public to the inevitability of a neo-liberal, market-driven process of globalization are being developed around the world. In these hegemonic modes of pedagogy questions about issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, colonialism, religion, and other social dynamics are simply not asked. Indeed, questions about the social spaces where pedagogy takes place—in schools, media, corporate think tanks, etc.—are not raised. When these concerns are connected with queries such as the following, we begin to move into a serious study of pedagogy: What knowledge is of the most worth? Whose knowledge should be taught? What role does power play in the educational process? How are new media re-shaping as well as perpetuating what happens in education? How is knowledge produced in a corporatized politics of knowledge? What socio-political role do schools play in the twenty-first century? What is an educated person? What is intelligence? How important are socio-cultural contextual factors in shaping what goes on in education? Can schools be more than a tool of the new American (and its Western allies') twenty-first century empire? How do we educate well-informed, creative teachers? What roles should schools play in a democratic society? What roles should media play in a democratic society? Is education in a democratic society different than in a totalitarian society? What is a democratic society? How is globalization affecting education? How does our view of mind shape the way we think of education? How does affect and emotion shape the educational process? What are the forces that shape educational purpose in different societies? These, of course, are just a few examples of the questions that need to be asked in relation to our exploration of educational purpose. This series of books can help establish a renewed interest in such questions and their centrality in the larger study of education and the preparation of teachers and other educational professionals.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/13431

Mary Frances Agnello • William M. Reynolds
Editors

Practicing Critical Pedagogy

The Influences of Joe L. Kincheloe

Springer

Editors
Mary Frances Agnello
Akita International University
Japan, Akita, Japan

William M. Reynolds
Department of Curriculum
Georgia Southern University
Georgia, USA

Critical Studies of Education
ISBN 978-3-319-25845-4 ISBN 978-3-319-25847-8 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015959698

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

To the memory of Joe L. Kincheloe whose intelligence, insight, and friendship inspired us all.

Foreword

What is distinctively evident through *Practicing Critical Pedagogy: The Influences of Joe L. Kincheloe*, as well as other texts/sites (*Teaching Joe L. Kincheloe*, *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *and The Freire Project*), is Joe's *profound* impact, his lasting legacy, and more powerfully his call to be present/thinking/ doing, for critical solidarity. His intellectual depth and pedagogical intent were always crystal clear, even in the first few minutes of an initial meeting. Many of us that were his students and colleagues feel a sense of determination in continuing this work. The institutions we navigate pull us to be less than the public intellectuals we need to be, falling short of equitable praxis, and often feel turmoiled over the consequences. These are difficult times not only for educational institutions k-higher education but for youth in social/public spaces and for anyone thinking left of right. There is a sense of the return of McCarthyism in many ways. The air is tense as we slide further into regressive politics and new levels of public disclosure previously unfathomable. I'm sure Joe would be feverishly writing, researching, and conversing about these issues and graciously inviting us to write with him, critically problematizing these issues, and forecasting what's next, and together new pedagogical paths would materialize. His insight, as well as his incredible talent in mobilizing us all, is sorely missed. *Practicing Critical Pedagogy* activates and makes clear the need to enact what and how we know, reminding us to stay steadfast toward justice.

Practicing Critical Pedagogy also encapsulates Joe's distinct mix of humility and urgency. One he also underscores in is *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* There he elucidates the tension within critical pedagogy as a field and warns that the fracturing of a disciplinary community can be its forfeit, one we can't afford and one that inadvertently anoints more power to mainstream perspectives. In this candid reflection, Joe lays out an imperative wake up call, much like Maxine Greene's call for wide awakedness[1] in the everyday. We can't hide behind ignorance either;

[1] Greene, M. (1981). The humanities and emancipatory possibility. *Journal of Education 163, (4)*, Fall, 287–305.

Deborah Britzman[2] clearly states it offers no safety, and he suggests we be ready to continuously forge the relationship between pedagogical practice and issues of justice. Joe (2007) noted:

> I am always amazed with how quickly the world changes, the acceleration of the pace of change, and the expansion of the power of power. Given such dynamics it is inconceivable that critical pedagogy would not be ever-evolving, changing to meet the needs posed by the new circumstances and unprecedented challenges…In such dire circumstances we need critical pedagogy more than ever. Where are we now? [We are] Wedged between an ideological rock and a hegemonic hard place with a relatively small audience. I believe critical pedagogy contains the imaginative, intellectual, and pragmatic power to free us from that state. Such an escape is central to the survival of not just critical pedagogy but also to human beings as a species. (40)

This brings me back to the compelling work in *Practicing Critical Pedagogy: The Influences of Joe L. Kincheloe*. Without a doubt it fully engages, illustrates, and maps Joe's extraordinary intellectual contributions, pedagogy, and camaraderie around the world. This book captivates while inviting the reader to pursue and commit to the possible through the nexus of praxis, compassion, and equity.

Department of Educational Leadership
and Cultural Foundations
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, NC, USA

Leila E. Villaverde

Reference

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

[2] Britzman, D., P. (1998). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight[1]. In B. Pinar's (ed). *Curriculum: Toward new identities*. NY: Routledge.

Poem—We talked over sweet rolls and coffee

We talked over coffee and sweet rolls,
on a cold March Montreal morning,
AERA was early that year,
and we had chanced on one another in the lobby,
outside the Beaver Club
in the Queen Elizabeth Hotel,
900 Rene Levesque Boulevard West

The Beaver Club required formal dress,
and we did not meet their formal dress standards.
Joe was wearing a tee-shirt and jeans, and
I was in brown walking shorts, an old blue seater and my Birkenstocks.

but we fit into a space outside that bastion of colonial power,
with its paintings
of trappers,
canoes,
Native Americans,
campfires, guns, Hudson Bay Blankets,
beaver pelts.
we would not have gone in that room, even if invited.

we talked of this an that,
power, wars, Bush, truth,
academic politics, making a difference.

but mostly we shared a quiet moment together,
united in a love of critical pedagogy,
fires inside the belly of the beast,

respecting the space of the other
outside a room that honored all that we
rejected … nothing loud though … laughter…

the laughter, the joy of being in that space together,
that is what I hold onto today.

Norm Denzin

Contents

Introduction

This text is for all those teachers and educational students who have experienced what they believe to be counterintuitive educational practices in their settings. They will benefit from the work that has preceded their current efforts to make education better, to make a difference in the schools, and to make a better world. This background of the book helps to shed light on the paths that have led each of us to write these chapters to capture the personal experiences inspired by the scholarship and educational guidance of Joe L. Kincheloe whose values and work still provide a beacon of hope in a contested space called "education."

Shirley Steinberg put together a symposium on the Influences of Joe Kincheloe for AESA in the Fall of 2013. As we sat and delivered our papers, some of us laughed and others cried. Rochelle Brock reminded us that Joe would not have wanted us to be sad. We knew that she was right, but we also knew how much we missed Joe and miss him every day. The idea of this volume arose, and 2 weeks later Bill Reynolds and I had a proposal for this text written. What we have tried to achieve in this book in an affirmation of Joe L. Kincheloe's thought, writings, and life on all of us as we see ourselves able to engage in critical pedagogy in the field through his philosophical underpinnings and insights, teachings, and musings. The presenters' essays and several of the session attendants' visions of Joe are included in this volume, in addition to others who were in our Kincheloe extended family. A bit of background shared here connects how I came to know Joe, his work, and his influences. It is important to emphasize how much Shirley is part of the Kincheloe dedication. We hope that it goes without saying that Shirley is part of our elaboration on Joe's work even though we do not acknowledge her in every instance. She also made this book possible by providing insight, love, willingness to share, and networks through which this work was achieved. It would be an oversight to not emphasize her support of us and Joe as we practice critical pedagogy in the field.

In the early 1990s, I began assembling a doctoral committee at Texas A&M. Gaile Cannella, who was in the College of Education at A&M at the time, encouraged me to ask Joe Kincheloe to be on my committee, and she enthusiastically informed me that he would be coming to Texas A&M to do an interview. I was skeptical that

anyone from afar would want to get involved with such a project. I soon learned otherwise. It was at one of those academic lectures where I heard and watched as Joe brought a group of fairly hard-hearted Aggies to their knees as we hung on his every word about the need for diversity in the academy, the importance of critical constructivism, and the need for inclusivity in education, the nation, and the world. I was already a believer having read Paulo Freire and Joe and having met Henry Giroux at a special summer Texas A&M workshop. That particular talk (sermon) moved the crowd, and Dean Jane Stallings offered Joe the position for which he was doing the talk. I was thrilled at the thought of having such a pillar of critical pedagogy joining the ranks of the curriculum and instruction faculty at the time.

It was an auspicious time at the stage of beginning my dissertation; I knew the study needed to be Freirean in nature, concerned with literacy, and grounded in the notions of the ways that we educate future teachers. Joe did not come to Texas A&M for several reasons, and I did not have the privilege of working with him in my campus setting. Rather it was over the phone (before cell phones) and via fax machine that I was able to achieve my work with Joe. Yet, I will always remember the day of Joe's interview faculty presentation, as he worked the crowd, greeting us all and so graciously talking to anyone who wanted to share ideas about education. I experienced firsthand the radical listening that Melissa Winchell, Tricia Kress, and Ken Tobin describe eloquently in the radical listening chapter found in Part III.

With a most engaged attentiveness, he listened as I explained that I wanted to do a Freirean study because I was convinced that we fail at teaching because we oppress our students. However, as I explained to him, I was also interested in several discourses of literacy as they influenced what goes on in schools and what the public develops in the name of "literacy." As he always exercised his penchant for intent listening, he told me that what I wanted to do was an "archaeological genealogy." He told me how to get started. So after my course work was done and I was a single mother in the middle of a divorce, I began a 2-year journey of reading Foucault, Habermas, feminists, and criticalists and more Joe. It was wonderful to discover the post-structural world that Joe had mapped for us in *Toward a Critical Politics of Teacher Thinking: Mapping the Postmodern* (1993). And of course, all of the new readings, especially by the French theorists, gave me another education—one much more suited to my background as a French major, a marginalized Sicilian Texan American teacher, and one who had struggled all of my life with structures of power supported by patriarchy, racism, sexism, and classism.

Joe was at Penn State when he became my co-chair and ghost chair. Thanks to John Stansell, Gaile Cannella, and Tom Reynolds, my committee members at Texas A&M, Joe was able to direct my work because he knew how to. From afar, he got me on track, redirected my detours, and inspired the dissertation that became the book, *A Postmodern Literacy Policy Analysis* (2001). It was his staunch brilliance and humble humor that kept me going during some very dark times. And when the opportunity to return the favor of time, attention, and intellectual endeavor presented itself, it seemed only natural that Bill and I work on this book together; it was something that we had to do for our friend, mentor, muse, and inspiration—Joe L. Kincheloe.

Yes, I (Bill) think of Joe often when I am teaching Foundations of Education courses. Joe's concern and radical love for students are qualities I try to emulate. I show them Kincheloe's interview from the Freireproject.org and the students gravitate to that video clip. When he discusses the fact, that mainstream (banking education) maintains the educational behemoth. We have long discussions about their experiences in the belly of that behemoth. I knew Joe for over 20 years and I was/am always inspired by the amount and breadth of his scholarship. I have written about our mutual love of rock-n-roll and his scholarship, but always remember Joe was a scholar first and foremost. His humble manner would not allow him to boast about his scholarship. We should all be as humble. He wrote about Paulo Freire, critical pedagogy, educational foundations, educational psychology, schools, multiculturalism, students with disabilities, indigenous knowledges, art, measurement, McDonalds, teacher thinking, urban schools, vocational education, Einstein, media, literacy, popular culture, whiteness, multiple intelligences, critical constructivism, Islamophobia, childhood studies, and a multitude of other subjects. One could easily fill a book with just the subjects Joe wrote about. I remember visiting Joe and Shirley's house in Quebec in 2011. Visiting Joe' study was an unforgettable experience. I remember thumbing through a well-worn copy of Dewey's *Democracy and Education* filled with Joe's notes. It was on Joe's desk and there were the hundreds of spiral notebooks filled with Joe's notes in Joe and Shirley's extensive home library. Those notebooks filled with words and numbers (I believe those numbers were a code for references). A brilliant mind at work. That memory always reminds me of the primacy of Joe's intellectual pursuits. No doubt Joe had the music in him, but he exercised a mighty intellectual power as well. I think we read about both of those qualities in this volume.

The way that the chapters in this volume fell into place was based in the emergent topic sections: Joe Kincheloe: Pillar of Critical Pedagogy, Joe Kincheloe: Transforming the World, and Joe Kincheloe: "A Man for All Seasons." Each section title sets the tone for its chapter contents. We knew Joe's theories and ideas were grounded in the fabric of a disharmonious society torn by race, class, gender, and capitalism and offered us if not approaches to take with our students as we discovered the world together, then at least insights to why things were not going so well when we could not connect with our students, particularly those from rural and urban families with lower incomes. The strength of a pillar was provided by Joe's perspectives on critical pedagogy and its importance to good teaching, learning, and coming to grips with difference in our society so often glossed over in schools.

When I think of the ways in which Joe so creatively described schooling and American culture, the word "mellorine" comes to mind. I don't think "mellorine" is available anymore, but it was an ice cream-like product made of nonfood ingredients. I knew of a "vanilla mellorine"—perhaps there were other flavors too. And so it was the by-product of poor schooling that students all would become "mellorine"—or fake vanilla ice cream. How could there have been anything authentic about what we were being shaped to be when we were asked to suspend our

personal experiences and pretend that all students were the same, all interested in the same things, and all endowed with similar opportunities? We were supposed to disregard white privilege, wealth of some versus poverty of others, and gender disadvantages on both sides and assume that the recipe would work and that we would all emerge on the exiting side of the educational assembly line homogenous and vanilla—good adherents to the machinery of capitalism. Joe helped us articulate with the insight of theory who we were and how we got to be that way. Yet, as an adherent of critical pedagogy, he also helped provide us a way to see through the ideological obscurity and harmfulness of American education with his tenets of critical constructivism and pedagogy.

As we made sense of Joe's influences in the field, we found that those chapters that elucidate the tools to pursue meaningful and purposeful educational work are included in Part I. There were obvious individuals' works that needed to be included here, like Bill and Randall's, for they knew him well and worked with him for many years. And yet as we extended our gaze to survey the academic horizons touched by Kincheloe, we hear from other authors the profundity of the impact that Joe had on them, their thinking, and their academic work. Reese Todd, my dear friend and colleague from Texas Tech University, captured it well in her chapter in which she describes how Joe's books or he recurrently entered onto the stage of our lives in our various places sporadically or periodically to influence social interactions that made big and lasting impressions on us. She traces her journey through graduate education where she encountered Joe's work and into Appalachia where Joe's earliest stages of critical enlightenment began. In the "Recursive Spiral of Influence Bends Toward Justice: Influence of Joe Kincheloe's Critical Pedagogy," Reese confesses her connection through family to unjust racist decisions made by higher courts regarding civil rights reading her life experiences and work through Joe's Tennessee roots and networks.

There were the big name influences on Joe that Randall Hewitt covers quite comprehensively in his "Mad Soul For Joe: The Sociological and Epistemological Kincheloe" chapter including Freire, Foucault, Frankfurt scholars, and more. Perhaps most touching to those of us with some association with the South is Randall's poignant and sometimes biting descriptions of what it meant to the literary community and to Joe to be southern. But in the great mind of Joe was an artist as described in, "Hey, Hey, My, My": Joe L. Kincheloe, Friend, Teacher, Scholar, and Musician, by Bill Reynolds who is also a musical artist inspired by the great names in rock and roll. If any of us has a rock and roll heart, Joe certainly did as discussed in both Randall's and Bill Reynolds' chapter. Like Bill, Joe and Randall were also inspired by southern literary ghosts who pushed him to try to understand race, loyalty, pride, genius, and independence. Joe preached on many of these topics as he addressed academic gatherings around the world. In teachers as researchers, I revisit a Kincheloean approach to teachers working as both learners and instructors in their classrooms.

In Part II, we read the many ways in which Joe's work has been influential around the world to make sense of educational practice based on theory and research. Those chapters include Joe's sense of radical love as practiced in Spain and as discussed by Ramon Flecha and Aitor Gómez in Barcelona and Tarragona, respectively. As described in "Joe Kincheloe: How Love Could Change the World," they highlight a history of their connections to Joe. Mimma Domenica discusses the need for teachers with moral and aesthetic responsibility realized through critical pedagogy as inspired by Joe in Italy and Sicily. Naoko Araki in Japan and Kim Senior from Australia reflect on their own teaching experiences both in public and private schools and imagine what a difference having a Kincheloean insight and vocabulary learned through critical pedagogy in teacher education would have had on their classroom work. They, along with Catherine Teasley, who describes Joe's public intellectualism to critique globalizing factors of capital, capitalist ideology, and capitalist oppression of people around the world in "Evolving Critically for a Transnational Public Pedagogy," see the universal applications of Joe's work. As Joe had enumerated in his scholarship, the neoliberal agenda spares no one in its usurpation of talent, time, thought, and political engagement of students and citizens from around the world.

Part III, Joe Kincheloe: "A Man for All Seasons," addresses the breadth and relevance of Joe's work and talent. Gresilda A. Tilley-Lubbs never knew Joe except through Shirley and yet she really knew how his work could be meaningful for her career and her students' lives which she carefully outlines in her chapter. Few people we have encountered personally and professionally have the skill and art of radical listening as described in the Melissa Winchell, Tricia Kress, and Ken Tobin's chapter, "Teaching/Learning Radical Listening: Joe's Legacy Among Three Generations of Practitioners." In Paul Miller's chapter, Paul discusses white privilege and the setting where he grew up in the heart of the birthplace of the Ku Klux Klan. Though he came from an educational and cultural capital elite background, his understanding of himself as different informs how we think we ought to interact with our students despite the tendency to assume their heteronormativity. Bringing us full circle to the Martin Luther King arc bending toward justice discussed by Reese, I could not help but think as I listened to the news in the Fall of 2014 and watched from Akita, Japan, what seemed like reruns of news footage covering the civil rights era that nothing much has changed in the USA. And because the racial tension is so profound and rampant in the fabric of life and schools, Brett Blake's chapter, "A Broken Arch, a Broken Bridge, and a Broken Promise: Using Kincheloe's Critical Pedagogy Concepts to Teach About Race in an Urban Graduate School Classroom," captured the current phase of racial tension and warfare brilliantly and offers us relics of Kincheloe's guidance to her work with her students as they learned through racial strife, navigating through its tensions, and making educational strides in coming to terms with what Wendell Berry called the "hidden wound" of racism that pervades the American psyche. Rounding out the book is "Joe Kincheloe:

Marxist Kritik and the Tender-Hearted" that Marla Morris graciously agreed to allow us to reprint highlighting her profound comprehension of Joe's theoretical foundations. We know all of these chapters are very personal with didactic value for next-generation educators. This book is certainly a tribute to the life and work of Joe Kincheloe. The point is not to idolize Joe or create Joe as an icon. He would not have wanted that. We want to remember Joe as our unpretentious brother in the continuing struggle for a more socially just world.

Mary Frances Agnello
William M. Reynolds

The original version of this front matter was revised. The correct editorial board information has been updated.

Part I
Joe L. Kincheloe: As Pillar

“Hey, Hey, My, My”: Joe L. Kincheloe, Friend, Teacher, Scholar, and Musician

William M. Reynolds

> I will continue to begin again to read Gilles Deleuze [Joe Kincheloe] in order to learn, and I’ll have to wander all alone in this long conversation that we were supposed to have together… And I would have tried to tell him why his thought has never left me… (Derrida 1995)

> “Critical Pedagogy”
> Emancipated and historicized,
> Seeing through subjugated eyes,
> Part to the whole and whole to the part,
> Posing problems is where we start. (Kincheloe in Willinsky 2011, p. 442)

I am one of many of Joe’s countless friends and colleagues. I knew of Joe in the 1980s when he was at Louisiana State University at Shreveport and I was at The University of Wisconsin-Stout. I think the first time we met face to face was at an AERA meeting in Washington (although it might have been earlier at Bergamo). I had dinner, at a Moroccan restaurant in Washington, with Joe and Shirley. We got together, initially, because we shared some common interests. We sat on the floor and ate with our hands. I was dressed in my typical blazer, shirt, tie and Khaki pants. I know Shirley thought I was a young Republican, but never said anything, at least at that time. Joe probably thought the same thing but never said a word. He treated me as a friend and colleague from that moment. Of course, I long ago ditched the blazer, tie, et al. But I am sure it would not have mattered to Joe in the least. We were intellectually and no doubt musically in sync. I do regret that Joe and I never got a chance to jam but I am confident that our musical tastes were compatible. Whenever I read Joe’s writing there are always the echoes of Southern Rock, Neil Young and Tom Petty running through my mind.

W.M. Reynolds (✉)
Department of Curriculum, Georgia Southern University,
Georgia 30458, USA
e-mail: wrey@georgiasouthern.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_1

We both, by the late 1980s, had published our first books with a small and little known publishing company named Peter Lang. His book was, *Getting Beyond the Facts: Teaching Social Studies in the Late Twentieth Century* (1989) and mine was *Reading Curriculum Theory: The Development of a New Hermeneutic* (1989). They were in the American University Studies series and both sported those memorable puke green covers. And there were the many legendary Conferences on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice known as The Bergamo Conference held in Dayton, Ohio, Banff, Alberta, Canada, Monteagle, Tennessee, Blooming, Indiana and then back in Dayton. There were late night conversations with Joe and Shirley and I eagerly introduced my graduate students to them. Joe was always kind and encouraging to my students and always took the time to listen to them. I was always grateful to him for that. Joe was also a sharp, quick wit that always made me laugh. I remember he was the fastest talking Southerner I ever met and his impersonations of Southern Baptist preachers I will never forget and they still make me smile. One of my lasting memories of Joe and Shirley was at the second Monteagle (Bergamo) Conference in 1995. Under the shade of a large Magnolia tree with a rabbi officiating, Joe and Shirley celebrated the 5th anniversary of their marriage. This demonstrates not only how much Joe and Shirley meant to each other, but how much they both valued the conference that was a haven in a heartless academic world for many of us.

The conferences were not always without contention. One beautiful fall evening in the late 1990s a rift occurred during the Bergamo conference. By that time I had given up the editorship of the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, which was the journal where many of the participants from the conferences published their work. It was a publishing outlet for marginalized, critical academics – one of the few before Joe and Shirley began to help us all with publishing in their many series. At that time Joe and Shirley were the managing editors and it fell upon them to intervene in the contentious argument. They called me into the meeting held outside in the courtyard of the Bergamo Conference Center because of my editorial experience and probably for friendly support. That night I saw Joe and Shirley's personal and professional integrity in operation. It was a rather painful meeting and some of the rifts that we tried to repair still linger in the curriculum studies field. The manner in which Joe and Shirley handled the situation honestly and forthrightly still demands respect.

In early the 2000s the Georgia Southern University curriculum studies faculty invited Joe and Shirley to speak at Georgia Southern. They were fantastic. They discussed critical theory and radical love. But I distinctly remember one of our more mature female doctoral students chasing Joe and Shirley through the College of Education parking lot with a huge notebook full of lesson plans trying to get them to look them over. I was so embarrassed – lesson plans of all things. Obviously this student had missed some of the finer points of the demanding theoretical curriculum studies coursework. But Joe was kind and actually looked them over and gave the student some advice. That single action speaks volumes about the type of radical love Joe demonstrated with students and the kind of human being Joe was.

The Long Conversations We Were Supposed to Have

Joe and I shared many similar experiences, which I didn't realize until recently having conversations about Joe's experiences, after reading *Key Works in Critical Pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe* (2011) and having browsed The Freire Project Critical Cultural Community, Youth, and Media Activism. I wish I could have talked more with Joe about all those experiences. I believe we probably would have ventured into a writing project about them. These short descriptions of Joe's ideas and work are not met as exhaustive by any means and others have written much more extensively, but they reflect those conversations I did not have with Joe and wish I could have. Joe held many positions, of course, in many different places and I held different positions as well. We became friends before the internet and I suppose that might have slowed communication in the 1980s and early 1990s. But, whenever I needed support Joe was there. And, I hope he knew I always had his back. Ironically, as I was writing this essay, I posted on Facebook that I was writing an essay on Joe and it was one of my most liked postings.

One of the experiences we both shared from our early years was being brought up in the Methodist Church – Joe in Tennessee and me in upstate New York.

> For the first twelve years of his life, he was apprenticed to his uncle, Marvin Kincheloe a rural circuit preacher in the Methodist Church. Every Sunday, dressed in his Sunday best, Joe visited the elderly and sick parishioners, and attended Marvin's church. At 12, Joe realized he would never be saved, and refused to continue along the soul saving path. However, he did learn how to preach. (Steinberg 2011, p. x)

For me the experience with the church was similar. I also grew up in the United Methodist Church. I even served as an acolyte; that is I wore a robe and before the church service started I would light the candles on the altar. There were usually two acolytes and the best part of this responsibility was I got to sit in the back of the church with my friend and we could talk during the service. The Methodist Church in upstate New York preached the social gospel – a gospel of social reform. Salvation surely, as Joe experienced, was part of the message, but not the entire message. In 1969 the minister of my church took The Methodist Youth Fellowship group to Scott's Run Settlement House near Morgantown, West Virginia to help out-of-work coal miners repair their houses, and rebuild some of the Settlement house itself (see Reynolds and Webber 2009). I left the church many years ago, but that experience working in West Virginia was life changing concerning my understandings of poverty and class.

I think the conversation that Joe and I would have now about Christianity would be about the way that the Right-Wing has hijacked Christianity. With some exceptions, of course, gone are the days of the social gospel. They have been replaced by a Civic Gospel (see Reynolds and Webber 2009) where there are homophobic hate-filled preachers who rant in the most horrible rhetoric against homosexuality, women's rights, and socialism. My guess is that Joe and I would commiserate about the lack of socially conscious spirituality over a few beers.

Another close parallel in our experiences was the reading of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1971) by Paulo Freire. I know that book had a powerful and lasting influence on our scholarship and our teaching.

> In 1970 he [Paulo Freire] had a book come out in English written in Portuguese originally in 1967 the book was called *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* I read it in 1970 and have been reading and working on Paulo's work ever since that time. (freireproject.org/freire-project-tv/)

Joe, of course wrote, taught and constructed various venues for and about the work of Paulo Freire. His primer, *Critical Pedagogy 2nd Edition* (2008) is a crucial text in the field. I make sure to recommend it to all of my students. For me reading *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1971) in 1977 after 3 years of teaching high school English, finally gave me a language for what I knew in my heart was education. I could express in a coherent language the reasons for the way I was attempting to educate students. I have been developing that for years. Not of course as a methodology, but as a way of being in the world and reading that world. The goal was and is to develop critical consciousness.

I am convinced that Joe and I would have a critical complicated conversation about Freire and critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century. In fact, I have been writing more about Freire in the last few years and plan to write much more on critical pedagogy. And, because of Joe there are many scholars with whom to engage in these conversations and work. That is certainly one of Joe's lasting legacies.

A third experience that Joe and I shared, which I only discovered recently through various readings was our work with Native Americans.

> Joe's first job was probably his most significant, serving as department chair of the education department at Sine Gleska College on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. It was here he began to publish and research on the disenfranchisement of Native Americans. In 1982, Joe was given the Lakota Sioux ceremonial name TiWa Ska, meaning clear, loving or brilliant mind (Steinberg 2011, p. x)

Those experiences enrich our understandings and they "informed his life, his work and his context" (Steinberg 2011, p. x).

Like Joe I worked with Native American teachers. I was director of the Lac Court Oreilles Native American Project. This project involved delivering master's degree courses to Ojibwa teachers at the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa School in Hayward, Wisconsin. I spent 2 years working with the teachers and students attempting to understand their situations in schools and the larger context and how critical pedagogy might be helpful. I always found it ironic that at that time all the teachers were either tribal members or members of other tribes and yet the principal was a white man. This is certainly the basis for a critical discussion. Another discussion I was supposed to have had with Joe. Interestingly enough, even though the experience with the Ojibwa has been tremendously influential on my life and outlook, I have never written about it. I am sure that if that should have had conversation had occurred with Joe. He would have encouraged me to write about those experiences.

Gifts

Gift One – That Old Guitar

This past summer when I was teaching at University of Calgary, I was given at least two amazing gifts. The first gift was that Shirley Steinberg let me play one of Joe's guitars. There is always a strong connection between old hippie musicians but to be able to play Joe's guitar was a solid almost mystical connection to Joe the musician. As I sat in Shirley and Eelco's living room I played those old Southern Rock songs and even did a bit of Neil Young. In my mind as I played and sang I could picture Joe sitting behind the keyboard at various gigs that Tony and the Hegemones played. I remember listening to the band at one American Educational Research Association meetings, where the band was playing in the hallway of one of the huge hotels. I know there is a story about why they were playing in the hall. Joe was a preeminent scholar and prodigious writer and his heart was in music. I am convinced that for him as well as me and others that one of our first loves was rock and roll. He was a brilliant rock and roll scholar. He and I could sure talk about music for hours. One of the conversations we should have had was not a conversation at all but a jam session playing and singing all the music that means so much to us.

Gift Two – Books on the South

> One of the first questions I asked Joe in Ohio on the October day we met was: 'Who was right Neil Young or Lynyrd Skynrd?' Without a beat he replied: "Neil Young." As much as he loved the South, Joe was painfully aware of her ghosts, and Neil had seen their auras. He did, however, feel "ole Mr. Young" was uniformed as to the nuances of the South, and had Mr. Young spent time in the South, his Canadian dismissal of *Southern Man* as simply barbaric and racist would have been more informed. (Steinberg 2013, p. 2)

The other gift that Shirley Steinberg gave me was a collection of Joe's books on the South. Since I was inspired by Joe's work on the South and had just finished a book on the South and was working on another, this was truly a wonderful gift. My edited collection on the South, entitled, *A Curriculum of Place: Understandings Emerging Through the South Mist* (2013) was a continuation of the discussion started by Joe Kincheloe and Bill Pinar in *Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis: The Significance of Place* (1991). I began almost immediately to read one of Joe's favorite authors. I started with Willie Morris's *Terrains of the Heart and Other Essays on Home* (1981).

> Also, there is no way to elude that venerable Southern Sunday afternoon feeling, when the bars are closed and no one wants to see anyone else, and the church bells ring out to the old recognitions, and it is raining and you are alone with your dog, that none of the words really matter anyway, especially if the writer of the words has his predilection for the graveyards. There is no place under the Lord's heaven which elicits such angst and forboding [sic] than Sunday afternoons in a small town of Dixie. (Morris 1981, p. xi)

The truly remarkable part of this gift was not only was the book signed by Willie Morris, but it had Joe's handwritten notes all the way through it. I could eavesdrop on the conversations that Joe had with Morris and my understanding of both authors was enriched.

> I am a child of the South, one who had sought to understand the rhythms of southern life and their effects on me. For many reasons, my first exposure to Willie Morris about twenty years ago provided much insight into my own southern consciousness. So profound was the effect that I adopted Morris' "North Toward Home" for my introduction to education classes when I came to Louisiana to teach. An excellent educational autobiography, I hoped that the work would touch the consciousness of my students. I hoped that it would promote an introspective analysis of personal educational experience that might lead to a better understanding of the social forces that shaped southern students. (Kincheloe and Pinar 1991, pp. 131–132)[1]

I read the essay, *The Ghosts of Ole Miss* (1981) by Morris an important essay for Joe's writing about the South and his Southern roots. In the margin written with a green pen are Joe's first notes about Morris. "Willie Morris visits graveyards – it is the quest for memory; to remember who we are and what we might become by remembering the best of what we were."[2] In another important book I was given signed by Morris and containing Joe's notes was *North Toward Home* (1967). This book was also tremendously influential for Joe. As I read it, I noticed that it had even more marginal notes from Joe than did the other volume by Morris. In the section of the book entitled Mississippi in Chapter 10 there are three pages where almost every sentence is underlined by blue and green pen and Joe has written in the margins almost as much as Morris. Morris is writing about his high school days in Mississippi and in Joe's writing in the margins his thoughts about the South take shape.

– *Southern cultural changes had yet to come –*
– *Pre-change South elicits mixed emotions: the resistance to the homogeneity of industrialized culture but that is juxtaposed with the cruel racism…*

And then the Ghosts return in the exchange between Morris's writing and Joe's notes.

> Morris:
>
> I was with the little plantation girl I loved, and old friends who had been friends for as long as I can remember, in a town as familiar and settled to me as anything I would ever know. I would never wander very far away. (Morris 1967, p. 140)
>
> Joe*: I don't miss them but I think about them a lot*.
>
> Morris:
>
> I would wander off by myself to that place of my childhood, the town cemetery. Here I would walk among all those graves I knew that had given me such a sense of town when I was a boy – of the reprobates and early settlers, the departed gospelists and bootleggers, and all the boys we had buried with the American Legionnaires. (Morris 1967, p. 143)

[1] Shirley Steinberg also discusses this essay by Kincheloe in *Revisiting and Reconceptualizing Southern Ghosts* (pp. 1–15) in W.M. Reynolds (Ed.). A Curriculum of Place: Understandings Emerging through the Southern Mist (2013).

[2] Notes written by Joe Kincheloe in his copy of Willie Morris' *Terrains of the Heart and Other Essays on Home* (1981).

> Joe: *back to the cemetery – my imagination*.

These writings by Morris, I am convinced, were pivotal to Joe's brilliant essay on the South entitled, *Willie Morris and the Southern Curriculum: Emancipating the Southern Ghosts* (1991). To really begin to understand the South, particularly from a Southerners point of view this essay is a must read.

I know now that I have lived in the South for almost 20 years (although I know I will never be a Southerner because "I'm not from round here"). Joe and I could have had one of those marvelous conversations about the South. I know that it would enrich my understanding and writing on the South. We should have talked about the love/hate relationship we have with the south. The love we have for the azaleas and dogwoods in spring, the warm misty mornings, collard greens and sweet tea and hard-working people. And, the hatred for the racism that still circulates among those misty mornings in towns where the Confederate battle flag is still flown and the same symbol is stuck to the bumpers of pick-up trucks.

So, I treasure the memories I have of Joe – the laughter, the music and the intellectual and rock and roll conversations. I think about the conversations we should have had. And, the music we should have played. Both Joe and I lived through much of the development of the curriculum studies field and critical pedagogy in the United States. I think Joe would be happy to see how rapidly both areas have developed over the last 5 years, particularly the plethora of literature on critical pedagogy, critical media studies, critical youth studies and the continuation of his efforts on maintaining Freire's presence on line, in organizations and in publications.

One of my most treasured memories of Joe is a Preface he wrote for my book, *Curriculum: A River Runs Through It* (2003). Joe most kindly wrote:

> As Bill struggles for hope in times of despair, I find great hope in the faces and the words of his students. In this and many other contexts I am proud to call him a brother in our pedagogical, cultural, political and spiritual quests. (Kincheloe in Reynolds 2003, p. xix).

I am privileged to have known Joe and I am proud to call him a brother too. Let's just face it. The world is a lesser place without Joe L. Kincheloe in it.

References

Derrida, J. (1995). *I'll have to wander all alone*. Retrieved from http://www.usc.edu/dept/complit/tympanum/1/derrida1.html

Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire Project TV Channel (Producer). (2013). *Interview with Joe Kincheloe* [steaming video]. Available from http://www.freireproject.org/freire-project-tv/

Hayes, K., Steinberg, S. R., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Key works in critical pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.

Kincheloe, J. (1989). *Getting beyond the facts: Teaching social studies in the late twentieth century*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. (2003). Preface: Keeping hope alive. In W. M. Reynolds (Ed.), *Curriculum: A river runs through it*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1991). *Curriculum as social psychoanalysis: The significance of place*. Albany: State University Press of New York.
Morris, W. (1967). *North toward home*. Oxford: Yoknapatawpha Press.
Morris, W. (1981). *Terrains of the heart and other essays on home*. Oxford: Yoknapatawpha Press.
Reynolds, W. M. (1989). *Reading curriculum theory: The development of a new hermeneutic*. New York: Peter Lang.
Reynolds, W. M. (2003). *Curriculum: A river runs through it*. New York: Peter Lang.
Reynolds, W. M. (2013). *A curriculum of place: Understandings emerging through the southern mist*. New York: Peter Lang.
Reynolds, W., & Webber, J. A. (2009). *The civic gospel: A political cartography of Christianity*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.
Steinberg, S. (2011). For my next trick, I'll need a volunteer: Forward. In K. Hayes, S. R. Steinberg, & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy Joe L. Kincheloe* (pp. ix–xiii). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Steinberg, S. R. (2013). Revisiting and reconceptualizing southern ghosts: Curriculum from the other side. In W. M. Reynolds (Ed.), *A curriculum of place: Understandings emerging through the southern mist*. New York: Peter Lang.
Willinsky, J. (2011). The music: Afterword. In K. Hayes, S. R. Steinberg, & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.

William M. Reynolds teaches in the Department of Curriculum, Foundations and Reading at Georgia Southern University. He has authored, co-authored and co-edited numerous books including *Curriculum: A River Runs Through It* (2003), *Expanding Curriculum Theory: Dis/positions and Lines of Flight* (2004), and *The Civic Gospel: A Political Cartography of Christianity* (2009), *A Curriculum of Place: Understandings Emerging through the Southern Mist* (2013) and *Critical Studies of Southern Place: A Reader* (2014/in press) and *Expanding Curriculum: Dis/positions and Lines of Light 2nd ed*. (2016/in press). He has a book series with Intellect Books, *Cultural Studies Toward Transformative Curriculum and Pedagogy* series and co-edits a series with Brad Porfilio, *Youth Culture and Pedagogy in the twenty-first century* with Lexington Books. He has also published many articles and chapters on issues in curriculum, politics of education, critical media literacy, critical pedagogy, youth studies, critical Southern studies and cultural studies. He has been a visiting professor at McGill University, Lewis University and the University of Calgary.

Mad Soul for Joe: The Sociological and Epistemological Kincheloe

Randall Hewitt

Despite the title I have listed above, I don't intend to explicate Joe Kincheloe's texts so as to identify its sociological and epistemological foundations. Nor will I engage in a philosophical analysis of the concept of soul as this emerges through his work, though this task would be interesting and fun, but I will leave this job to a graduate student needing something important to do. What I intend to do here is commemorate the crucial impact that the critically-minded Joe Kincheloe had on me as a human being. In doing this, I will briefly remind readers what his sociological and epistemological stance was and then get to what really matters to me about him.

Joe's sociological and epistemological stance (I'm running these two realms together) was Deweyan at base, refined and sharpened to a fine point by the Frankfurt School. Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Leo Lowenthal, Michel Foucault, Antonio Gramsci, and, of course, Paulo Freire figured large in Joe's thought and work. These traditions influenced Joe to see that human beings are born into a situation in which the settled and assured "commingle" with the tenuous and uncertain. Life is a scene of risk, as Dewey puts it, a gamble by which human beings suffer and enjoy the unpredictable, the hazardous, and uncontrollable as much as their opposites. This aleatory scene provides the backdrop against which, through which, and on the basis of which we humans construct and embody a living and breathing security net of shared habits and social practices. And, by way of these social practices, we develop feeling and impulse, and acquire realms of meaning, ideals, beliefs, standards of judgment, and self-identities. Yet, this is not all that this safety net of shared habits (or nets, to be more accurate) provide us. As the Frankfurt School was quick to point out, these safety nets have differential, asymmetrical, and asynchronous material effects such that these safety nets are really veiled webs of power, yielding various degrees of dominance and oppression, as

R. Hewitt (✉)
College of Education and Human Performance, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816, USA
e-mail: randall.hewitt@ucf.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_2

well as chances at transcendence (holes in the webs, cracks in the system). And, again, as the Frankfurt School points up, these differential and asynchronous material effects accumulate as wealth for some and at the expense of (and misery for) the many. Those of accumulated wealth gain greater control over the webs by way of which they acquired their riches to begin with, that is, over the means of production and of physical coercion. Included in this control over the means of production and of physical coercion is the control over men's and women's actions by way of controlling the meanings by which they act, that is, by controlling ideals, beliefs, standards of judgment, and self-identities. As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward put it in *Poor People's Movements*:

> What some call superstructure, and what others call culture, includes an elaborate system of beliefs and ritual behaviors which defines for people what is right and what is wrong and why; what is possible and what is impossible; and the behavioral imperatives that follow from these beliefs. Because this superstructure of beliefs and rituals is evolved in the context of unequal power, it is inevitable that beliefs and rituals reinforce inequality, by rendering the powerful divine and the challengers evil (Fox-Piven and Cloward 1979, p. 1).

What the Marxist/Critical Theorist tradition adds to Joe's Deweyan philosophical base is the analytical emphasis on power, power particularly constructed by the preeminent force called capitalism. Mix in the works of Foucault and Gramsci, now Joe has the means by which to understand how capitalist power courses through the human body to manufacture consciousness conducive to its own ends. Energized by all of his cultural studies friends, Joe developed a penetrating analysis of the ways our social institutions (schools, media, churches, the state apparatus) work to inform, shape, our consciousness such that we come to regulate experience ourselves according to the needs and demands of the powerful. Of course, his obsession with the development of consciousness, the ways by which larger, shared meanings, beliefs, ideals, and standards of judgment become internal compulsions of the self, such that the individual becomes complicit in regulating his or her own demise is what attracted me to Joe in the first place, well over twenty years ago. Here is my confession.

My name is Randy Hewitt and I am a one-dimensional man. An inarticulate son of a "lint-head," I suffer from the demons that attend a one-dimensional consciousness. I first met Joe Kincheloe when I took his Social Foundations of Education course at Clemson University in 1990. Having graduated two years earlier with a degree in English Literature, I was coming back to Clemson for teacher certification, a little older than my classmates, a baby on the way, and freighted with a felt multi-dimensionality that only lysergic diethylamide offers. Joe promised that he had the means by which to break me out. He said that it will be painful, that it will piss me off, that there will be tears, that living experience on the surface level of consciousness is not the same as living experience on the second level, that is, not the same as thinking critically about the experience lived. I was skeptical of him, not because I didn't trust his critique but because I didn't believe he had the depth of hard-knock experience (the experience of "going down the line," as James Baldwin put it) (Baldwin 1993) that would make his critique realistic and relevant. "What does this pale, skinny, patrician-like academic really know about the 'dirty South?'"

Joe didn't introduce me to "holes-in-the-wall," relatives having sex with each other, and drunken and drugged-out fist-fights over Cheetos. I probably was more intimate than he was with drafty trailers, butchering hogs, and grown-ass men smothering themselves in paper bags of grey paint. I'm pretty sure that my mama and daddy wrote the manual on running from and threatening bill collectors, and while my grandpa on my mama's side may not have set crosses on fire, he expressed great sympathy for those who did. My path to redemption and salvation was opened over in Sunnyside, certainly not on the mill-hill and not by Joe either. It was through the graciousness of the Drummonds, Wallaces, and O'Neils that I was cautiously welcomed into their black space and eloquently taught that I wipe my ass just like everybody else. Their living examples pointed up to me something about race—the human race—and that poverty-stricken Sunnyside and "lint-head" Victor Mill had more in common than upwardly mobile Needmore and lily-white, manicured Victor Heights, regardless of race. No, Joe didn't introduce me to the low-down; I was born into that funk. What Joe did was re-mind me that at root all funk was the blues and gospel and that my funk was just a particular, shared rhythmic attitude toward the precarious and prophetic in experience. And what Joe was a master at doing was drawing this funk out of me so that I could better understand why I dance and cry, hustle and bump, love and hate, and hope and rage. You see, Joe Kincheloe was a bluesman, a foundations man.

In *Boogie Man: The Adventures of John Lee Hooker in the American Twentieth Century,* Charles Shaar Murray argues that the art of the bluesman is the art of the healer. By telling his story—or variations of it—the bluesman "enables us to face our own. In this sense, the bluesman is our confessor, our shrink; it is his job to forgive us and comfort us, shoulder our burdens as he invites us to help him shoulder his own" (Murray 2000, pp. 8–9). And as the great Eudora Welty suggests, listening keenly and seeing with range and depth are intuitions necessary to all good story telling (Welty 2002, p. 31). What the storyteller is listening and looking for is the universal as it reveals itself—as it can only reveal itself—through the local, in downtown Kingsport, for example, or on the outskirts of Greer at 4:20 in the afternoon. So, she listens for "the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself," cast through Papa Drummond's cuss words and reflected in Aunt Effie's prayers (Faulkner 1950). She sees love and honor and pity and pride and compassion and sacrifice" as these are hunched over in a Tampa sod field or hidden in the back corners of the Sagittarius Lounge. Her task is to "transfer without distortion" the cadence of this shared life expressed through idiom and embodied in gesture just "this side of chaos" (Welty 2002, p. 71). And when she hits the mark, the emotions that flow out of everyday life become the flashpoints whereby we not only understand ourselves better as *human* beings but because of this understanding, we feel life more variously, more intensely, rendering us, in turn, more susceptible and tender towards our lives together.

In his critical reading of Alice Walker's work, Felipe Smith suggests that art has its redemptive and saving work to do. Art recalls the ancestral spirit from the grave so that it has immortality in the present. It connects one, otherwise existentially alone, with the wisdom of the past which serves as a blueprint for personal and col-

lective growth. It puts us in the universal, the realm of human meaning, the realm of soul inspirited by the concrete present and thus graces us with the opportunity for wholeness, for connection, for community. Art channels the spirits (Smith 1992). To Joe Kincheloe, our lived stories not only were means to underscore a moral point about the world but primarily were modes of inquiry into and ways to craft ourselves, as curricula connecting soul to soul, melodic variations played over the rhythmic repetition called life. He did this foundations work from the inside out. He drew from the depths of his own experience growing up to depression-era parents in Southern Appalachia, a place riddled with racism, sexism, class prejudice, and, of course, the holy ghost, to understand and validate other people's felt experience and to pull out the demons and daimons wandering the back channels of their consciousness. Joe Kincheloe was an artist, he was our bluesman.

References

Baldwin, J. (1962/1993). *The fire next time*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Faulkner, W. (1950). *Nobel prize acceptance speech*. http://www.rjgeib.com/thoughts/faulkner/faulkner.html

Fox-Piven, F., & Cloward, R. (1977/1979). *Poor people's movements: Why they succeed, How they fail*. New York: Random House.

Murray, C. S. (2000). *Boogie Man: The adventures of John Lee Hooker in the American twentieth century*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, F. (1992). Alice Walker's redemptive art. *African American Review*, 26(3). Terre Haute: Indiana State University.

Welty, E. (2002). *On writing*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Randall Hewitt is Associate Professor in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership at the University of Central Florida. Hewitt's current research focuses on the critical sense of the American pragmatist, social reconstructionist traditions, and on the art of democratic pedagogy. He is the author of *Dewey and Power: Renewing the Democratic Faith* and co-editor with his old friend Joe Kincheloe of *Regenerating the Philosophy of Education: What Happened to Soul?* And despite all of the above, he still is as working class as the day he was born.

Recursive Spiral of Influence Bends Toward Justice: Influence of JOE L. KINCHELOE's Critical Pedagogy

Reese H. Todd

> *Disciplinary demarcations no longer shape…the way scholars look at the world.*
>
> (Kincheloe 2001, p. 683)

> *Life on the disciplinary boundaries is never easy, but the rewards to be derived from the hard work demanded are profound.*
>
> (Kincheloe 2001, p. 691)

Joe Kincheloe's notion of bricolage in critical pedagogy provides a framework for understanding the disparate influences and resources educators bring together in the complex task of teaching and learning. In his view, it is not only an artisan's image of assembling available materials to complete a project, but it also celebrates the resources of people and places that influence our decision-making as educational theorists and practitioners.

The wholeness of who we are as educators is influenced by a blend of interactions with people whose lives intersect with ours over time and geographical places we call home. Yet, we often find that the significance of seemingly discrete experiences ebb and flow like the tides, bringing reshaped perspectives back to us in ways that enrich our theory and practice. From the ongoing processes, we begin to observe patterns and make connections from which new understandings emerge. Educators understand that the processes of learning require us to revisit experiences and ideas over time to discover the complexities that underlie the initial encounters with people and places.

The continuous repeated cycles in the natural world are also found in the cycles of teaching and learning. Curriculum theorist, William Doll (1993), uses the term *recursive* to describe the cyclical learning process but notes a critical difference between repetition and recursiveness. With repetition, we expect the same results from repeated actions, such as driving a nail into wood by hitting it with a hammer.

R.H. Todd (✉)
College of Education, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, USA
e-mail: reese.todd@ttu.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_3

Recursive, however, focuses on the varied outcomes that may result from the learner's continuous engagement in the process. The reflective learner evaluates the repeated experiences as growth opportunities and celebrates the awareness of complexities and connections across a broader spectrum of knowledge. I also find a similar understanding in Jerome Bruner's (1996) "spiral curriculum" with active and recurring cycles as a critical component to in-depth learning.

As a mid-career graduate student, I did not know that JOE KINCHELOE would be one of those recursive experiences in my professional growth. I certainly did not see myself as a teacher aligned with a field of critical pedagogy, although elements matched questions in my professional and personal life.

Initially, I discovered Joe Kincheloe in *Thirteen Questions* (2002) as I sought a theoretical framework for my research studies, but I was advised to continue looking for other resources in the interest of completing my degree. Next, Kincheloe showed up, in person, for an invited three-day seminar at the university where I was an assistant professor in curriculum and instruction. Up close and personal his ideas still made sense and dialogue with my new colleagues extended the impact of that encounter as they shared their own understandings and resources. Later, a trip to eastern Tennessee put me in touch with the place where his roots were—not far from my own roots in northern Alabama—and the particular social contexts of the South. Most recently, my academic conference proposals and community projects have led to dialogues that have deepened my understanding and further appreciation of Joe Kincheloe's influence in education. That is what happens when we revisit ideas, delve more deeply into them, open ourselves to new understandings, and bring together discrete pieces into a wholeness that respectfully celebrates strengths of people and places.

Encountering the Work of Joe Kincheloe

In Graduate School

Thirteen questions raised questions about the social issues that characterized the environment of college students of 1960s—gender, race, class, religion—and whether living in a democratic society should make any difference in our schools. "What's missing in the public conversation?" asked Peter McLaren. Maxine Greene asked us to consider "what schools are for and what should we be doing in the name of education." These chapters reflected some of my own concerns.

Perhaps I "found" Kincheloe's book initially as a result of an assignment in one of my classes that required each of us chose a book from Professor Jayne Fleener's list and report to the class on it. Greene's *Releasing the Imagination* was my choice as a companion to a class assignment from *Dialectic of Freedom*. Integrating a creative mindset to our academic dialogues and problem-solving offered an approach to elicit meaningful responses to challenging educational questions. While I was a student, Jayne Fleener's own book, *Curriculum Dynamics*, was published in the

series of Studies in Postmodern Theory of Education. The general editors of the series, Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg, provided some further underlying influence through Fleener's work.

However, a critical, interdisciplinary framework was not acceptable to most members of my committee. They questioned the whole field of critical pedagogy as "going off the deep end" and ending in sub-par quality research. "Stay within the social studies discipline if you want to graduate!" I did, but I kept finding critical theorists whose work made the most sense. What kind of foundation would be appropriate for research that conveyed my sense of social justice yet stayed within the boundaries of a mainstream philosophy acceptable to a dissertation committee at a large southwestern university in a "red" state? A single well-defined research approach left out so many relevant aspects for answering research questions. I needed more theoretical options, the kind that Kincheloe was describing with *the bricolage.*

I can identify with a bit of wisdom from Kincheloe about the context of our work. Joe openly shared the dilemma of some of his doctoral students as they sought academic positions. When they interviewed, university faculty search committees disparaged the whole notion of the bricolage as research methodology. They claimed it was too messy; it did not adhere to the standard guidelines. And so, students were not hired. As Joe warned in a speech at ICQI, "If one is focused on getting tenure, he or she should eschew interdisciplinarity; if one is interested in only doing good research, he or she should embrace it" (2001, pp. 680–681). I chose to complete a dissertation and get tenure.

The critical philosophers in education aligned with my social justice theology within the social principles of the United Methodist Church. I had to weave them together to engage in ethical research. I was to learn later that Joe's background also held some similar theological principles spurred to social consciousness with civil rights protests of the 1960s. Fire hoses, attack dogs, lunch counter sit-ins, and marches from Selma could not be ignored as young people came of age. A whole way of life in the South was turned on its ear and demanded some kind of framework for understanding what was going one.

Kincheloe's writing about *the bricolage* emerged to provide some framework. It was grounded in the imagery of hands-on workers adapting available resources to complete projects. But it was expanded metaphorically into academic dialogues that looked for the web of connections across disciplines. As I understand the idea, the scholar must possess an in-depth understanding of multiple disciplines to make sense of such social upheavals and to apply research methodologies from those fields to our academic studies. That's what I did not know then. I only had the pieces.

In Lectures Series

After I became a faculty member in College of Education at Texas Tech University, Doug Simpson, endowed chair professor, invited Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg to deliver a Jones Lecture Seminar (Fall 2008). There I experienced the

immediate connection JOE KINCHELOE established with individuals in the room, one-on-one, and listened to his stories that communicated the impact of educational work in the big picture of our society. Somewhere in the stories over those couple of days, he reminded us of his roots in the Tennessee mountains, a place frequently associated with southern poverty, ignorance, roughness, and a backwards life style. He exhibited none of those characteristics; instead we met a gentleman and a scholar who took time for conversation with each of us as though we had been longtime friends and colleagues. Some who had known Joe for a longer time assured us that was just who he was. Unfortunately, that was among his last seminars before Joe's untimely death in December, 2008.

I took away from the seminar a renewed concern for the questions. How could my work as a teacher educator contribute to democratically responsible schools, even in the red states of the Plains? I was fortunate that my university colleagues included Doug Simpson, an educational philosopher and Dewey scholar. He continued to organize seminars and facilitate critical conversations for just and ethical teacher education programs. He seemed to be getting back to the thirteen questions about what schools are for and what we should be doing in the name of education. What's missing in the public conversation? He said,

> "If teacher educators fail to dialogue democratically about the ideals and issues of teacher education curricula that reportedly nurture democratic values, then they have questionable ground for claiming they are the midwives of democracy. Instead they seem to be the servants of the dominant interest of factions in society and universities." (Simpson 2009, p. 478)

Through the Geographic Landscape

Several months after the lecture series, I had occasion to drive by myself through eastern Tennessee and began thinking about differences between living in the mountains and valleys and living in the open plains of West Texas. Narrow winding roads, hidden sunsets, running water along every road, huge forests, and community schools tucked in between contrasted with straight roads that stretched out miles ahead, big skies as a backdrop to full sunsets, dry creek beds, scraggly mesquite trees, and community schools standing out on the open prairie—one enfolding people in their sheltered places; the other opening to distant horizons.

In those sheltered mountain communities, I saw poverty typical of rural southern communities and visited schools struggling to educate their children. I talked with educators and community leaders who were initially suspicious of me as an outsider. But I also found those people who loved the hills and were open to conversation with me. They showed me their favorite places, shared meals with me, and told stories of growing up in the area as well as of its history. In the conversations, I was reminded how places do have a social history that is woven into the fabric of community values, traditions, practices, and even dreams of the future. For some, those dreams were thwarted by unresolved social justice issues of race, gender,

education, economics, politics, and religion. Questions about public education continued to allure me.

I thought about the influence of place on Joe Kincheloe's work, at least the small part of his work that I had encountered. It was multi-dimensional thinking. It was built on relationships with an open-access network of participants (some of whom were on the fringes of traditional structures), respect for persons, love of arts (especially music from the heart of Nashville and storytelling), and profound commitment to equity and justice. From Joe Kincheloe, I learned the value of putting together things you love in order to create your own voice and contribution.

Research and Practice: Connections Create Awareness and Understanding

After recalling the recurring experiences, the next step of the process as a reflective educator was to consider how I might synthesize the knowledge and evaluate the parts that recognized the influence of Joe Kincheloe on one educator. In keeping with the imagery of *the bricolage*, I considered two areas of my academic work in teacher education: (a) curriculum and instruction and (b) geography education. Content from these fields informed my scholarship, but if I focused my reflections with only the content, I would be missing the social context that was so much a part of the influence of JOE KINCHELOE. Thus, a third section considers the synergy of networks of people.

Curriculum and Instruction: Academic Study

In keeping with the idea of learning from reflection, I reviewed the final chapter of my dissertation (Todd 2003) that met the goal of being completed, but made only moderate contribution, at best, to the field. However, I find some elements of Kincheloe's potential influence as I note a concern for social justice in the "commitment to ideals of justice and fairness in a democratic society" and the references to "connecting fragments into wholeness". The importance of the context of teachers and learners and their places continued through my future work at the university and in the local/global community.

The legacy of the educative practices of classroom teachers is found in the personal stories with their students, their professional efforts to improve the quality of education through school-wide changes, and their commitment to the ideals of justice and fairness in a democratic society. Education in the twenty-first century relies on teachers who are engaged in knowing their material, connecting fragments into wholeness, and imagining learning as it might be. When achievement of these goals requires modification of a standardized program, they adapt practices in

the interest of educating their students for living in an environment that values multiple perspectives and celebrates the diversity in the global community (Todd 2003, p. 126).

Although, as a whole, my research carries limited significance, some points link to concepts I would revisit later. For example, Joe Kincheloe talks about education not being culturally separate from the place; those experiences and places are part of the context of the complex processes of teaching and learning. Kincheloe explained, "Divergent forms of research gain unique insight into multiple perspectives. …they become complex and critical when we appreciate the historical aspects of its formation" (2001, p. 687).

In my work, I knew place mattered. I insisted on a whole chapter describing the historic, social, and physical place of the study (Grunewald and Smith 2008). Plainview, the site of my research, is an integrated and international community, by chance, as a result of a large military post with extensive training and medical facilities, three Native American tribes as landholders, and its Anglo settlement that grew overnight to 10,000 with a land lottery in 1901. Military families continued to add spouses from around the world and the blending of cultures was evident in grocery stores, art exhibits, regional college courses, and festivals. Teachers in the study shared a commitment to social justice in the multi-racial community in spite of demands for more standardized curriculum and testing accountability. Administrators challenged the importance of interdisciplinary units with their middle school teams, but teachers were determined to meet particular needs of kids in their school by investing in relationships with kids. Their classrooms would be equitable, fair, just, and rigorous; the words "diversity" and "global communities" were more than rhetoric. Teachers brought with them the experiences of living overseas as military families and drew on that knowledge as they maintained high professional standards. These career teachers had a long-standing relationship with the particular community and an understanding of the local cultures that made a difference for these caring teachers.

As I examined my relationship to my research, I contemplated my own foundations of education. My educational philosophies reflected my years as a classroom teacher in public schools, primarily middle schools (sixth through eighth grades) in rural and suburban districts in the southern Midwest. But my educational beliefs are closely tied to my theology and seldom separate in practice. So I need to include here a section of potentially controversial social justice issues without which the whole body of work in critical pedagogy falls apart for me. In *13 Questions*, Kincheloe recognizes the significance of theological position in understanding beliefs in the formation of the bricolage. He does not shy away from including in his collections essays on religion along with race, class, and gender as significant aspects for dialogue in critical pedagogy.

In the work I pursued, my own understanding of educational theory and practice has always been expressed by my deeply held theological beliefs as taught through the Social Principles of the United Methodist Church (UMC). Through my whole adult life, I found study groups and regular interactions with thoughtful people putting beliefs into action to reduce injustice and oppression of people around the world.

Spanning back to the early twentieth century, a social creed was first adopted in 1908 by today's United Methodist predecessor denominations that have a long history of concern for social justice. Early Methodists expressed opposition to controversial issues of slave trade, smuggling, and child labor laws. The social principles are reviewed every four years by the General Conference with representative participants from the diverse membership of the Methodist church from around the globe.

Issues of social justice stimulate some of the most controversial dialogues that take place among the thousands of delegates as they seek to "evolve in light of new information, new biblical and theological insight, and the changing face of the world" (Social Principles 2004, p. 2) . More recently, discussions have addressed questions about responsible development of all energy resources, the sanctity of the marriage covenant, racial and ethnic groups demanding just and equal rights as members of society, health care as a basic human right, policies to alleviate causes of poverty, and access for all persons to free public elementary and secondary schools and to post-secondary schools of their choice. Principles are a call to "all members to a prayerful, studied dialogue of faith and practice" (p. 4). These principles inform my educational practices and decisions that include seeking justice for marginalized learners and providing opportunities for them to pursue their dreams.

Linked with the social justice issues are the civil rights actions that were not only political, but also theology in practice. Joe spoke often about the voices of peaceful protest to change those social conditions that denied some people the opportunities of employment, education, health care, and civic engagement. The historic context of the civil rights era evoked intense emotion in the South and from it emerged a cadre of powerful leaders from all walks of life that define the 1960s and influence all who shared the geographic place of the regional south even when we wanted to keep it in the shadows. Knowing that I share some influence from the regional South with JOE KINCHELOE, adds yet another dimension to my interpretations of his work.

Geography Education: Geographic and Spatial Perspective on Place

Curriculum and Instruction is the foundation of my academic studies with an emphasis in the field of social studies, specifically geography education. Thus, I include geographic/spatial perspectives about place in synthesizing knowledge and reflecting on experiences. The complexity of knowledge through the spatial lens provides yet another link for me with JOE KINCHELOE's Southern roots and the need for *the bricolage* in understanding the complexities of teaching and learning.

Geographic literacy includes the interpretation of text but also relies on visual / spatial knowledge to a greater extent than some other fields. The complexity of geographic literacy increases as we consider how the informed researcher must

acquire expertise in related fields to make sense of experiences. For example, initial geography learning focuses on facts about locations, places, and peoples; that level of geography study is generally what is measured on school geography tests but offers limited value to applying geographic understanding to informed decision-making. Initial factual information, however, does become the building blocks of a far more complex understanding of the physical and human processes taking place on the Earth's surface in particular places at particular times. Noted geographers seek understanding of related fields—such as geology, marine biology, anthropology, urban geography – to further geographic knowledge. It is a kind of bricolage.

Research in the field of geography in recent years has responded to the impact of technology on the social applications of spatial knowledge in a way that is accessible to scholars in many disciplines. Current tools of geography include multi-layered data within the powerful management and analysis systems of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). What used to be available only through very large, high dollar servers, is now available as a desktop application (ArcGIS). Users can select a base map layer of the physical surface landscape and overlay additional information to provide contexts relevant to their work. City planners may need the layer of utility lines, educators can add schools and public areas, students can add coffee shops, and curriculum writers can add photos and 3-D satellite imagery to accompany literature. Lessons on the civil rights era may include sites of conflict with linked photographs of 16th Street Baptist Church, video recordings of King's "I Have a Dream" speech, and documentary footage of the Selma march.

The National Research Council recognized that understanding of spaces was critical to solving problems in the twenty-first century. As a result, the Council assembled a team of outstanding geographers to create an accessible, academic document on spatial thinking which resulted in the book, *Learning to Think Spatially* (2006). In the text, the Committee on Support for Thinking Spatially comprised of Downs, Bednarz, Gersmehl and eleven other scholars, explained the need for better spatial understanding among the general public with three kinds of spatial learning found in everyday life and described experiences in terms of learning *about space, in space, and with space*.

The first category, *about space*, is described as our life spaces and the tasks related to our regular activities. Way finding among academics may mean moving from one teaching and learning environment to another. Joe grew up in the hills of Tennessee but had to learn about new life spaces as he relocated multiple times. Learning to think about space meant that he was frequently selecting a new place to live, moving belongings to larger/smaller house/office space, and orienting himself to streets in unfamiliar urban landscapes. Understanding of geographic concepts such as distance, direction, scale, shape, patterns became the essential skills needed to make informed decisions.

The second category, learning *in space*, focuses on physical/social spaces. It requires awareness of systems of transportation to get to campus, locations of

grocery stores with favorite foods, available entertainment venues, and even the laws of driving on right or left side of road. I believe that Joe was successful with these also. In my brief experience, I saw how easily he entered the social spaces as he interacted with whoever was present in the room. A conversational style and a ready smile brought people into his social space and frequently led to in-depth dialogues about the nuances of education/philosophical theories.

The third category identified by the Committee led by Downs and his spatial research colleagues was the intellectual space in which people worked *with space* on a more abstract level with scholarly networks and webs of influence drawing on mental imagery and special visualization. Downs et al. explained the interplay of time and space in intellectual space with the example of the DNA double helix. The breakthrough knowledge was more than creating the double helix model; it was in the relationships of the parts that Crick and Watson envisioned its changes in time and space. The spatial aspect of geography encourages the spatial organization of ideas as they overlap and transition, just as Joe explained in his many books, articles, and conversations.

What can we do WITH spatial understandings? Sinton (2013) collaborated with Gersmehl, Bednarz, and others to further investigate spatial thinking and arrived at the assertion that:

> We think with space to help us both learn and convey meaning to ourselves and others? When we put information, data, or knowledge in a special context, and "spatialize" it we are able to make sense out of the information through the arrangement itself. (Sinton, p. 23)

Consider the impact: What if the *Periodic Table of the Elements* was just a listing of all the information rather than a document that shows the patterns? The spatial structure provides access to the patterns that encourage a recognition of the relationships among them, and even directs research toward finding the missing elements.

Theories in geography explain those similar processes and patterns in historical events and engage in making decisions and solving problems of the present and future. To understand the spaces, a geographically literate person will "see meaning in the arrangement of things on Earth's surface, relations between people, places, and environments, and apply spatial and ecological perspectives to life situations" (Geography for Life 2, p. 7). For example, knowing that the global climate is changing can be verified by a layer of data on a base map. However, interpreting that data and envisioning what effects the conditions might have on rising sea levels, coastal cities, and sustaining environments addresses an in-depth analysis of the complexity associated with the initial information. The answers cannot be found by a single climatologist tracking the historic data. Rather, it requires the work of multiple geo-scientists and social scientists to make sense of the relationships of among the physical and human processes taking place over time. Geographers explain theory in spatial terms: "theory is more an explanation of our relation to nature" (*Geography for Life 2*, p. 7). The task of geography as a discipline is the study of spaces/places and the physical and human interactions that occur in the particular place.

Networks: People and Contexts

The notion of interactions among people and places is also a critical piece in educational theories. JOE KINCHELOE's writing recognizes the role of dialogues and interactions with students and colleagues in maintaining relevance in educational research. Paying attention to those rich relationships with students and colleagues, particularly those whose experiences and voices may have been marginalized, brings depth and complexity to questions and answers about what matters in education.

In each of my encounters with JOE KINCHELOE's work, concurrent social interactions with others enriched my understandings of both theory and practice. Discussions with university colleagues introduced me to new levels of study in areas such as place-based curriculum, narrative inquiry, cross-cultural research, participatory action research, and community engagement scholarship. My dialogue and collaborations with colleagues expanded and deepened the scope of my work that included submitting proposals, making presentations, writing manuscripts, and participating in conferences that challenged even more diverse thinking. The dynamic processes of learning as a teacher educator brought together an array of people and their insights that became my resources with relevance to addressing what is important in education.

Curriculum theorist William Doll (1993) noted that maintaining permeable boundaries among theories enriched curriculum. He further described these aspects of quality curriculum in terms of 4 R's: richness, rigor, recursion, and relations and showed them in a matrix with interconnections across the cells (1993). Much like an image of a web, the depth and complexity of knowledge increased as the connections expanded through peoples' explorations and investigations. In particular, it connects with Kincheloe's theory of *the bricolage* in understanding that recursiveness in learning is more than just repetition. Rather it is a creative and reflective process from which greater understanding emerges. More-of-the-same does not promote growth any more than repeatedly hitting a nail with a hammer. Similarly, Doll's understanding of rigor as "purposely looking for different alternatives, relations, connections" (p. 181) supports the search for depth of knowledge Joe Kincheloe always encouraged.

Bricolage Brings Hope

In the social development of the South and in my own life, the networks of diverse people and places also fostered a climate of hope for the future in times of despair. The conflict in the social context of the 1960s in the South brought together influential theologians, storytellers, poets, and politicians that shaped how we thought about education and why we needed to ask difficult questions. Rather than despair at the social conditions, leaders brought their disciplinary expertise to the

community with mixed results. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s leadership in times of widespread inequalities among African Americans brought a powerful voice for peace and justice in the troubled times. His words encouraged both black and white young adults to trust in the democratic processes in the larger social context assuring followers, that the "moral arc of the universe bends toward justice" (MLK 1967).

Joe Kincheloe added his voice to that network of people with hope for our society. As long as we don't get discouraged and give up, we believe that modes of schooling dedicated to democratic ideals, the capacity of all students to learn, rigorous scholarship that explores multiple viewpoints and knowledges from around the world, the professional sanctity of the career of teaching, the right of urban communities to control their own destinies, and education as the foundation of a humane, egalitarian society will prevail (2009, p. 406).

Coming Full Circle: Summary Thoughts

As I come full circle to the question of what education is for in a democratic society, I recall the dilemma of Kincheloe's students who presented their research with *the bricolage* approach and were not hired. I applaud them for taking the more challenging path. They cared too much about education, not just replicating a narrowed schooling curriculum that lacks relevance for young learners and understanding of other voices in our history. Those silenced voices were and continue to be marginalized between the lines of social studies textbooks without the stories that tell who they are and the real struggles of their lives (Anderson 2014, Steinberg & Canella 2012). Teaching such information and not just names and places to our children helps define and determine what it means to live in a socially just, multicultural world. The graduate students who were shunned represent the influence of a strong network of people that can encourage one another by asking relevant questions, respecting others, extending knowledge of ways of learning so we can use resources at hand. Like true artisans, the researcher uses a variety of discrete parts assembled into new formats to create enduring work. Having the tools at hand and knowing which is most effective for a particular job results in powerful artwork. We just often do not have the range of tools at hand to complete the job.

My reflective process about the influence of Joe Kincheloe leads me to the following points that represent beliefs that seem to recur in my professional life and remain relevant in time and spaces; that is, until new pieces challenge the big picture by knowledgeable, eloquent bricoleurs.

- Pay attention to unexpected relationships with people and places on the sidelines of your established world
- Keep focus on your passions and what you love
- Journey toward social responsibility for global citizens
- Embrace the perspectives of geographical places
- Celebrate what matters in the lives of people

Conclusion – Influences of Joe Kincheloe from Here and Now

The influence of my encounters with JOE KINCHELOE's world lies in the power of educational studies that encourages a critical and reflective perspective on recurring experiences and draws upon diverse resources appropriate to the particular people and places impacted by actions at a specific time in history. The theory of the *bricolage*, thus, encourages us to engage in the process that results in meaningful education in a democratic society and provides an answer to the question of the purpose of education in our schools.

For me, the process of reviewing and reflecting on the influence of Joe Kincheloe supports a commitment to public education that is respectful, equitable, just, rigorous, academically multidisciplinary, and philosophically multi-dimensional, yet it also creates conflicts with my Southern roots and the injustices perpetuated by my generational family history. My experience within the social history of the time and place included hearing frequent use of derogatory language based on race, receiving childhood punishments for social interactions with marginalized people, and a high-profile legal case by my state Supreme Court Justice great-grandfather supporting racial inequities. Before such disrespect resulted in the civil rights movement of the 1960s calling for social justice, I encountered others who did not condone such practices. I engaged in academic studies, lived in other regions of the United States, and connected with networks of culturally diverse people. The final segment of my dissertation gives a snapshot of an emerging academic voice in public education and a quest for educational leaders to support my growth toward understanding of meaningful pedagogy for theory and practice. I was finding my way.

Joe Kincheloe's critical pedagogy and his extensive writing continue to encourage educators to ask important questions and seek answers that include experiences and understandings that are inclusive, equitable, just, and respectful of our differences. Each time the life-circle widens with increasing networks of colleagues, students, events, friends and family, yet another dimension of knowledge and understanding emerge. Some refer to this phenomenon as synergy –creative and intellectual explorations that are greater than our separate individual work. Synergy is seen in an increased awareness of the complexity of our world and the people we encounter along the way. As we venture across the boundaries throughout space, in space, and with space, we glimpse a more global perspective from visionary educational leaders who see a hopeful future. In the words of one such eloquent speaker, Martin Luther King, Jr., "The moral arc of the universe does bend toward justice" (MLK 1967) and Kincheloe adds, "when we work together for a humane, egalitarian society" (Kincheloe 2009, p. 406).

References

Anderson, J. (2014). *Education of blacks in the south 1860–1935: A long shadow in the American pursuit of political justice and education equality*. Lecture presented at the American Educational Research Association's Eleventh Annual Brown Lecture, October 23, Washington, DC.

Bruner, J. (1996). *Culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Committee on Support for Thinking Spatially. (2006). *Learning to think spatially*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fleener, M. J. (2002). *Curriculum dynamics: Recreating heart*. New York: Peter Lang.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grunewald, D. A., & Smith, G. (2008). *Place-based learning in the global age*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heffron, S. G., & Downs, R. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Geography for life: National geography standards* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: National Council for Geographic Education.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*(6), 679–692.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2009). No short cuts in urban education. In S. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism* (pp. 380–409). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (1992). *Thirteen questions: Reframing education's conversation*. New York: Peter Lang.

King, M. L. Jr. (1967). *Where do we go from here?* Speech given at 11th Annual Southern Leadership Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Simpson, D. J. (2009). The high stakes of artificial dialogue in teacher education. *Teacher Education and Practice, 22*(4), 478–481.

Sinton, D. S. *People's guide to spatial thinking*. Washington, DC: National Council for Geographic Education

Steinberg, S. (Ed.). (2009). *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader*. New York: Peter Lang.

Steinberg, S. R., & Cannella, G. (Eds.). (2012). *Critical qualitative research reader*. New York: Peter Lang.

Todd, R. H. (2003). *Modifying social studies curriculum in the classroom: Case study regarding inclusive practices for engaging young adolescents in learning in the face of external constraints.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.

United Methodist Church. (2004). *Social principles of the United Methodist Church: 2005–2008*. Nashville: General Board of the United Methodist Church.

Reese H. Todd is an emeritus associate professor in Curriculum and Instruction with the College of Education at Texas Tech University and currently lives in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Her career experience with middle school and community college educators led to a wide range of innovative, participatory collaborations among higher education faculty and K-12 school partners and informal educators. She continues to engage in international work projects, community service, educational travel, the arts, and development of inclusive curriculum. Her publications and research include teacher education, geographic literacy, service learning, and qualitative research methods.

The Dispositions of Teachers as Researchers: A Call to Action

Mary Frances Agnello

Background

Because of the steady and sure closing in on education from all sides—including policies by national, state, and local governments, ventures by capitalists, reactionary takeovers by far-right conservatives under the guises of American patriotism, accountability, efficiency, morality and the mandate to retain a world dominant position, teachers who dare to talk back to authority, who possess the audacity to not teach to the test, who have professional and moral imperatives as their professional compass and thus stray from the script, or who might dare to listen to the students, are a rare breed. Nonetheless, if every student has at least one of these teachers, glimmers of what Deweyian democratically informed education should be, make lasting imprints on citizens of next generations. I write this paper to discuss Joe Kincheloe's concept of teacher as researcher (1991) based on ten tenets he posited in *Toward a Critical Politics of Teacher Thinking: Mapping the Postmodern* (1993) and dedicate it to the spirit of critical education and critical literacy which are both possible if teachers develop their intellectual, political, and cultural capacities.

M.F. Agnello (✉)
Akita International University, Japan, Akita 010-1292, Japan
e-mail: maryfrancesagnello@aiu.ac.jp

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_4

Kincheloe's Ten Commandments of Critical Teacher as Researcher

A Humanist Critical/Hermeneutical Look at Joe L. Kincheloe and a Self-Reflection

I will cite the following ten precepts or commandments preached by Kincheloe and elaborate on each of them as I see them as outward signs of Joe's character and influences on me, commenting on practical applications of each of them to the holistic praxis of democratic pedagogy. Informed by critical, feminist, phenomenologist, humanist and democratic communitarianist theories, these ten commandments of postformal teaching include the following dispositions: inquiry orientation, power insights, commitment to world making, dedication to improvisational dialog, situatedness in social contexts, critical self- and social awareness, democratic self-direction, cognizance and responsiveness to multicultural educational perspectives, implementation of action, and priority given to human interrelationships. The following summation addresses each of these attributes and puts them into a Kincheloean and Agnelloean context—juxtaposing two regional experiences in the South—not identical, yet similar in the ways in which race, class, and gender determined who got the goods and who did not.

1. **Teachers as researchers are inquiry oriented**: Teachers can take action when they have information upon which to progress. They acquire such information as they observe their classrooms reflecting upon teacher and student behaviors informed optimally through problem posing about the curriculum, everyday life, and society in general. Joe knew through his own life how and why to question his observations. I too would disrupt authoritarian expectations of my behaviors by simply asking, "Why?" As the "why" of situations —both big and small—are addressed, a dialog ensues. Such a dialog opens the door to many possibilities that teachers create for curious students. Unfortunately the curiosity that all children have can be socialized out of students who realize it is a lot less trouble to do what one is told, rather than to complicate things by asking questions or be regarded as impudent for asking, "why?". Joe and we know from our experiences in education that real learning is often a lot of work or trouble. Yet, we embrace such inquiry oriented learning.
2. **Teachers as researchers realize that learning is socially contextualized and they are informed about power**: Teachers with sociological imaginations can see and observe who exercises power and how it is exercised over others. They recognize the degree to which power and resources are allocated equally or unequally in broad and local contexts. In Tennessee through his church experiences and his family's connections to school, Joe saw how power was exercised and by whom, as well as how people formed their social beliefs through educative processes. He was unafraid to protest the Vietnam War and suffered the consequences in his conservative college. Although not the South of Tennessee

that Joe described in much of his work, Texas provided me a socio-political state of mind where there was a hierarchy of power and influence that was visible in financial institutions and political exchanges in my small town outside of Houston. Brought up in a farming environment, I saw who worked and how people were regarded. I spoke out. I often got in trouble for it. Nonetheless, I tried to comprehend how the social interactions in which I was involved at school were related to many factors, most of them beyond my control. The knowledge of how power was exercised through acts of racism, classism, and sexism would serve to kindle Joe's critical spirit of researching teachers. Joe helped me articulate what I saw and experienced in classrooms as a teacher and as a student. Racism was clearly an aberration of power and Christian values, and I could discern it in my social contexts. However, classism and sexism were so tacit that they were difficult to distinguish in our omnipresent patriarchy. It was through my readings and work with Joe that I could name the sexism and classism I had experienced in education since the beginning, as well as in the schools where I taught.

3. **Teachers as researchers are committed to world making**: Teachers understand that they pass formal knowledge to students. However, more importantly, they comprehend how their students also produce knowledge creating a classroom world of idea exchange. In the current testing environment, researching teachers discover why their students are unable to perform on standardized measures of formal knowledge, as well as address their needs. Teachers as intellectuals also recognize the many kinds of knowledge that students possess embracing and accepting that knowledge as foundations for building future knowledge. Joe helped create learning worlds all around the globe through his interpersonal relationships and his scholarship. I currently work in a Japanese university environment where the community of students is seeking possibilities for transforming the world by becoming global leaders. I encourage university students who say of their ambitions, "I want to be a teacher, and so I do not see myself as a global leader." I tell them, "You want to be a teacher which is the most important global leader there is." I tell them this because I believe it. Joe believed it, and he helped me to believe in myself as a teacher who "makes the world".
4. **Teachers as researchers are dedicated to teaching as an art of improvisation**: Teachers are extemporaneous as they think, reflect, and teach in reaction to their students. They build trust in their classrooms so that students flourish in risk-free environments. Joe was a musician with a comedic personality who studied culture imitating and satirizing it, creating a pleasant environment in which people could advance their ideas. Joe was always prepared to move an audience with research that astounded. I have been told that I am dramatic. I do better sometimes than others in my improvisation of teaching. No matter what the outcome, my teaching improvisation is always best when I am prepared to teach and advance student learning from where it stopped during the last class. Students appreciate my ability to remember things they have shared in past classes in future contexts. I also try to ensure that some of the structure of class

is relaxed so that there can be a dialog and exchange of ideas that is fluid and fun—yet serious and critically grounded.

5. **Teachers as researchers are able to cultivate and respond to situated participation**: Teachers set the stage with props, materials, media, discourse, and body language for students' words, concerns, and experiences. The researching teacher makes professionally informed decisions about how to teach students, as well as the kinds of lessons that will have the most impact. Joe cultivated his participatory skills and measures based on Appalachia, Native America, urban and rural schools, educational policy, popular culture, broad study across a spectrum of disciplines, and creativity situated in the present no matter where he was. Looking at Joe's experiences as an observer, mentee, and student, I see myself as inspired by unpretentious genius. For most of my career, I have worked in a very conservative environment which has its own set of barriers to participation, not the least of which is white privilege. Getting past my understanding of white privilege in the United States, I situated myself with my students who were mostly Anglo, and who work two and three jobs while enrolled in university classes. They too are trying to overcome their backgrounds and see themselves as meritorious. My job often became that of helping them to see how their future students from different and marginalized backgrounds have not reaped the benefits of many aspects of schooling from the literacy curriculum to the extra-curriculum which is not a lived democratic experience for many students. As critics of an undemocratic educational system, I model for students who assume that everyone starts at the same place in their quest for education, a critique of a system that does not include, inspire, or reward everyone fairly, equitably, or democratically. Helping future teachers and students understand the need to situate ourselves in the community where schools reside promotes an anthropological holism that ideally results in contextualized learning and that benefits students, rather than disadvantages them. Joe's research and theory both were the north star and a sign post to criticalist educators in this respect. Put simply, when we are in doubt, we need to ask our students.
6. **Teachers as researchers are professionally directed by critical, self-, and social reflection**: Teachers who are in constant dialog with themselves, their educational communities, and other professionals, in addition to students, understand that it matters how we speak to each other in classrooms. Working with students to see the world through various kinds of lenses and from several perspectives involves taking risks and being vulnerable. It means that we look at determiners of educational opportunities prior to and during students' schooling experience. Joe was a criticalist informed by feminists, the Frankfurt School, Marx, Foucault, and Freire, among other theorists (Kincheloe and McLaren 1994). He read the word and the world; he acted politically inside and outside the academy. His prolific scholarship embodied critical, self-, and social reflection. As I find myself in the midst of a professional wasteland with tenured faculty too afraid to speak, professionals protecting dishonest scoundrels in administrative roles because they want to be nice, and academic, as well as teacher knowledge diminished by rewritten and unspoken policies, I am spurred

to action. I will not be daunted in the face of adversity, and I know that I can be a better mentor to my students if I am constantly directed by critical, self-, and social reflection to enhance formal knowledge and scholarship. Joe walked the walk and talked the talk—bringing critique to the forefront as the place from which to transform ourselves, society, and the world. I am not nearly as evolved as Joe was in his ability to be a radical listener, but I have models who were inspired and mentored by Joe. Through critical self- and social- reflection, I can be a better person and educator. Joe modeled a relaxed sage who was quick to self deprecate and critique social and cultural practices that impede democratic ways of life.

7. **Teachers as researchers are concerned with and inspired by democratic self-directed education**: Teachers who are, first of all, informed about democratic classrooms, and second of all, embrace them, are promoters of their students' abilities and rights to speak, disagree, create, point out teacher errors, and most importantly to engage in their own education. Joe was driven by such democratic principles. With a foundations-of-education insight, he taught what he believed and in the manner in which he could provide students with the tools to be their own navigators of learning. He taught me as a doctoral mentor in this manner. A few educators dedicated to the vision of democratic and ethical education can make a difference in a great wasteland of educational challenges we see at every turn. I work very hard to inspire students to gear their learning to their interests. This might seem a simple task; yet it is difficult in a spoon-fed testing environment to give students such freedom because many of them have not experienced it before. The down side of allowing students to pursue their interests is a perception on the students' parts that the teacher is not well qualified or is somehow unprepared. Enriching students' learning reflects in many academic and cultural exchanges. Rigor of self and social analysis and relaxed "being" in the classroom are complementary as they inform democratic approaches to teaching and learning.
8. **Teachers as researchers are cognizant and responsive to multicultural educational perspectives**: Teachers who understand and value multiculturalism understand how dominant discourses, textbooks, testing curriculum, and unreflective education, in general, overpower marginalized perspectives in the classroom, school, and society. Joe was not willing to settle for educational experiences in which racism, classism, and sexism prevailed. My work with Joe had several effects on me: I learned how to articulate many kinds of ostracism, I was inspired to learn more about native knowledges, and I take every opportunity to participate in workshops on gender, race, and class, as well as the arts. I believe that my teaching and research are better for such participation—not only more informed, but also more metacognitive, creative, and driven by research. Joe was not willing to accept the racist, classist, and sexist curriculum as the focus of education, and showed us how to address its deficits multiculturally.
9. **Teachers as researchers are geared toward action**: Teachers who possess critical insights avert the forces of the educational hierarchy to overdetermine

meanings for their students. The education process initiates with thought and moves to generate educative action through problem posing. Joe allowed his students, including me, to pose serious and academically articulatable problems. He guided but did not lead. He supported but did not coddle. He allowed his students to create meaning for themselves. I have taught action research, curriculum theory classes, teacher education, and foundations of education for two decades relying on Joe's approaches and scholarship. In all of my teaching, I work with students to ascertain actionable learning that they can implement in their own social or professional settings. Teaching in this manner is not always a smooth endeavor because many times students want to be told what to learn, what they need to do, and how many points they need to earn an A. They are not necessarily concerned with transforming society or the world. Yet, their projects often reflected transformation in their own contexts constituting their world.

10. **Teachers as researchers are guided by consideration for human interrelationships**: Teachers who practice feminist pedagogical strategies through nurturing networks motivate their learners by encouraging and valuing emotional reflection in action-oriented education. Joe was a promoter of feminist philosophy, theory, and research, as well as activism. He embraced feminism and its tenets. It is obvious in his caring and careful scholarship, as well as in the ways in which he comported himself with this students and protégés. Acting in a protective stance over his students who often were marginalized or doing work in the margins, Kincheloe promoted intellectual development with kindness and nurturing. Pursuing the scholarship that resulted in my dissertation a Peter Lang publication, *A Postmodern Literacy Policy Analysis* (Agnello 2001), the discourse analysis strategies that Joe shared with me inform all of my literacy and financial literacy research, policy considerations, and teaching methods.

Conclusion

The impact of Joe Kincheloe's work as an educator of teachers, philosophers and historians of education, as well as research methodologists is still flourishing in pockets. It is the kind of work that will not go out of style in a society that prides itself on democracy and democratic schooling. Empowering teachers to be contextually grounded researchers committed to creating a better world through improvised and situated participation informed by critical self- and social reflection dedicated to developing students driven by democratic self-directed, multicultural, humanistic, and action oriented values was a tall order (Kincheloe et. al 2011). But it was one that took Dewey's vision of democratic education to the next level, a transition needed in the sociopolitical and economic environment in which we find ourselves presently. Joe L. Kincheloe was a scholar and an activist – caring and driven. When I want to quit, thinking about Joe and Paulo, as well as the next generation influenced by Joe, keeps me going (Brock et al. 2011).

And so Joe, though I miss the Tennessee accent that characterized your preaching and would have preferred that you have articulated these guidelines that follow here. I have improvised the following ten commandments and dedicate them to a multicultural way of comporting ourselves as researching teachers in your honor:

- As teachers as researchers we shalt allow all to ask questions and not put ourselves, our questions, or our priorities into a position of superiority over those of our students.
- We shalt not put wealthy, elitist, or megalomaniacal behavior above honest democratic leadership in classrooms as democratic communities.
- We shalt not worship those who profit politically by preying on the downtrodden and destroying the planet because we are committed to world making.
- We shalt participate meaningfully in an artistic and spontaneous way of teaching and learning.
- We shalt remember to save some time for self, family, and spiritual renewal, as well as for communion with nature as we cultivate and participate in the life of the classroom, school, and community.
- We as researching teachers are inspired to exercise critical, self, and social reflection as we participate with our students to do the same.
- We recognize that democratic self-directed education is optimal and we should not abuse power, wealth, or position to belittle or disadvantage people, nor should we ever make others feel small as they pursue their own visions of education for social advancement, success, or credential.
- We teachers as researchers are knowledgeable about, recognize, value, and embrace multiculturalism and diverse perspectives and are always open to expanding our repertoire of understanding students' cultures as we experience them through schooling and education writ large.
- We teachers as researchers understand that literacy for praxis—reading the word and world– inform generative teaching and learning for taking action in transforming the world of classrooms, schools, and communities.
- We teachers as researchers love our students because they provide us the fire for engaging in productive human interactions and interrelationships that are the most valuable outcome of education, not only in our immediate circles, but also in the ever expanding networks of people and their projects—local and global.

Important to the success of teachers, we must model such behaviors for our students because they know when we are authentic and not.

Finally we should remember that faith, hope, and love are the most important human virtues and that teaching as Joe L. Kincheloe taught and advocated is an act of love. Teachers as researchers teach as an act of radical love if they follow these ten precepts he so carefully illustrated for us.

References

Agnello, M. F. (2001). *A postmodern literacy policy analysis*. New York: Peter Lang.
Brock, R., Malott, C. S., & Villaverde, L. E. (2011). *Teaching Joe L. Kincheloe*. New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquire as a path to empowerment*. New York: Falmer Press.
Kincheloe, J. L. (1993). *Toward a critical politics of teacher thinking: Mapping the postmodern*. Westport: Bergin and Garvey.
Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (1994). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The qualitative research handbook* (pp. 138–157). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Kincheloe, J. L., Hayes, K., Steinberg, S., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Key works in critical pedagogy*. Boston: Sense Publishers.

Mary Frances Agnello is currently an associate professor at Akita International University in Japan. She did her undergraduate studies at The University of Texas at Austin in French, government, and teacher education. Her master's and doctoral degrees are from Texas A&M University in College Station. She has been faculty in Foundations of Education, Teacher Education, and Curriculum Studies at The University of Texas at San Antonio and was tenured at Texas Tech University. She is teaching writing and literature in the English for Academic Purposes Department as Liberal Arts faculty at AIU continuing to research discourses of language, literacy, and culture, as well as educational policy and comparative education. Her books include *A Postmodern Literacy Policy Analysis* (2001) and a co-edited volume *A Critically Compassionate Approach to Financial Literacy* (2015).

Part II
Joe L. Kincheloe: Transforming the World

Poem – Joe L. Kincheloe

Layla in my living room
You played it on the grand piano after
I saw you looking at my self-portrait hidden in the corner
How we long for your velvet Tennessee voice

Enlivening, envisioning
Your energy preceded you
With a heart for love
And a love for life
Your intellectual guidance helped us name the strife

And so in Baltimore
The racial struggle continues
Police killing blacks
People pretending the National Guard will make it right
As our brave black President recommends soul searching
We had already done that with insight re-searching sisters of soul

Your love for place and the local
Your recollection of concrete and abstraction
So many ways that you reached us "as restless warriors"
Through songs from your heart
Lyrics flowing from your genteel
And cadenced brilliance

We knew greatness in our midst
You were teacher and friend
Right before you left
You played Layla in my living room

At home in every setting
A mercurial messenger, you inscribed
Meaning from the blackness of
Philosophical spaces
Tattooing us with your re-visions

Unafraid to take on the religious right, fascist freaks,
And good ol' boys of science in the all of Foucault's

Social, economic, and cultural nexes of earthly inferno
We offer you thanks and salute Joe Kincheloe,
Whose echoes of laughter we hear in our heads

The one we miss more than our kin
Better than a best friend, here but absent
Tickling piano keys singing
You brought us to our knees
Better yet you bring us to our feet
Marching for righteous-ness

You bring us to the word
Reassuring us that we can speak
Naming the violence, oppression, opposition, transgression
With clarity of thought and preaching
Responsive to aggression
Talking baseball and playing Layla in the hotel halls

No need to go to the temple
No need to long for more
Though we do
We are here in the now
Braver because of you
Smarter than before

Legacies can taint the remnants of historical figures
But in your case
We celebrate the man, the breadth of the work
With empathic fortitude to listen
Leading us with your words
Leaving us with your music

I will never forget you played Layla in my living room.

Evolving Criticality for a Transnational Public Pedagogy

Cathryn Teasley

Activating Criticality

My relationship with Joe Kincheloe has always been textual, save a brief, face-to-face encounter in a University of Illinois parking lot during the 2004 Crossroads conference in Urbana. At that chance meeting, I commented to him that several of his articles, as well as the book he edited with Shirley Steinberg in 1998, *Unauthorized Methods: Strategies for Critical Teaching*, had impacted me greatly because, for me, they were… "righteous". At that, Joe—unable to suppress his characteristically quick wit—matched my out-dated hippy expression with a, "Right on, Cathryn!", coming to realize nonetheless (and following some additional exchange) that the book had helped me in crucial ways to change my thinking about teaching and other aspects of my professional praxis as an educator. In fact, Joe's work had served as a catalyst for establishing the connection between Paulo Freire's groundbreaking *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970)—an essential read back in the days of my teacher preparation program (1984–1985) at the University of California at Berkeley—and my work as a novice teacher in a relatively well-off northern Californian public school. I had found it quite challenging to work Freirean pedagogical principles into that learning context, even as I saw the need to do so.

In 1991 I had left California in order to move to Spain, but had returned to Berkeley in 1998 to conduct some doctoral research. During that stay I visited the independent bookstore Cody's Books, and although their education section was small, it was the largest in the city, their selection of titles one of the most critically informed.[1] I spotted the book *Unauthorized Methods*, which immediately felt like a

[1] Sadly, Cody's could not compete with the increasingly monopolistic corporate marketing of books, and went out of business in 2008.

C. Teasley (✉)
Department of Pedagogy and Curriculum Studies – Faculty of the Educational Sciences, University of A Coruña, A Coruña 15071, Spain
e-mail: cathryn.teasley1@udc.es

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*, Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_5

breath of fresh air. I then recognized the surname Kincheloe, all the time imagining Joe was of Hawai'ian origin; "Kincheloe" just sounded Hawai'ian to me! How surprised I was to finally learn, in 2004, that, far from an indigenous islander, Joe was a white Appalachian with a distinct southern accent.

In more ways than one, then, Joe Kincheloe had helped me break down preconceptions and paradigms, his writings becoming a faithful companion in my own quest to establish the link between the messages of critical pedagogy and transformative teaching practice in diverse educational contexts. One of the most powerful messages emphasized in *Unauthorized Methods*, but also throughout Joe's scholarship—as the recent books *Key Works in Critical Pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe* (Hayes et al. 2011) and *Teaching Joe Kincheloe* (Brock et al. 2011) attest to—is the need for educators to constantly question authority by asking ourselves, our students, and the school communities we serve the questions: Whose interests does the curriculum actually serve; whose interests does it least serve, leave out, or even harm; and why? And a related, crucial question: How might we make our pedagogies "go public," in the sense of serving the rights and needs of the many, not the few, in a globalizing world?

This critical consciousness around power, representation and social justice worked its way into my educational practice via Joe's work, a poignant example of which comes to mind. During the 1998–1999 academic year, I joined the ranks of educators set on defending bilingual education in California against an English-only movement which was gaining momentum throughout the 1980s and 1990s among politicians and media agents, and consequently, the general public. So I volunteered to participate in fieldwork with a group of Berkeley-based researchers coordinated by the now emeritus professor and sociolinguist specializing in bilingual cross-cultural education, Lily Wong Fillmore. Lily helped lead the collective struggle against the so-called "English For the Children" or "Unz Initiative" (Proposition 227), which would eventually severely restrict the continuation of bilingual education in California. In the end we lost that battle, but we knew the fight was not over. In fact, I had joined that struggle because I had always questioned the unfounded authority of, and interests behind, the English-only agenda for education in the United States context. And that questioning was often guided by reading Joe's relentless commitment to transforming education into a more broadly fulfilling, empowering and emancipating project—a commitment that was transmitted, for example, through his and Shirley Steinberg's reflections on cross-cultural justice, post-formal thinking and critical consciousness in *Changing Multiculturalism* (Kincheloe and Steinberg 1997); and later, through Joe's multi-perspectivial "bricolage" approach to breaking down the cultural and structural modes of reproducing disadvantage and inequality under capitalism through pedagogical thought and praxis (Kincheloe 2006, 2007).

My participation in the fight against the English-only agenda was also motivated by that initial teaching assignment in California in 1985–1986, where I was placed in charge of a "pull-out" bilingual education program at the aforementioned elementary school.[2] Soon after being hired, a district level memo arrived mandating

[2]The program served students of immigrant origin who, in order to attend, had to leave their mainstream classrooms for certain periods of the school day.

that district programs like the one I ran be renamed to "English Language Acquisition Centers". While I had to comply with the renaming mandate, I nonetheless continued to dedicate a significant portion of program time to the "unauthorized" teaching of curricular contents in Spanish.

That decision to resist District policy eventually led to a (dreaded) personal visit from the superintendant of the city's schools. She interrogated me on my pedagogy in an attempt to elicit a convincing justification for—or, more likely, to make me desist from—continuing to teach in Spanish. I centered my defense on some broadly influential empirical studies (some of which were fairly recent at the time) reflecting comparative achievement levels of students coming from minority-language households and educated either through monolingual or bilingual programs, this from research I had been reviewing through a bilingual master's program.[3] Aside from those studies, I further argued in favor of equal access to learning because I knew the deeper issue at stake was cross-cultural social justice, although at the time I lacked the discursive resources of critical pedagogy to best transmit that idea—a void that Joe's work would help fill later on. In any case, I managed to convince the superintendent that first-language instruction had clear benefits for "underachieving" migrant students, and so was able to retain my job and even carry on with limited bilingual instruction.

Evolving Criticality

Considering, then, that promoting a truly critical, activist pedagogy can in these ways be daunting, I found crucial support in Joe's rigorous development of alternative epistemological perspectives that reveal how educational practice is historically constructed in response to the constant challenges, or dialectic, presented by diverse interest groups. As he stated, educating is "an ambiguous phenomenon as it takes place in numerous settings, is molded by numerous and often invisible forces and structures, and can operate under the flag of democracy and justice in oppressive and totalitarian ways" (Kincheloe 2007, p. 16). His notion of an "evolving criticality" is key here in that it sets forth one of several tools for grappling with dominant demands and power-plays, as well as the resulting injustices and contradictions emerging from educational contexts:

> In the epistemological domain White, male, class-elitist, heterosexist, imperial, and colonial privilege often operates by asserting the power to claim objectivity and neutrality. Indeed the owners of privilege often own the "franchise" on reason, rationality, and truth. An evolving criticality possesses a variety of tools to expose such power politics. In this context it asserts that criticality is well-served by drawing upon numerous discourses and including diverse groups of marginalized peoples and their allies in the nonhierarchical collection of critical analysts. Here rests the heart of critical multilogicality, with its feet firmly planted in an understanding of political and economic conditions and its ear attuned to new ways of seeing the world. (Kincheloe 2007 p. 19)

[3] I cited findings drawn mostly from Heath (1986), Cummins (1986), Lambert and Tucker (1972) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukamaa (1976).

This idea of keeping one's criticality evolving is not only motivational; it is *vital* if we truly believe, as did Joe, that a primary goal of education is to emancipate ways of knowing from oppressive frames and forms of control that limit how we interpret our social reality—a goal pursued not only by Freire (1970) but by Foucault (1980) as well, the latter having developed his genealogical method for identifying and moving beyond "subjugated knowledges."

One oppressive frame currently subjugating our epistemological lens can be found in the unsustainable and yet overwhelmingly normalized project for establishing a new world order under an ultraliberal form of capitalist democracy. Characterized by a shrinking welfare state resulting from an ever expanding "free" market system, the central tenet and driving force behind this neoliberal tendency consists of maximizing human and natural resource exploitation, for profit, by reducing to a minimum public control over (and limits on) that exploitation.[4] In today's world, this virtually unbridled form of capital accumulation can now easily and speedily cross multiple state borders with the help of advanced technologies, communications and transportation (Bauman 2006; Castells 2009; Kincheloe and Steinberg 2010). Not only that, but as Joe and numerous social theorists have pointed out, neoliberal capitalist democracy has been artificially constructed by its promoters as the *only* viable form of political economy or social order now worth pursuing.[5]

Mainstream economic theorists know that unchecked capitalism leads to the concentration of profit/capital in ever fewer hands. And yet this tendency is now subjected to fewer and fewer controls, even as it is relegating the majority of the world's populations to limited and subsistence-level working and living conditions, especially in the global South. Consider, for example, the implications of the fact that the wealthiest one percent worldwide now owns nearly 50 % of the world's assets, while the bottom half of the global population combined owns less than one percent of the entire planet's wealth.[6] But the operations of neoliberalism do not end there; they simultaneously engage other strategies such as: privatizing the social institutions and services traditionally provided by formerly more robust welfare states, including educational systems; or (re)producing and commercializing market-friendly cultural norms, practices and products—this involving the production of knowledge itself—and aiming these productions at world populations, envisioned as consumers. It also leads to depleting the planet's interconnected ecosystems, the

[4] Exceptions to this rule are applied when the economic elite find themselves in financial trouble. For example, governments will generally come to the rescue of recurring economic crises by supplying public bail-out funds to banks and investment agencies, and will tend to protect their countries' large corporations from foreign competition by offering the former hefty subsidies and tax reductions, or by imposing importation duties.

[5] For various angles on this assertion, see e.g.: Ball (2012), Bauman (2003, 2013), Bourdieu (1998), Callinicos (2009), Chomsky and McChesney (2011), Eagleton (2011), Hall (2011), Harvey (2007), Kincheloe (2008), Klein (2008) or Torres Santomé (2001).

[6] According to the *Global Wealth Report 2014*: "[T]he bottom half of the global population own less than 1 % of total wealth. In sharp contrast, the richest decile hold 87 % of the world's wealth, and the top percentile alone account for 48.2 % of global assets" (Credit Suisse 2014, p. 11).

effects of which are multiple and potentially devastating, just one being the threat posed to alternative and indigenous approaches to social coexistence and knowledge production, most of which is more directly connected to those ecosystems (Kincheloe 2008; Kincheloe and Steinberg 2010; Santos 2008, 2010; Shiva 1997, 2005).

Given this socially imbalanced and destructive global scenario, minds that are ethically and historically informed—and in this way, less subjugated—can more clearly see the unjust workings and repercussions of such a "system," and thus stand a better chance at exploring and developing more socially just alternatives. For this purpose, transforming the oppressive worldview of neoliberalism and its workings is not merely an ideal but a real goal I have strived to contribute to through my own pedagogical praxis, and to pass on to my university students who are becoming teachers. For instance, since joining the Education Faculty at the University of A Coruña, I have worked to expose the exacerbation of social inequality caused not only by neoliberalism, but by the concomitant epistemological subjugation generated by a nuanced form of hegemonic positivism, which Joe referred to as FIDUROD: Formal, Intractable, Decontextualized, Universalistic, Reductionistic and One Dimensional modes of knowledge production (Kincheloe 2008). To better grasp the *modus operandi* of FIDUROD, a deeper understanding of the complex multilogicality that informs the interpretation of our world—or what Joe called the "bricolage" (Kincheloe 2006, 2007)—can be revealing, as is dissecting the multidimensional manifestations of power as they operate within and through the various spheres and levels of knowledge production.

In my praxis I aim to do this by incorporating critical, cross-cultural and intersectional perspectives into classroom analysis of dominant social and educational structures, policies, discourses, practices, trends and realities. Working with students, then, to situate key social and educational issues within their historical, political and epistemological contexts, facilitates this critical analysis. In all of the courses I teach, for instance, my students and I collectively analyze at least one educationally relevant news item or current event every week. To offer a brief example: what may at first seem to be a positive educational development in Spain, at closer inspection may not prove so encouraging. In a recent press conference, Ministry of Education spokeswoman Montserrat Gomendio reported a significant decrease in the otherwise high dropout rate from compulsory secondary education (the compulsory part of which ends after age 16), the rate having dropped from 26.5 % in 2011 to 23 % in 2013. During her announcement Gomendio suggested that this trend was related to a supposed improvement in the educational system since 2011, the same year, coincidentally, that the current conservative administration took power. What this public agent failed to address, however, was an alternative and much more plausible reason for why youth were deciding to remain in secondary school longer. Since the world financial crisis hit Spain following 2008, growing numbers of the working-aged school population (16–18 years old) have been remaining in secondary school or vocational training due in large part to the enormous unemployment rate faced by their age group, now representing over 53 % of the working-aged population under 25 years old (see Herrera 2014; El Diario 2014). In fact, prior to 2008 (the first year of the crisis), the dropout rate in Spain had reached a whopping 28.4 %, during the

2006–2007 school year (Fernández et al. 2010), but had then begun to fall. It clearly did not proceed from any educational policies put in place by the conservatives because they came into power three years after the dropout rate began its downward turn. The trend coincided quite closely, on the other hand, with the evolution of the financial crisis in Spain, and thus begged to be situated in its greater social and historical context in order to be better understood. It is through critical analytical exercises of this kind that students can come to see the centrality of interpretation—of "critical hermeneutics" (Kincheloe 2008)—for grasping the complexity of social realities, and thus become more familiar with contextualizing the biased information they are repeatedly served via the mass media.

In addition to deconstructing these and other repercussions of the neoliberal model for society, students might further grapple with other questionable frames created by mainstream approaches to, for example, multicultural coexistence. As Joe and Shirley argued in *Changing Multiculturalism* (1997), the conservative, liberal, pluralist and essentialist conceptions of multiculturalism that most influenced the Western collective imaginary at the end of the twentieth century were overdue for some serious scrutiny from critical pedagogical viewpoints. In the authors' words, "unlike other forms of multiculturalism, the critical articulation is concerned with the contextualization of what gives rise to race, class and gender inequalities" (p. 25). This concern has become even more relevant since the advent and rapid spread of neoliberalism, but has also come to the fore since the emergence of anti-colonial perspectives on the world's colonial past and neocolonial present,[7] perspectives which pose important challenges to the current *order of things*, to borrow another Foucauldian term (1970). On this issue, Joe argued in favor of decolonizing epistemology by attempting to move well-intended researchers beyond Eurocentrism and FIDUROD:

> What such researchers and pedagogues don't sometimes see is that the social assumptions that shape the institutions and scholarly communities in which they operate are saturated with such Eurocentric and reductionistic—not to mention patriarchal, homophobic, colonialist, and class elitist—premises. This tacit dimension where dominant epistemologies, ideologies, and political economic policies work behind the scene to shape what we know and who we are is the "ground zero" of twenty-first century oppression. (Kincheloe 2008, p. 181)

That said, perhaps what most marked a turn in the debate on cross-cultural justice and cohesion in the twenty-first century was the fateful event of September 11, 2001, the violent attacks on the World Trade Center of New York City causing great suffering and loss, as well as long lasting symbolic reverberations that have led to increasingly polarized cultural outlooks on multicultural coexistence in general around the world, especially between East and West. In their introductory chapter to *Teaching Against Islamophobia* (Kincheloe and Steinberg 2010), Joe

[7] See, for example, Bhabha (1994), Dei and Kempf (2006), Dussel (1982), Dimitriadis and McCarthy (2001), Fanon (1967), Memmi (1965), Mignolo and Walsh (2002), Hall (1996), Said (1978–2003), Santos (2010), Shiva (1997) or Spivak and Harasym (1990). These authors range from the decolonial to the postcolonial, depending in part on their epistemological positionings toward critical (decolonial) or postmodern (postcolonial) modes of analysis.

and Shirley ably challenged the increasing incidence in the United States of racism and xenophobia following that event, as it was indiscriminately directed at both citizens and non-citizens of Arab extract or of the Muslim faith. One of the tools suggested in their chapter is "a literacy of power":

> A key dimension of a democratic education involves a literacy of power that enables an individual to explore the relation between power and knowledge, to expose the imprint of power on the knowledge that confronts us. (p. 24)

Here, the authors speak to the unwillingness, even the inability, of U.S. leaders to comprehend the full cultural and social ramifications of their neocolonial economic and military pursuits in the Middle East and elsewhere, pursuits typically justified by a Western sense of superior (FIDUROD) rationality and purpose (Kincheloe 2008), propelled by a centuries-old belief in cultural superiority since the Crusades and European colonialism. It is a new form of imperialism protected by the complicity of the mass media and school curricula, which tend to silence and distort alternative perspectives on the role of U.S. operations in nations of the Middle East and North Africa, while providing biased and reductionistic information about Muslim peoples in general, immersed as this filtered information is in binary oppositions with Western culture (Kincheloe and Steinberg 2004; Kincheloe and Steinberg 2010). Such tendencies therefore miseducate the U.S. public:

> As a result of the miseducation, the United States encounters every new international circumstance as if it were a totally new situation, completely unrelated to colonial histories and global political and economic issues—a veritable *Goundhog Day*[8] of context. (Kincheloe and Steinberg 2010, p. 24)

This induced blindness and misrepresentation regarding the points of view of *others* and the politics of knowledge is troubling because, although pronounced in the case of the United States, it is not unfamiliar to other national contexts as well. The fact is that the influences "left behind by power that saturate every fragment of data included in the mainstream curriculum are so profoundly revealing but so totally ignored in most mainstream Western classrooms" (Kincheloe 2008, p. 248). Such is the case with the distorted representation in school curricula and textbooks throughout Spain of the historic invasion of the al-Ándalus—the southern Iberian region of the Islamic Empire—by Christians from the north, an event still referred to as the *Reconquista* or the "Reconquering." The subsequent Spanish invasion and occupation of most of the Americas is also still largely and uncritically referred to as the *Conquista* or the so-called "Conquest".[9]

This warping of reality by hegemonic (manichean, neoliberal, Eurocentric and FIDUROD) ideologies feeds into other damaging dynamics of very current and real proportions, as peoples of diverse nations, histories and cultural references

[8] The reference to the film *Groundhog Day* is meant to call up an image of the ordeal faced by the lead character, who wakes up one day to a time loop, caught in the repetition of the day before (Groundhog Day), this becoming a seemingly endless daily dynamic.

[9] An example of this can be found in a history textbook by García Sebastián et al. (2004). See Teasley (2012) for an analysis on racism in educational contexts in Spain.

experience harsh and often severe repercussions from actions issued from geopolitical centers—the North, the West, the First World or "developed" countries, and their transnational institutions: the IMF, the World Bank, etc.—where power has traditionally and persistently been enacted on other parts of the world in an imbalanced, dominating and oppressive manner. While coherent with colonial rationality and functionality, such neocolonial operations are now thinly guised under the banner of free-market democracy; thus there is no longer any need for occupying powers to declare the occupied lands and peoples as colonies. That would be considered, moreover, to be a direct transgression of international jurisprudence as reflected in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, of 1960.[10] In some cases, however, these processes of subordination, especially when exercised by means of military incursions in foreign sovereign states, have contributed to extreme oppositional reactions such as the violent fundamentalism of Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, or the more recent Islamic State-ISIS in Syria and Iraq, which are matched by the corresponding growth of white supremacists, neo-Nazi groups, and far-Right xenophobic political parties in Europe and North America (Ali 2003; Chomsky 2003; Hedges 2014).

What is more, the *coloniality* of power (Mignolo and Walsh 2002) has long managed to coerce and seduce government leaders of the historically colonized geopolitical South and East into reproducing its tenets within the realm of sovereign nations' domestic affairs. For instance, just as the United States government and business leaders are occupying more and more lands in African countries in order to secure the extraction of multiple vital resources, so too are the Chinese, the Saudis, the Indian corporate elite, and other leaders of non-Western nations. Their mass purchases rely, for example, on the complicity of various African nations' leaders knowingly selling off lands cultivated by generations of poor peasants who, lacking formal entitlements, stand to lose their main, if not their only, means of survival (Rulli et al. 2012; Shiva 2005).

This then is the kind of global scenario where neoliberalism, neocolonialism and cross-cultural interdependence converge. Such complex dynamics require interpretive skills that are up to the task, and that's what fostering a "post-formal" critical hermeneutics is all about (Churchill 2011; Kincheloe and Steinberg 1993; Kincheloe, Steinberg and Hinchey 1999; Thomas and Kincheloe 2006; Kincheloe 2007; Kincheloe 2008).

Critical Public Pedagogy for a Globalized World

Aiming to decenter and transcend simplistic, dualistic and therefore harmful hegemonic conceptions not only of the unjust operations of domination in the geopolitical organization of societies today, but of multicultural coexistence within

[10] See the United Nations website on decolonization: http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/declaration.shtml (accessed 25 October, 2015).

and among such societies, I have been working on a critical form of "anti-bias" teacher education to address these epistemological and ontological concerns (Teasley-Severino 2013). Starting from early ground-breaking sources on anti-bias education for all ages, such as the *Guidelines* for bias-free children's literature from the Council on Interracial Books for Children (1980), or Louise Derman-Sparks and the ABC Task Force's *Anti-Bias Curriculum* (1989), and inspired by a transdisciplinary range of critical scholarship, of which Joe's work is an integral part, my intent has been to move the focus on social and curricular bias into a more critical space of analysis in teacher preparation programs. With a definition of social bias as a dominant, collective tendency that favors *some* sectors of society while disfavoring *others*, the idea is to draw on post-formal understandings and manifestations of cross-cultural knowledge and reasoning in ways that intersect with postcolonial and decolonial perspectives on *what* knowledge is considered worth teaching and learning.

In keeping then with a critical hermeneutics (Kincheloe 2008) that dovetails with critical postmodern analysis (McLaren and Jaramillo 2007; Santos 2008), the anti-bias perspective, firstly, does not downplay the centrality of political economy, or structural concerns, in the otherwise fluid, "liquid" (Bauman 2006) production of bias in societies worldwide, and, by extension, in the preparation of educators and the development of educational policy. Secondly, the anti-bias perspective on coexistence offers a triple heuristic advantage. One concerns the cumulative effect of bias, which lends itself to historicizing the analytical lens, in the Foucauldian genealogical sense. Another advantage can be found in discovering the aggregate nature of bias, which helps surmount individualistic FIDUROD accounts of "failure." And a third advantage resides in the fact that bias represents subtle, less explicit tendencies that cannot be overlooked or dismissed based on best intentions and therefore lack of responsibility. Finally, a critical anti-bias analysis of reality draws heavily from interdisciplinary postcolonial and decolonial inquiry and praxis, such as that expressed by Indian ecologist and physicist Vandana Shiva (1997, 2005) on biopiracy and Earth democracy; or by the late Palestinian cultural theorist Edward Said (1978–2003) on Orientalism and contrapuntal analysis; by social theorists Enrique Dussel (1982), Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2010) or Walter Mignolo and Catherine Walsh (2002) on decoloniality; or by curriculum theorists Greg Dimitriadis and Cameron McCarthy (2001), and George Sefa Dei and Arlo Kempf (2006); among others. The transnational intersections of these scholars' diverse perspectives work to unsettle and dismantle the hegemony of FIDURODism in pre-biased educational contexts around the world.

Through it all, I will continue to draw from Joe Kincheloe's prolific, optimistic and exceptionally lucid writings, which have a knack for breaking down mindsets and extant paradigms, opening his readership to alternative ways of knowing, being, and exploring possible paths towards transforming unjust social realities. Although Joe himself is no longer with us, his legacy always will be.

Here's to you, Joe.

References

Ali, T. (2003). *The clash of fundamentalisms: Crusades, jihads and modernity*. London: Verso.

Ball, S. (2012). *Global Education Inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. New York: Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. New York: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. New York: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2013). *Does the richness of the few benefit us all?* New York: Polity Press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New Press/Polity Press.

Brock, R., Malott, C. S., & Villaverde, L. E. (Eds.). (2011). *Teaching Joe Kincheloe*. New York: Peter Lang.

Callinicos, A. (2009). *Imperialism and global political economy*. New York: Polity Press.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication and power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Chomsky, N., & McChesney, R. W. (2011). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Churchill, A. (2011). Kincheloe's postformal pedagogy: A transformative praxis. In R. Brock, C. S. Malott, & L. E. Villaverde (Eds.), *Teaching Joe Kincheloe* (pp. 77–94). New York: Peter Lang.

Council on Interracial Books for Children. (1980). *Guidelines for selecting bias-free textbooks and storybooks*. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children.

Credit Suisse. (2014, October). *Global wealth report 2014*. Zurich: Credit Suisse AG Research Institute. Retrieved on October 20, 2014, from https://publications.credit-suisse.com/tasks/render/file/?fileID=60931FDE-A2D2-F568-B041B58C5EA591A4

Cummins, J. (1986). The role of primary language development in promoting education success for language minority students. In Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education of California (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (9th ed., pp. 3–49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center California State University/ California State Dept. of Education.

Dei, G. J. S., & Kempf, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Anti-colonialism and education: The politics of resistance*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Derman-Sparks, L., & The A.B.C. Task Force. (1989). *Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Dimitriadis, G., & McCarthy, C. (2001). *Reading and writing the postcolonial: From Baldwin to Basquiat and beyond*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dussel, E. (1982). *A history of the Church in Latin America: Colonialism to liberation*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx was right*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

El Diario. (2014, August 29). España vuelve a ser líder del paro juvenil en Europa. *El Diario.es*. Retrieved October 12, 2014, from http://www.eldiario.es/economia/paro-zona_del_euro-Eurostat-desempleo_juvenil_0_297470427.html

Fanon, F. (1967). *The wretched of the Earth*. Harmondworth: Penguin.

Fernández, E., M., Mena, M., L., & Riviere, G., J. (2010). *Fracaso y abandono escolar en España*. Barcelona: Fundación "La Caixa".

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings.* New York: Pantheon.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.

García Sebastián, M., Gatell Arimont, C., Llorens Serrano, M., Ortega Canadell, R., & Roig Obiol, J. (2004). *Ciencias Sociais, Historia 4: Ecumene*. A Coruña: Vicens Vives Educación Secundaria.

Hall, S. (1996). Cultural studies and its legacies. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 262–275). New York: Routledge.

Hall, S. (2011). The neoliberal revolution. *Soundings*, *48*(Summer). Retrieved on October 5, 2014, from http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/journals/soundings/issue/48.html

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hayes, K., Steinberg, S. R., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Key works in critical pedagogy: Joe L. Kincheloe*. New York: Peter Lang.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In California State Department of Education Bilingual Education Office (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (2nd ed., pp. 143–186). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Hedges, C. (2014, June 22). The ghoulish face of Empire. *Truthdig.* Retrieved October 20, 2014, from http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/the_ghoulish_face_of_empire_20140623

Herrera, E. (2014, September 11). El abandono escolar empieza a bajar antes de la puesta en marcha de la 'ley Wert'. *InfoLibre.es.* Retrieved October 12, 2014, from http://www.infolibre.es/noticias/politica/2014/09/11/el_abandono_escolar_empieza_bajar_antes_puesta_marcha_ley_wert_21353_1012.html

Kincheloe, J. L. (2006). Social studies in flux: In pursuit of a new rigor, criticality and practicality. In A. Segall, C. H. Cherryholmes, & E. E. Heilman (Eds.), *Social studies—The next generation: Re-searching in the postmodern* (pp. 211–216). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Evolution for survival. In P. McLaren & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 9–42). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. New York: Springer.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1993). A tentative description of post-formal thinking: The critical confrontation with cognitive theory. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*(3), 296–320.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. London: Open University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (1998). *Unauthorized methods: Strategies for critical teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2004). *The miseducation of the West: How schools and the media distort our understanding of the Islamic world*. Westport: Praeger.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (2010). Why teach against Islamophobia? Striking the Empire back. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, & C. D. Stonebanks (Eds.), *Teaching against Islamophobia* (pp. 3–27). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., & Hinchey, P. (1999). *The post-formal reader: Cognition and education*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Klein, N. (2008). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Picador.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert Experiment*. Rowley: Newbury House.

McLaren, P., & Jaramillo, N. (2007). *Pedagogy and praxis in the age of Empire: Towards a new humanism*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. New York: Beacon.

Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. (2002). Las geopolíticas del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder: Entrevista a Walter Mignolo. In C. Walsh, F. Schiwy, & S. Castro-Gómez (Eds.), *Indisciplinar las ciencias sociales: geopolíticas del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder. Perspectivas desde lo andino* (pp. 17–44). Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar/Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Rulli, M. C., Saviori, A., & D'Odorico, P. (2012). *Global land and water grabbing*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. Retrieved October 16, 2014, from http://www.pnas.org/content/110/3/892

Said, E. (1978–2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
Santos, B. d. S. (2008). *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies*. New York: Verso Books.
Santos, B. d. S. (2010). *Desconolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Montevideo: Trilce.
Shiva, V. (1997). *Biopiracy: The plunder of nature and knowledge*. Boston: South End Press.
Shiva, V. (2005). *Earth democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace*. New York: South End Press.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Toukamaa, P. (1976). *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.
Spivak, G. C., & Harasym, S. E. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. New York: Routledge.
Teasley, C. (2012). Deconstructing discourses on racism in educational contexts in Spain: Along a continuum of racialization new and old. In M. P. João & S. Jurjo Torres (Eds.), *Globalisms, education and power: Iberian educational and curriculum policies* (pp. 193–206). New York: Peter Lang.
Teasley-Severino, C. (2013). *La formación antisesgo del profesorado: hacia una pedagogía de la justicia sociocultural.* Doctoral dissertation, A Coruña: University of A Coruña.
Thomas, P., & Kincheloe, J. L. (2006). *Reading, writing, and thinking: The postformal basics*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Torres Santomé, J. (2001). *Educación en tiempos de neoliberalismo*. Madrid: Morata.

Cathryn Teasley is Assistant Professor of Curriculum, Instruction, and School Organization at the University of A Coruña, Spain. She focuses on promoting cross-cultural justice through critical anti-bias teacher education, and is co-editor of the book *Transnational Perspectives on Culture, Policy and Education: Redirecting Cultural Studies in Neoliberal Times* (2008).

Joe L. Kincheloe: How Love Could Change the World

Ramón Flecha and Aitor Gómez

Ramón Joe Kincheloe was a great author and above all a great friend. His critical vision of reality and his radical position in front of inequalities were always a constant during all his life. I had known his influential work for a long time. In Spain, Kincheloe was not known, as our mediocre university system has awarded authors that have never crossed the Pyrenees. Joe always criticized such mediocrity.

I met Joe for the first time in a Congress in Brasil, where we hardly had time to interact. The second time that we saw each other, we did have time to talk and exchange insights. This was in the Seminar "Cambio Educativo y Social IV: Repensar el multiculturalismo" [Educational and Social Change IV: Rethinking Multiculturalism] held on the 14th and 15th of November 2002. During those days in which we had the chance to exchange opinions, ideas and critical reflections about many issues, I was able to confirm the enormous human quality of Joe. He was an excellent friend to his friends and an enemy to all those who would despise or look down others believing to be better or to possess some sort of superior knowledge. Joe rejected the character of the typical expert that looks down on the rest.

Just as Freire (1997) used to say: "In being in favor of something or someone, I am necessarily against someone. Thus, it is necessary to ask: 'With whom am I? Against what and whom am I?'" (p. 40). Freire's critical vision of education and the world left a profound trace on Joe, who knew how to take position beyond the academy, as he took it to the personal domain too. Joe was totally coherent and consequent with the ideas he published, there were no gaps between the academic

R. Flecha (✉)
Department of Sociological Theory, University of Barcelona, Barcelona 08034, Spain
e-mail: ramon.flecha@ub.edu

A. Gómez
Department of Education, Universitat Rovira i Virgili,
Campus Sescelades, Tarragona 43007, Spain
e-mail: aitor.gomez@urv.cat

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_6

and the personal. The vitality he professed was contagious, and after talking to him people felt like continuing transforming the world.

During the days that the Seminar in November 2002 lasted, we had the opportunity to exchange not only theoretical analysis but also deep thoughts. The topic that structured all our discussions (academic or not) was love. Shirley Steinberg took part in these discussions and so did my great friend from childhood Jesús Gómez ("Pato") who shared with us wonderful moments that we remember still today.

Pato analysed reality in a critical way and always under the perspective of a radical conception of love. Joe who had had long conversations with Paulo Freire and Donaldo Macedo in Boston about the importance of love in everything we do and not do was totally astonished with the analysis that Pato did about it. Those were really transformative days for all of us who had the chance to enjoy the company of Joe and Pato.

From all the contributions that Joe Kincheloe has done to critical pedagogy we choose to share reflection on his critical vision of love and of egalitarian dialogue oriented to action and transformation of the world. Therefore, in the following pages we will try to express how the friendship that we shared with Joe has influenced our research, focusing on the particular way that dialogue about Radical Love has generated better research and educational practices.

Freire's Influences

Freire, in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, pointed out the importance of love: "dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and for people" (2000, p. 89). Years later, he argued that "education is an act of love" (2007, p. 33). The educator's concern must be giving everything expecting to receive nothing in exchange, in the same way that a person who is in love does.

Kincheloe, in *Knowledge and Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction*, dedicates a section to Freire and his notion of Radical Love. "Paulo Freire's notion of Radical Love has permeated all dimensions of my understanding of critical pedagogy" (Kincheloe 2008, p. 178). Freire and his conceptualisation of love were key to Kincheloe in his positioning as critical pedagogue.

As Joe, I (Ramon) knew the first works of Freire very well. They were introduced in a clandestine way to Spain still under Franco's regime in the early 70s. I started my teaching work in adult schools in Barcelona, first in La Mina (a marginal neighborhood in the suburbs of Barcelona) and in the 70s in the Adult School of La Verneda Sant Martí (the first Learning Community). My teaching practice those years was enriched through *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire 2000).

In 1987 I promoted the investiture of Paulo Freire as Doctor Honoris Causa of the University of Barcelona. That was the first time that I talked to Freire and I had the chance to confirm his great human quality. Not long before, his wife Elza with whom he had shared all his life, had passed away. In January 1988 was the ceremony of investiture and Freire surprised all attendees with his discourse. He emphasized

the relevance of love, and how the love that they had shared with Elza had forged him as a person:

> With her I learnt that the love that frees is the one in which the lovers remain because they can leave and leave if they prefer not to stay. Freely they stay or leave. With her I learned that passion is necessary in the act of love but it is not enough. If, on the one hand, the passion is not extended in love and, on the other hand, the love nurtured in passion does not widen the passion giving meaning to it in every step, every move, then love and passion die[1] (Freire 1989, p. 301).

The second time when we had the opportunity to interact and exchange knowledge and critical stances about reality, was in July 1994. In the 4th and 5th of July of 1994 I invited Freire to the "Congress on New Critical Perspectives in Education", that we organized from CREA, the Centre of Theories and Practices that Overcome Social Inequalities in the University of Barcelona.

In 1988 Pato did not get to meet Freire, but he did in July 1994. Freire arrived to the airport of Barcelona with his new wife, Nita. Just after having stepped into the car, Pato asked Freire about his love life and Paulo was delighted about it. Finally someone talked about the issues he really was most concerned about and which made the world go around. The music of Paco Ibañez, a Spanish singer songwriter who sings to the greatest Spanish poets of all times, played during the whole trip, and Pato and Freire ended up singing with one voice.

Pato published in 2004 *Radical Love* (Gómez 2015/2004) a work that captured his main critical thesis about love. In this work, the influence of the hegemonic model of masculinity is analyzed, with its related perpetuation of the double moral standards, as well as Pato introduces a new alternative model of masculinity which allows to overcome the masculine oppressive model. Uniting in the same person love (tenderness) and passion (excitement) the double moral standards – typical of the hegemonic masculine model where some women are conceived for stable relationships (love without passion) and other ones to have sporadic relationships (love without passion) are overcome.

> The alternative model helps to overcome the long-standing problems of the traditional model. Dissatisfaction in relationships, based either on "flirting" (passion without love) or stability (love without passion), can only be overcome by uniting affection and excitement, friendship and passion, and stability and madness in the same person (Gómez 2015, p. 77).

Freire and Pato were able to talk about and deeply agree that passionate love, like relationships based on free and Radical Love, – where lovers love each other without expecting anything in exchange-, is what allows transforming reality. Freire was very tired of attending academic events in which he was felt forced to have petty talk with people who wanted to meet him. With Pato everything was different, as from the beginning they talked about what for Pato was the revolution of the twenty-first century, the radicalization of love relationships. After this trip, Freire established an intense friendship with Pato, as both shared the same transformative and radical vision of love relationships, of education and of the world.

[1] Translated from the original version in Spanish (Freire 1989).

Kincheloe and Freire

Joe Kincheloe read *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* for the first time when he followed a Masters in Education at the University of Tennessee, and its reading marked his following years. In 1997 Joe moved to the City University of New York Graduate Center Faculty where he directed the doctorate in Urban Education, where Freire was a fundamental author (Hayes et al. 2011, ix–xi). In fact, Joe dedicated the book *Changing Multiculturalism* to Paulo the same year that he moved to New York. Freire died the 2nd of May 1997, and Joe wanted to dedicate special words to his friend: "In memory of Paulo Freire who affirmed Radical Love in all cultures" (Kincheloe and Steinberg 1997).

As we pointed out in the introduction, in November 2002 we invited Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg to the Seminar Educational and Social Change IV: Rethinking Multiculturalism. This was a key moment, as we had a precious time to be able to talk about important things, Radical Love and its relationship with critical education. Pato joined our discussions and they got along excellently, as he did with Freire, from the very first moment they saw each other.

The trips by car with Joe and Shirley were real musical sessions, remembering the 60s and the 70s up to the present time. Credence Clearwater Revival, Cream, Eric Clapton, Dire Straits, good music was always on. Pato loved to sing full voice in the car and Joe loved that, as he sang as well and played the keyboard in a rock and roll band, together with John Willinsky at the guitar.

The band, formed by four members, started calling itself SIG GIG and some years later it was renamed as "Tony and the Hegemones". The group became a central part in Joe's life, with gigs from coast to coast in the States. The combination of his family life, students' tutoring and academic work in teams with the possibility of being able to play with his friends was perfect. In fact, the group started playing also in receptions of the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) (Hayes et al. 2011, p. xi).

> During those days of November we had long talks about many relevant topics, including how to overcome problems like gender violence through the radicalization of love relationships (establishing a clear simile with the fostering of critical education). We talked about how passion can go perfectly hand in hand with reason. "A person who is passionately in love may remain perfectly lucid about his prospects and in full control of his behavior (…) There is no universal law of human nature expressing an inverse relation between passion and reason" (Elster 2000, p. 158).

This notion counters the extended idea that passionate love is uncontrollable, it is something that comes and goes, that can last a certain time and that it finally ends. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995), in line with his conceptualization about the processes of individualization, argued that attraction "simply happens, strikes like lightning or dies out according to laws which are not open to individual or social control" (p. 198).

The debates we had about Radical Love made evident that this passionate love does not have an expiration date, it only depends on the lovers and not on external

unchangeable factors or biological questions that decide its end. The existing problem in our societies, –where processes of extreme individualization are at work, where violence prevails in the models of attraction instead of what is egalitarian and dialogic-, is that there cannot be a logic explanation to the loss of passion if it is not due to biological or psychological questions.

Pato explained very clearly how love is social, it is not like a ray that strikes and then disappears afterwards. There is no "better half" waiting, there are a lot of "better half's", what is necessary is to work on the love relationship. Relationships do not die out with time, but they can go further instead, and therefore we can say that those are relationships of Radical Love. There is no biology that intervenes, it is not genetic. Pato explained the case of two friends of his who were twins, one was successful with the girls and the other one was not. They had the same genetic make up but, one was successful because he went around as a show-off and a womanizer, and the other one was not successful because he was nice and kind.[2]

Just like Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995, p. 65) questioned themselves, "Is it possible for equals to love each other? Can love survive liberation? Or are love and freedom irreconcilable opposites?" Pato and Joe used to talk about these issues, drawing from the understanding that in being in love with another person one loses freedom. Both Pato and Joe loved freedom and enjoyed it with their respective beloved ones, showing that it was perfectly possible to unite passionate love and freedom in a love relationship. Pato exemplified this through a beautiful Basque song which he loved and he used to sing very often:

> Hegoak ebaki banizkio nerea izango zen, ez zuen aldegingo.
> Bainan, honela ez zen gehiago txoria izango eta nik ….
> txoria nuen maite (Mikel Laboa)[3]

> If I had cut her wings she would have been mine
> she would not flee but, then she would not have
> been anymore a bird and me . . . it's the bird which I loved

Kincheloe left Barcelona thrilled with the friendship developed with Pato and Ramon. Full of new ideas and projects, Kincheloe left New York in 2005 because he was invited by McGill University and accepted the Canada Research Chair. In McGill he founded "The Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy". "In the spirit of Freire's work, Joe understood the project as a means to *support an evolving critical pedagogy that encounters new discourses, new peoples, with new ideas, and continues to move forward in the 21st Century. The project is understood as continued evolution of the work of Paulo Freire*. He chose to name it after Paulo and his wife, Nita, as a celebration of their partnership and Radical Love" (Hayes et al. 2011, p. xii).

---

[2] Video of the conference of Jesús Gómez in Olot "El amor en la sociedad actual. Un reto educativo" (13/03/2004): http://vimeo.com/102826648

[3] Mikel Laboa (1934–2008) was a famous songwriter born in Euskadi who performed this very special song, "Txoria Txori.

Joe's creation of this project brought him back to Barcelona by the mid of May 2008, when the "Association of Friends of Paulo and Nita Freire for the Development of Critical Education" was officially inaugurated. During those days, Joe interviewed Marta Soler (current director of CREA) and me (Ramón), among others. He asked me about the figure of Pato and his contributions to critical pedagogy. Joe and I talked for long hours about Radical Love remembering also Paulo Freire. Pato always told his students that science and passion are needed, without both things we are lost. Joe did the same with his students, with whom he had a close relationship, like Pato did.

Aitor I met Joe for the first time during the American Educational Research Association Conference of 24–28 of March 2008 in New York, some time before he visited Barcelona for the "The Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy". In prior occasions in which Joe visited Barcelona, I had not had the chance to talk to him. I was obviously aware of this friendship with Pato, my father, and about his profound conversations about Radical Love and the shared passion that both had about music, but I had not been able to talk to him directly. We went to the reception of Paulo Freire's Special Interest Group which took place at a bar with a dance floor. Joe was grand, playing the keyboards and singing old rock and blues songs together with John Willinsky at the guitar and the rest of his mates.

It had been a short time ago that Joe had been diagnosed with a skin cancer that he had treated and won successfully. And there he was enjoying the evening with colleagues in the band and his beloved Shirley Steinberg. We had the chance to talk about Pato and about music for a very short time while he had no people around him. But only a few minutes were enough to understand why Joe and Pato got along so well forging a life long friendship. Joe was vital, passionate, critical, dialogic and therefore it was impossible for them not to join their ways. Before leaving New York, I gave Joe a CD with many songs that Pato adored. Many of them Joe and Pato had sung together in the car that month of November in 2002, while they discussed Radical Love and critical pedagogy.

At the end of 2008, we learnt from Shirley that Joe had died of a heart attack while on holiday in Jamaica. It was something that struck us like a bolt from the blue. We could not believe it, after having overcome a cancer (a situation that reminded us the very illness that took Pato away from us in August 2006); it was a hard blow. On the 2nd of February of 2009 Shirley Steinberg organized an hommage to Joe at the City University of New York Graduate Center Faculty that I attended. It was a beautiful remembrance event in which Donaldo Macedo stood out for the wonderful words that he addressed to Joe. The whole large room was moved with it, and family, friends and students took their turn to highlight the passion with which Joe lived his whole life, enjoying every second.

Shirley gave continuity to this project from 2009 on, understood from then on not only as a continuous evolution of the work of Paulo Freire, but also of that of Joe Kincheloe and Jesús Gómez "Pato". That same year, Shirley organized the first

encounter promoted from the project (called from 2010 on, The Freire Project: Critical Cultural Community, Youth and Media Activism).[4]

The seminar took place in Baeza (Jaen) between the 16th and the 20th of September, and it counted on the participation, among others, of Nita Freire. The programme was oriented to pay homage to Paulo Freire, Joe Kincheloe and Pato and thus discuss Radical Love. During the encounter, different moving presentations followed one another with a mix of scientific knowledge and dreams, following the premise of Freire (1997), "in reality, education requires technical, scientific, and professional development as much as it does dreams and utopia" (p. 43).

Ramon said some words about Pato which combined science and hope, reflecting on the importance of fighting for relationships based on Radical Love and how these relationships become the motor of change, in the transformative potential of our lives at all levels. Pato used to say that the revolution of the XXI century was the revolution of Radical Love. He said that the most profound motivation of human beings and communities was love, provoking the creation of novel and transformative projects like Schools as Learning Communities and research lines such as Preventive Socialization of Gender Violence or New Alternative Masculinities.

Pato was a leading creator of the project of transformation of schools into Learning Communities. In the beginning of the transformation process of the Montserrat School into a Learning Community, the activists of the school felt unable to convince teachers and family members from different cultures about the need of community involvement for the transformation of the school, so they asked Pato to go to the school and talk to them. In the meeting with teachers and families, Pato said the following words: "Do you remember when you were in your teens and felt in love with your best friend? You would do anything for her or him, right? Are you going to do less for your children and for your students?" While hearing these words, sparks appeared in the eyes of the members of the whole community and the transformation, even at the personal level, started. That "shine in their eyes" was the meaning and driving force for the transformation of education in the Montserrat School.

After being a young anarchist activist and a love seeker, Pato earned a lot of money as manager of companies until he was forty. But when he met Lidia Puigvert, he discovered Radical Love and decided to transform his life recovering his best dreams. He earned much less money, but he had a wonderful life. From that time, he used to say that people have economy as their first priority only when they have lost their hope in finding Radical Love. Living Radical Love with Lidia made possible for Pato to meet friends like Paulo Freire, Nita Freire, Joe Kincheloe, and Shirley Steinberg, and made him able to inspire passion in people and communities to transform not only education but also their own lives.

[4] For more information on The Freire Project, visit: http://www.freireproject.org/about-the-freire-project/

During the seminar in Baeza, many conversations on Radical Love that Pato, Paulo and Joe had throughout their lives were shared by other friends and collected in a climate of excitement and solidarity. The inspiration of their life stories was such that by the end of the seminar, we all decided to create a declaration on Radical Love for a better education and a better world. The Baeza Declaration exposed how Radical Love can drive deep transformations in education and also in societies and individuals. When critical educators engage in egalitarian dialogue with marginalized and silenced people showing that in our lives there is solidarity, ethics and passion, that is an act of Radical Love.

Influence of Radical Love in Our Research Work

The conceptualisation of dialogic learning that I (Ramon) developed in the 90s had the influence of the debates I had with special people like Freire and Pato. The Learning Communities project is a clear example of critical and transformative education which I promoted in the 90s implementing the principles of dialogic learning and analyzing and putting in practice Successful Educational Actions. This would have not been possible without having met and enjoyed the honest friendship first of Pato and later on of Freire and Kincheloe.

Freire, Pato and Kincheloe broke with the double standards of a dominant society living through the alternative model of relationships based on the idea of Radical Love. The Learning Communities project breaks with the other double standard, by which there is excellent education for our children and another one leading to failure and social exclusion for other less privileged children. Learning Communities make possible excellent education for all, regardless origin and social class.

These double standards dominating our society – inherited from a patriarchal model in which men are represented following a traditional dominant model of masculinity (TDM) – is what Pato, Freire and Kincheloe fought to change. I had had debates with Pato since the 70s about how to overcome this dominant model of masculinity. The revolution of the twenty-first century was for Pato the Radical Love, because it meant the way to overcome double standards.

The passionate love was for Freire the motor of transformation of our society and the base of a critical education, as it was for Kincheloe. Therefore, as soon as they met Pato and they were able to share their critical visions of love and education, they joined in this revolution of the twenty-first century.

For me, all these debates started in the 70s and intensified in the 90s thanks to interactions such as those maintained with Kincheloe and Freire, who were key for the conceptualization of New Alternative Masculinities (NAM). NAM allows overcoming the traditional double standard, as it overcomes the division between Dominant Traditional Masculinities (DTM) and Oppressed Traditional Masculinities (OTM), which are, indeed, the two sides of the same coin. DTM are the traditional oppressive men. Despite not all DTM men are violent, all men that are violent against women are DTM men. OTM men have never exercised any kind of violence

against women. DTM do not regard OTM as an obstacle to getting in touch with any girl because DTM think that OTM are good for marriage but not to have fun with. Thus, "good" but subordinate boys are not an alternative to OTM, and therefore their behaviour does not contribute to overcome gender violence. NAM are radically opposed to OTM and DTM. These men combine attraction and equality and generate sexual desire among women. They move away from people with non egalitarian values or who are violent, and are highly active in working against gender violence together with women. They are on the side of the victims of gender violence, and therefore they always break the silence with no fear. Pato's analysis in his book "Radical Love. A revolution for the 21st Century" (2015) defined NAM very well: they are self-confident, strong, and courageous. In so being, NAM confront negative attitudes from DTM, and explicitly reject the double standard. It is with those who have developed NAM that it is possible to experience Radical Love.

The search for the radicalization of love relationships is what allowed Freire to live a life full of meaning and to make extremely revolutionary contributions in education. It is also what boosted in Joe Kincheloe his passion to transform a society where processes of solidarity and individualization were increasingly evident. For Pato it was the revolution of the twenty-first century for which we will keep on fighting to ultimately enjoy relationships based on science and passion, that fuel transformative educational contributions as well as personal revolutions that can last forever. This all entails committed struggles that will be only faced successfully through global solidarity. It is now our task to keep Freire, Joe and Pato's dream alive. Let's walk together the road of Radical Love that they opened up for us by passionately following the words of Machado[5]:

> Caminante, no hay camino,
> Se hace camino al andar.
> Traveller, there is no road,
> The road is made by walking.

References

Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995). *The normal chaos of love*. Cambridge: Polity Press (Original work published 1990).

Elster, J. (2000). *Strong feelings: Emotion, addiction and human behavior*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Freire, P. (1989). Discurso de investidura. *Temps d'Educació, 1*, 300–301.

Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc (Original work published 1970).

Freire, P. (2007). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc (Original work published 1974).

[5] Extracted from "Proverbios y Cantares" of Antonio Machado (Machado, A. (1977). *Poesías completas*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S.A. p. 223).

Gómez, J. (2015). *Radical love: A revolution for the 21st century*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc (Original work published in 2004).
Hayes, K., Steinberg, S., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Key works in critical pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Dordrecht/London: Springer.
Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ramón Flecha PhD, is full professor of sociology in the University of Barcelona and doctor Honoris Causa by the University of Vest Timisoara, Timişoara, Romania. His extensive research trajectory includes directing research projects of the 5th and 6th Framework Programs of Research of the European Union, always related to overcoming social inequalities. He was the main researcher of the Integrated Project from the 6thframework Program INCLUD-ED (2006–2011), the only study in the social sciences recognized among ten success stories of scientific research in Europe. It is now the main researcher of IMPACT-EV (2014–2017) from the 7th Framework Program. Through this project it is elaborating criteria of evaluation of social science research so that it not only has scientific and political impact but also social impact, improving the lives of citizens.

Aitor Gómez holds a PhD in sociology from the University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain and is currently a lecturer in the Department of Education in the University Rovira I Virgili, Tarragona, Spain, where he teaches courses on research methods. He has wide experience as a researcher in RTD projects of the European Research Framework Program, such as WORKALÓ, "The Creation of New Occupation Patterns for Cultural Minorities: The Gypsy Case," from the 5th Framework Program of Research of the EU. He has been applying the critical communicative methodology in studies aimed at overcoming inequalities since 1998. He is leading now the Marie Curie RISE action Saleacom at international level and the Research and Development project EDUFAM in Spain.

On the Critical Researcher's 'Moral and Aesthetic Responsibility' in the Consumer Society

Domenica Maviglia

School: Moral Commitment and Shared Responsibility

The relentless change in post-modern societies throws up a series of challenges for schools; young generations are living in a new cultural climate governed by 'a fetish for information' (Da Empoli 2002), they label themselves as 'consumers' and rebel against all forms of authority, providing no guidance on the development of an existential project and good reflection skills.

Therefore, as places of the utmost importance for cultural mediation and as crossroads of issues and projects – ateliers where the future of our communities and civil coexistence are built on a daily basis – schools retain the duty of providing guidance to young generations during this change.

In order to properly fulfil this task, schools cannot simply provide formal models of information acquisition and processing but they must take on the responsibility – jointly with other social institutions – for promoting a new citizenship open to global issues, becoming places that can shape free and aware individuals open to forms of joint solidarity responsibility (Chiosso and Mariani 2002, p. 34).

Therefore, schools face an important and complex mission; turn individuals into much more than simple receivers of information (Citati 1998) or expert navigators of a virtual world, providing them with the knowledge and skills needed to tackle and solve autonomously and successfully the tensions characterising their realities, allowing them to choose and create new syntheses.

Hence, in order to become truly successful on an educational level and turn into inclusive, challenging, and involving structures for students, schools should mobilise the territorial community around meaningful and shared values. They cannot keep being self-referential and isolated on an institutional level but they should

D. Maviglia (✉)
Department of Cognitive Science, Psychological, Education, and Cultural Studies, University of Messina, Messina, Sicily, Italy
e-mail: dome.ma@libero.it

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*, Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_7

engage with the (local) civil society in order to play an active part in an open, social, democratic project committed to the resolution of global issues. To provide new generations with a 'longing for the future' and a possibility to grow, it is important to make them more responsible in the search for new humanising pathways and sustainable development processes; they must be actively involved in democracy and, more importantly, they must feel that their efforts are recognised, enhanced, and could become a source of common hope.

In the twenty-first century, schools have the duty of supporting a globalisation free of marginalisation, with the aim of reaching a form of global 'governance' hinged on human development and fairness (Giroux 1997), without feeling nostalgic for ancient times of supremacy and without feeling sceptical and powerless when facing contemporary discomfort or loss of meaning. Each and every individual must take the choices needed to turn schools from repetitive establishments into community life places, where it is possible to learn how to learn, think, understand oneself and others, cooperate, and tear down the barriers that hinder personal and social growth. By rediscovering the true meaning of this humanising mission and by sharing it from a democratic and human solidarity perspective with all stakeholders involved, schools could become real engines of lifelong learning (Scurati 2001), promoting in particular the inclusion of individuals and groups at risk of marginalisation. This kind of school could also help in rediscovering the sense and 'taste' for a spiritual dimension, particularly in young generations, which are inebriated by a sense of freedom that does not feed them correctly and often numb their abilities to recognise limits and understand what really matters in life (Ouellet 2002).

Even keeping an unstable position in the current conditions of relentless change and mobility is becoming a tricky balancing act. In this century, communities should aspire to establish a school 'open' to all and 'for all', where it could be possible to learn how to produce culture and also question and open oneself to shared lifelong learning processes. A school that could support the understanding of complex dynamics by providing everyone with the opportunity to play a title role.

In a context that seems dominated by the effects of globalisation such as the standardisation of consumption and collective behaviour and the risk of cultural levelling, schools have the potential of becoming an empowering tool for creativity, to recover an existential dimension, enhance individual responsibility and, more importantly, commit to dialogue and provide a bridge between territorial-local realities and global ones.

All this outlines a form of school seen as a service provided by the community (Ribolzi 2000) and at the service of the local community, open also to a larger national and international community, and based more on learning than teaching. Furthermore, this form of school might be able to organise curricula that are concretely tailor-made for students, focusing more on development tasks rather than linear adaptive programmes. For these reasons, such school would require citizens who are aware, committed, and concerned about the future of humanity and the whole education of individuals, supporting the school as expression of the community. More importantly, it would need the passionate and creative commitment of

education professionals, who should work in team and consider professional maturity as a continuous work in progress.

The majority of teachers have indeed noticed how complex the education process has become and they are already working to recalibrate and find new parameters for intervention, testing new methods. The major change over the last years has been indeed a shift from a didactical and cultural 'isolation' of teachers – who were exclusively committed on a personal responsibility level to the education intervention – to a brand new form of exchange and coordination that boils down to a commitment to cooperation. The most important product of this process has been the concept of the educational project developed through a 'shared responsibility' both inside and outside the school, in cooperation with the social community in its broader sense (Sirna 2004). Research in the socio-educational field has shown that the realities that delivered the most efficient solutions were not only those that received substantial economic and human support, but also those that were built as 'open education communities', which were able to leverage their energies and channel their efforts in the 'creation of bonds', as Danilo Dolci (1985) would have said, enhancing the value of the relationship and social exchange network connecting teachers, families, and local community.

In other words, education has become today a commitment to the establishment of a pluralist, articulated, and – in particular – dialogical and inclusive culture that invests in the main actors of the education process: school managers, teachers, administrative and technical staff, children, families, and local bodies. The ability to organise forms of integrated, global, and contextual knowledge, fuelled by a process of critical and questioning reasoning, represents the only genuine requirement to ensure a fruitful collaboration; a *sine qua non* to successfully face uncertainty.

From a teaching perspective, all this implies that teachers should accept to co-exist with uncertainty, considering their educational endeavour a 'gamble' (Laporta 1979), working with action tools and flexible and creative strategies, without focusing too much on curricula, techniques, and mechanisms. Furthermore, this requires an overall commitment to the establishment of an integrated, global, and contextual knowledge, supported by an ethical commitment to put different positions and ideas in dialectical relationship.

According to Morin (1999), with the fall of ideologies and the fragmentation of knowledge, the post-modern age has led to the creation of a pluralist and fragmented world exposed to disintegration, where emotional insecurity dominates and there is no agreement on educational and training models. Therefore, the major challenge for schools and teaching is to succeed in acquiring and conveying to individuals the ability to face complexity by being aware of the 'common destiny' that we all share and by having the mental habits that we will need to address the defining challenges that are currently putting our existence, solidarity, peace, and values at risk.

For a Quality School; The Practice of Education and the Types of Knowledge of Critical Researchers

It should surprise no one that in an age like ours, when globalisation keeps causing deep and swift cultural and social changes, a growing attention has been devoted to educational processes and education institution. There is a clear need for new education and training pathways that could lend an helping hand to young generations looking for proper theoretical and practical knowledge to face the challenges characterising these changed contexts.

Consequently, the profession of teachers is now seen with renewed interest and there is a request to widen their functions and possess new and more advanced skills. Teachers are seen as the leading actors of the educational process, frontline 'agents for change'.

This implies that teachers must shoulder the burden of the contradictions and current sensitive and complex challenges of our lifestyle without receiving an economic, social, and professional reward for the qualitative improvement required to deliver this new kind of teaching professionalism.

The profession of teacher and its development are now at the centre of the debate on the innovation of schools and societies. And while there is a widespread agreement on the importance of the pedagogical principle that marks the central role played by students in the educational process (Xodo 2003), it has also been highlighted the significance and irreplaceability of teachers who can take on the complex and unavoidable task of promoting the development of skills to become active, competent, and aware members of humanity. Teachers are not just asked to be bureaucrats but also professionals, who are able to calibrate their interventions on the needs and skills of each student, finding their inspiration in a strong moral motivation and commitment to carry out tasks of assistance, guidance, entertainment, and mediation with smart sensitivity and a high degree of accountability, fairness, and involvement.

In this framework, teachers become major players tasked with the establishment of a 'quality school' that should be structured as a public interest service for the individual and the community, providing a place where knowledge is conveyed and created and in which various social forces meet and cooperate with a strong sense of responsibility. Therefore, quality schools are only those that 'keep a strong focus on results, the streamlining of procedures, and the efficiency and control of organisation but do not aim solely at reaching these goals, working hard to ensure the educational significance of their processes' (Sirna 2005, p. 29).

The 'educational quality' of schools can hence be evaluated by considering 'the way in which students reach final results, (therefore) the process is as important as the specific outcome' (Fiorin 2004, p. 153). If this is true, then the major driver to ensure quality in education is not the amount of information that schools provide or the skills that they nurture but rather the quality of the teaching relationship that teachers establish. Indeed, upon this relationship depends the launch of a process of

individual development aimed at building identity, autonomy, personal competence, and in particular an openness to social commitment and joint responsibility.

More than ever, teachers are important players involved in the transformation of schools into communities committed to the building of substantial and shared knowledge (Knowledge Building Community), a genuinely educational place where individuals become responsible and open to a dialogical and enriching relationship with what is different (Cacciamani and Giannandrea 2004).

Undoubtedly, these teachers are extremely different to those that followed teaching methods based on monologues aimed at conveying contents and notions, since these methods could be managed according to bureaucratic-administrative paradigms or curricula, following more or less validated official methods. Therefore, the professional and personal growth of teachers cannot be ensured by the decision of diligently following established formulas and rigid methods, but it is fed by a continuous reflection on and search for dialogical and collaborative behaviours and, in particular, by an effort to be open to others.

This means that since the beginning of the education process, teaching is not about a simple transfer of knowledge and contents, nor a process in which a creator-subject shapes an undefined body that is ready to adapt. In fact, teaching represents a process of simultaneous teaching and learning, in line with the differences that identify the two main characters of the education process, avoiding that one of them could become the object of the other. In other words, as it is well known, learning comes before teaching. Therefore, those who teach, learn while teaching; whilst those who learn, teach while learning (Freire 2001).

Consequently, when taking part in an authentic teaching-learning practice, there is an involvement in a full pedagogical experience that acquires a directive role. An experience that is simultaneously 'aesthetic and moral', in which beauty goes hand in hand with ethics and seriousness.

During this education process, teachers must exercise a 'moral and aesthetic responsibility' (Freire 2001) vis-à-vis the student, stepping into the shoes of a 'critical researcher' (Kincheloe 2008a). In other words, the practice of education owns a strictly 'moral and pedagogic' nature. As teachers, educators, professors or tutors, we must activate this nature in performing our duty as educators and, in the same way, highlight this responsibility also to those who are getting trained in order to take our place in the future. Educators therefore cannot ignore what Freire (2001) calls 'universal human ethics', which condemns the manipulation of truth, the exploitation of the weakest and defenceless, the manifestations of exclusion or cultural discrimination based on gender, race, social status, sexual preference or religious faith. Freire refers to ethics as a specific aspect of human nature, which is crucial to ensure human co-existence. A 'moral and pedagogic' nature that is constructed socially and historically not simply as something existing *a priori* but rather as the core of a process in becoming ('*in fieri*') that recognises and enhances the presence of others. In these terms, ethics becomes inevitable and, according to Freire (2001), its transgression turns into a non-value and never a virtue.

Hence, the best way to exercise and defend the double nature, i.e. 'moral and aesthetic', of the practice of education is to live it while exercising it, becoming its

enthusiastic witnesses in the eyes of students; showcasing moral rectitude, respect for others, coherence, ability to live and learn with differences. This means that educators should wear what Kincheloe (2008a, b) calls the hat of the 'critical researcher'; a 'teacher-researcher' who must firstly know and understand the socio-cultural contexts of students, and secondly recognise all possible oppressive and discriminating modalities that could exist in those particular contexts and negatively affect students (Kincheloe 2008a, b).

In other words, teachers and educators who are truly committed to the education of their students cannot ignore the social, cultural, economic conditions of their pupils, their families and the environment where they live each and every day. It is impossible to respect students, their dignity, their condition of beings-in-becoming, their identities '*in fieri*', without considering their living conditions and recognising the importance of the 'knowledge originated by experience' that they have even before attending school.

Considering the teacher's duty to respect the dignity of students and their identities still in the making, it is crucial to devise a way to implement a practice of education that grants the respect teachers owe to students and does not hamper it. This requires a continuous critical reflection on the practice of education that will eventually reveal the need for a series of virtues or qualities that are indispensable to evaluate and respect students (Freire 2001).

Furthermore, the 'critical researcher' must perform two main 'tasks', one related to teaching, the other related to research. These two intertwine with one another and it means that while critical researchers teach, they must also research and keep researching. They must research to verify, verify to intervene, intervene to educate and learn. Hence, the researcher-role of a teacher is not linked to a particular skill, quality or activity that enhances teaching abilities, but it relates to the wish to discover and research, which represents a crucial part of the teacher's practice. In other words, during their lifelong learning process, teachers must feel the need of being and considering themselves researchers, exactly because they are teachers (Kincheloe 2008a, b, pp. 19–21).

From this point of view, it is clear that the profession of teacher requires a high level of moral responsibility, particularly because it asks teachers to work with people, not objects. Because of this fact, teachers cannot refuse to keep a vigilant and caring eye on each and every student.

It is widely recognised that pedagogical experiences have the ability to awake, promote, and develop in the players involved in an education process the taste for love and happiness, elements that provide meaning to the practice of education. The work of teachers is always performed in relationship with people who live a lifelong researching process: students, people who are changing, growing, re-orienting themselves, improving themselves. Yet, they are still people and therefore they can even reject values, distort their identities, take steps back and transgress. Teachers must therefore be open to dialogue and be ready to listen, because their genuine encounter with their students depends on their relationships with them, their respect for differences, and the coherence between their words and deeds (Freire 2001).

In the practice of education, one of the main skills needed is indeed the ability to vouch and critically reflect on the openness to others and on the curious availability to embrace life and its challenges. This attitude provides the biggest chance to take the first steps on the path leading to a dialogical relationship. Furthermore, the availability to dialogue inevitably intertwines with the ability to listen. Being able to listen is both important and necessary and it requires the continuous availability by the listening subject to be open to the reasons of others and their differences. Hence, embracing and respecting difference represents one of the virtues required for listening. If one is prejudiced against a boy or a girl who is poor, or black, or Indian, or rich; or against a woman, a peasant or a factory worker, he will not listen to them and therefore he will not speak 'with' them, but only 'to' them, with a top-down approach, losing the possibility to understand them (Freire 2001). Feeling superior to people who are different, without considering who they are, entails the refusal to listen to them. Different people should not be mistreated or despised; they should be respected precisely because they are 'the other' and they deserve respect. In the intimacy of the education process, educators play a crucial role because they must promote the empowerment of those people labelled as different and they must shoulder the responsibility of making those people understand what kind of important 'human capital' they represent (Kincheloe 2008a, b, p. 110). In other words, teachers must always be open to difference and the facts of reality, with the aim of keeping activated and finely tuned their ability to listen with respect, think clearly, and make careful observations. At the end of the day, this is the right attitude of those who are always available to listen to the calls coming from others and respond to the different signals calling for action, without feeling like masters of the truth or objects at the disposal of the authoritarian discourse of others.

This availability to accept something new and reject all forms of discrimination, combined with a praxis free of race-, class- or gender-based prejudice, creates an approach that cannot offend human nature or radically deny the concept of democracy.

Necessarily, the issue of cultural identity cannot be underestimated, since it encompasses both the individual and class dimensions of students and its respect is absolutely crucial in the practice of education. The respect for the dignity and the identity of every human being is an ethical imperative, not a mutual favour that may or may not be granted. Being racist, classist or holding prejudices against someone leads to a transgression of human nature. There are no genetic, social, historical, philosophical grounds that can justify the superiority of the white race over the black race, men over women, or employers over their employees. All forms of discrimination are immoral and must be tackled, without considering how difficult it could be. The respect for the dignity and identity of students asks teachers to adopt a practice of education in line with this fact, forcing teachers to develop a series of virtues and skills that are necessary to avoid that their knowledge could become fake, idle chatter, or mere verbalism.

Educators must therefore be aware that certain qualities or virtues are necessary for all forms of progressivist pedagogical practice, like lovely care, respect for the other, tolerance, humility, taste for happiness and life, openness for what is new,

availability to change, will to fight, rejection of fatalism, identification with hope, openness to justice. These qualities or virtues are not awarded for good behaviour but they are built by educators with commitment when they toil to reduce the difference existing between their words and deeds, theory and practice; in other words, when they improve their coherence. The teaching profession is intrinsically human. It is deeply educational, hence ethical. Teachers are required to shoulder such a huge responsibility and they are not always aware of its importance. The nature of the praxis that must educate people highlights how it is carried out.

One of the biggest risks that teachers run because of the current ethics of globalisation and the existential fatigue felt by educators because of the lack of public interest in public education is falling prey to the fatalistic and cynical indifference that forces them to fold their arms and turn away. Nevertheless, if teachers respect their students, they are asked to promote humility and tolerance without denying their crucial role, which must contribute in a dialogical and positive way to turn students into promoters of their own education, with the necessary support of teachers.

For all these reasons, the respectful climate created by fair, serious, humble, generous relations represents the only setting in which the authority of teachers and the freedom of students can develop in an ethical way. Moreover, this climate makes the educational character of the pedagogical space truly unique. The pedagogical space has always been considered a 'text' that must be continuously read, interpreted, written, and rewritten. From this point of view, the higher the solidarity between teacher and students in 'taking care' of this space, the greater the opportunities of having a democratic learning model in schools. This fact illustrates very well how much the respect for difference and obviously different people requires a kind of humility that allows for the identification of the risks implied by the disregard of these limits, which could lead to forms of arrogance or false superiority by an individual, race, gender, class or culture over another. If this humility were lacking, it would become a transgression against the human vocation of becoming 'more fully human'.

Being a teacher means, therefore, finding the courage to carry out our profession on behalf of honesty and against immodesty; on behalf of freedom and against authoritarianism; on behalf of law and order and against the lack of rules; on behalf of democracy and against rightist or leftist dictatorships. Being a teacher means working to fight against all forms of discrimination, against the economic exploitation of some individuals or social classes. Being a teacher means struggling against the current capitalistic order created by the aberration we are witnessing: misery in wealth. Being a teacher means working to show the beauty of our praxis; a beauty that may disappear if we do not care for the knowledge that we ought to teach, if we do not graft for that knowledge, if we do not struggle for the right material conditions that are necessary to perform our duty. We must not stop caring for our body or neglect it; the risk we face if we let it run down and suddenly we let it stop being the symbol of what it should be: the body of a hardy fighter who might get tired, but never gives up—is the inability to rise to the many responsibilities of the teacher.

We risk loss of the beauty of our practice that is much more than just a reflection in the mirror of ourselves—arrogant and haughty (Freire 2001).

Teachers must therefore make smart use of several types of knowledge to establish efficient interpersonal relationships that could help individuals on their path towards the gradual development of their autonomy and social and personal growth. As a matter of fact, 'where there are no genuine and responsible interpersonal encounters, it is difficult that there will be genuine cultural learning and noticeable shared knowledge building' (Rossi 2005, p. 13).

The new tasks that falls on teachers today require them to autonomously and efficiently navigate in the various contexts where they are asked to play a multitude of functions, which are differentiated and equally important. This is possible only by exploiting several types of knowledge. Kincheloe (2008a, b) lists six types of knowledge that can endow teachers with the necessary skills to develop the personality, professionalism, conscience, and competency required to support and ensure success in the field of education.

These types of knowledge are:

- *Normative knowledge*. A type of knowledge that encompasses the moral and ethical values on which education is based.
- *Empirical knowledge*. A type of knowledge that features a series of remarks made on the various aspects of education, in particular regarding the strategic role of the teacher-researcher in the web created by the historical-social-political-economic reality and the philosophical-psychological-cultural situation of a specific context.
- *Political knowledge*. A type of knowledge strictly intertwined with the normative knowledge. It focuses on the way in which power affects the training of teachers, their teaching methods, and their programming choices.
- *Ontological knowledge*. A type of knowledge that concerns the set of teaching methods and pedagogical aims that teachers wish to pursue.
- *Experiential knowledge*. Kincheloe links this type of knowledge to the 'indeterminate zones of practice' identified by Donald Schön, who used this term to describe the uncertainty linked to the singular complexity of the nature of the practice of education.
- *Reflective-synthetic knowledge*. A type of knowledge based on the reflection about all those types of knowledge and teaching methods that can be used in a critical-pedagogical action with the aim of avoiding the indoctrination of students and help them acquiring a critical sense to objectively inform their opinion through a plurality of sources, making it morally democratic and politically fair (Kincheloe 2008a, b, pp. 112–118).

By properly cultivating and exploiting these types of knowledge, teachers can master the cultural tools that will allow them to become serious professionals of education, individuals who do not simply possess competences in few disciplines or relational and didactical techniques but who are morally committed to pursue goals related to human promotion and fairness in the framework of education institutions 'of all' and 'for all'.

Bibliography

Beck, U. (1998). *World risk society*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Cacciamani, S., & Giannandrea, L. (2004). *La classe come comunità di apprendimento* [The classroom as learning community]. Rome: Carocci.

Chiosso, G., & Mariani, A. (2002). *Teorie della scuola e professione docente* [Theories of school and the teaching profession]. In AA. VV (Ed.), *La formazione degli insegnanti. Scienze dell'educazione e nuova professionalità docente* [The training of teachers. Science of education and the new teaching profession]. Turin: Utet Libreria.

Citati, P. (1998). *L'armonia del mondo* [The harmony of the world]. Milan: Rizzoli.

Da Empoli, G. (2002). *Overdose. La società dell'informazione eccessiva* [Overdose. The excessive information society]. Venice: Marsilio.

Dolci, D. (1985). *Palpitare di nessi*: *Ricerca di educare creativo a un mondo nonviolento* [Beating bonds: Searching for creative education in a non-violent world]. Rome: Armando.

Fiorin, I. (2004). *La relazione didattica. Insegnamento e apprendimento nella scuola che cambia* [The pedagogical relationship. Teaching and learning in a changing school]. Brescia: La Scuola.

Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling: A critical reader*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008a). *Critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008b). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. London: Springer.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. (2006). *Doing educational research*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kincheloe, J. L., Bursztyn, A., & Steinberg, S. (2004). *Teaching teachers: Building a quality school of education*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Laporta, R. (1979). *La difficile scommessa* [A difficult wager]. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Morin, E. (1999). *I sette saperi necessari all'educazione del futuro* [The seven knowledges necessary the education of the future). Milan: Raffaello Cortina.

Ouellet, F. (2002). *Tolleranza e relativismo: Saggi sull'intercultura* [Tolerance and relativism. Essays on interculture]. Milan: Unicopli.

Ribolzi, L. (2000). *Il sistema ingessato. Autonomia, scelta e qualità nella scuola italiana* [A rigid system. Autonomy, freedom of choice and quality in Italian schools]. Brescia: La Scuola.

Rossi, B. (2005). *Intelligenze per educare* [Education intelligence]. Milan: Guerini.

Scurati, C. (2001). *Fra presente e futuro: Analisi e riflessioni di pedagogia* [Between past and future. Remarks and observations on pedagogy]. Brescia: La Scuola.

Sirna, C. (2004). *La cultura dell'autonomia* [The culture of autonomy]. In I. Fiorin (Ed.), *La scuola dell'infanzia nello scenario della riforma. Prospettive pedagogiche e didattiche* [Elementary schools in a context of reforms: Pedagogical and teaching possibilities] (pp. 13–34). Brescia: La Scuola.

Sirna, C. (2005). *Verso una scuola comunità di apprendimento* [Towards a community school of learning]. In C. Sirna & A. Michelin Salomon (Eds.), *Operatività ludicità cooperazione. Idee, percorsi e buone prassi a scuola* [Operative abilities, lucidity, cooperation. Ideas, pathways, and good practices in schools] (pp. 19–43). Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

Xodo C. (Ed.). (2003). *Dalle pedagogie alla pedagogia. Seminari itineranti. La persona prima evidenza pedagogica per una scienza dell'educazione* [From pedagogies to pedagogy: Moving seminars. The individual as major pedagogical evidence for a science of education]. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.

Domenica Maviglia is Doctor of Philosophy in intercultural pedagogy at the Department of Cognitive Science, Psychological, Education, and Cultural Studies of the University of Messina. Her work focuses mainly on critical pedagogy and the theoretical and historical research in the field of pedagogy, with a particular emphasis on the philosophy of education, the history of pedagogy, and the history of education. In her career, she has worked with different educational and training institutions, taking part to educational research projects carried out in several schools.

Confirming and Assuring Within the Unspoken: The Influence of Joe L. Kincheloe in Additional Language Education and Teacher Education in Australia

Naoko Araki and Kim Ann Senior

"Why do we have to learn Japanese? We don't use it at all in everyday life."

– a commonly voiced compliant by our past students in an additional language class

"For goodness sake, why are you making things so hard for yourself? You will never have to have a student in your class that basically doesn't want to be there. So just enjoy the ride."

– a comment made to Kim by a fellow 'elective' subject colleague in her first year of teaching

An Introductory Wish

Both authors of this chapter regularly heard the above criticism from students in Australia while teaching Japanese as an additional language despite working in diametrically opposed educational environments, in different cities and in different decades. Acquainted in our current work as teacher educators, we were bemused to find that even though in many ways our backgrounds and trajectories into the teaching of additional language were so very different, we found such a strong resonant

N. Araki (✉) • K.A. Senior
School of Education, Deakin University Australia,
Melbourne Burwood Campus, Burwood, VIC 3125, Australia
e-mail: kim.senior@deakin.edu.au

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_8

chord from our past experiences. Both of us had found challenges as new teachers of Japanese trying to communicate with students, parents and even colleagues who failed to see the possibilities in learning an additional language. This failure was by no means theirs alone. We also failed in the early days to be critically conscious of what it was to work as a teacher of language and a teacher of culture. As we discussed and pondered over our contribution to this book we were reminded again of the need to be courageous in this profession. To be strong for those for whom we are responsible and those to whom we are responsible, but also to be strong for ourselves. We need courage and strength in the day to day, in the small and in the seemingly insignificant for it is our belief that oppression and subjugation live perniciously in the unspoken or the aside. It is for this opportunity to share our experiences and dilemmas as well as the chance to be reminded that professional dedication and action is never completed, never done that we wish to thank the editors of this book for the opportunity to reflect on our teaching.

In Australia the choice of language, or even promotion of additional language at all, has always been politically driven. For much of its white history, additional language learning in Australian schools was confined to French, Latin and perhaps German (this waning with periods of war). As successive post federation governments kept their gaze and spiritual links to 'the mother country' additional language learning was a conservation of the traditional values of European centrism, cultural refinement and intellectual rigour. Formal additional language learning was largely confined to students beyond the primary years and confined to those students who were considered 'bright' enough, or by expectation, those who needed such rarified knowledge for social aspiration or tertiary study. In the 1970s some murmurings of community languages, such as Italian, Greek and Spanish found mild head -way with the government's promotion of multiculturalism. Early political engagements with multicultural policy also saw the promotion of additional language learning in public education as an instrument to further tolerance and understanding within Australia's growing diversity. However, a concerted national strategy regarding the learning of additional languages did not make a real impact on Australian schools until the 1980s when the Australian government determined its economic future lay with 'Asia'. As Prime Minister Hawke controversially stated in 1985, "Australia is part of Asia" – no matter that we had been ostensibly denying this for most of our white history despite our geographic reality or no matter what our 'Asian' or 'Pacific' neighbors thought of our belated declaration. Australia needed to promote trade with Japan, and we needed to create greater links with our very near and very populous neighbor, Indonesia. Successive Australian governments have been unequivocal in the underlying reasons for the promotion of additional language learning. In a foreword to a national guide on the teaching and learning of languages (Scarino and Liddicoat 2009), the then Minister for Education Julia Guillard opens:

> The Australian Government is committed to languages education in Australian school and recognised the important role it plays in equipping young Australians with the knowledge, skills and capabilities to communicate and work with our international neighbours (p. 5).

The primary focus for additional language learning in the past three decades has been unashamedly vocational.

It is from within this historical context that we the authors came to education as teachers of Japanese, not as educational leaders, not as policy makers and not as members of the school leadership team, but as classroom teachers. Between us, our experience spreads across two decades of language teaching and learning in both the public and private sectors of secondary school in Australia. As mentioned earlier our backgrounds are very different, and yet we both as new professionals firmly believed that language learning, in particular additional language learning including Japanese as a foreign language learning, was/is a site for meaningful ontological and epistemological work. Our teacher 'training' (as it was commonly refereed to at that time) and our practice as classroom teachers of Japanese predates Kincheloe's publications on *Critical Pedagogy* (2008; 2010) and *Critical Ontology* (2011), yet both of us have ensured that our present teacher education students engage with his work and those of other criticalists such as Debra Britzman (2003), Mary Doll (2000), Elizabeth Ellsworth (1992, 1997), bell hooks (2003) and Antonia Darder (2002) *because of* our early experiences in the profession. In the following pages we theorise what it might mean to struggle for professional courage and strength with integrity in the everyday, mundane or 'small things' of teaching.

Riding the Wave: A Teacher of Japanese in 1980s Australia

In the early 1980s I completed a Bachelor of Arts in Modern Languages (including a sub-major in politics) – the first person in my family to go to university and only the second one to graduate Year 12 high school. In my mid twenties I went back to university and completed a 1-year full time Diploma of Education (Secondary). In my course, English as a Second Language (ESL) and Languages Other Than English (LOTE) students were taught in the same class; in a cohort of around ten students four of us were to be LOTE teachers (two qualifying as teachers of Japanese and two as teachers of French). Demand for teachers of Japanese was so great at this time that both of us had a choice of positions in both the public and private education sectors; in fact my graduating peer was 'head hunted' by another State Education Department to work in their public school system. I became a teacher of Japanese at a new (in its second year of operation) public school in a growth corridor of the town in which I lived. A school in some ways demographically reminiscent of my own working class high school, although while my high schooling was reflective of the post war immigration families from the U.K., Greece and Italy, the school I came to as a teacher also included a new wave of migrant and refugee families from south-east Asia and the former Yugoslavia. This school also included a high proportion of students who identified as indigenous Australians.

I was not surprised that some of the students or parents questioned the relevance of Japanese language learning. Which community language should the school have promoted amongst the hundreds I am sure were spoken in the various homes of my

students? And who would have taught it? I had been fortunate enough, by luck rather than design, to be one of the first students in our town to study Japanese in Year 11 and 12 as part of a program where a university lecturer of Japanese had come into our public school and taught on a part time basis to overcome the shortage of Asian language teachers. It was this introduction to Japanese and access to opportunities to study in Japan on scholarship brought to my attention by this lecturer/teacher (the first person with a Ph.D. I had ever come into contact with) that impressed upon me most fervently the transformative power in an education. I not only wanted to be as skilled as her in Japanese and as broadly well-informed, I wanted the self-determination I saw in her life. So, whilst I went into my first position as a teacher of Japanese hoping that my students might find it as enthralling and fascinating as I did, what I was also hoping to do was engage in a pedagogical relationship with my students that considered who they might be or want to be. I wasn't surprised that some students and parents did not initially see things in this way, but what truly surprised me (and what I wasn't prepared for) was the political nature of nearly everything said, or unsaid, in schools. It wasn't just the students who suffered in this but myself as well. It took a long time before I recognised and deeply questioned the reproductive nature of the grand political narratives in the 'petite' life of my new chosen profession. I felt being well placed to take advantage of all the professional resources, materials and grants offered to Asian language teachers, as well as calling upon my own newly formed connections for the benefit of my students and school was all I needed to be the kind of teacher who could make change, or 'make a difference'.

Chinese? Japanese? Is There Any Difference?: Teaching Japanese in 1990s Australia

From the late 1990s until early 2000, while I was a Japanese language teacher at Australia schools, Japanese language was considered as an 'unimportant' school subject in students and their parents' eyes. I am a native to Japan (both parents are Japanese) but did my tertiary education in Australia as an international student. Whenever I met students in the very beginning of a new school year in Japanese language classroom, they first had to learn the unfamiliar non-English name, Araki. The attitudes towards Japanese language being a lower prioritized subject were demonstrated clearly in the parental attitudes at the elite suburban Christian private schools where I taught. In particular, a letter from one parent excusing her son's late submission of a homework project opening with 'Dear Ms. Cho, My son didn't do his homework because he had football practice and…' I still remember the sting of disappointment I felt after teaching the student for a whole year and his parent could not be bothered to learn an Asian teacher's name. The attendance rates at parents' interview nights twice a year for my subject were low. Only a couple of parents would come to the Japanese language table to quickly find out about overall scores

before heading home and after spending a long time at Math and English discussing their children's progress. These inquiries were often prefaced by questions in a doubtful tone about why their children had to study Japanese and how might Japanese prove useful in their future. Interestingly, I noticed a sense of relief cross their faces as soon as I spoke English with an Australian accent. Later, as the Japanese economy started declining and trade with China became more powerful, parents tentatively began expressing their desire for Chinese to be taught instead of Japanese because it would be more useful for future business opportunities.

The Japanese language was literally and obviously a 'foreign' language to my students and their parents. It was just not perceived as a useful subject in everyday life of Australian school. The general view that students had was that Japanese class was 'a fun time' or it was really only for 'clever' or 'bright' students. My agenda was how I could motivate the students and how I could reduce an emotional distance so that they would feel a closer familiarity with the language and culture. In every language lesson, I was unconsciously seeking innovative approaches and pushing my pedagogical repertoire. Another goal I sought was to encourage students to feel a sense of ownership and agency in using Japanese – that they would feel that they could 'speak Japanese in their own words to speak of their own world'. This was certainly a challenging task as typical language teaching in the late 1990s and early 2000 had been done at the table or desk through handouts and textbooks. Asking the students to use their imagination beyond paper materials would have created extra pressure in classroom. I simply refused to just 'ride' and refused to go with the flow that this is the way that students learn an additional language. I could not simply ignore a lack of engagement in Japanese language class.

I received my teacher-training education in Australia without experiencing schooling in Australia. During my bachelor years in the Faculty of Education, I was one of the few international students from Asia amongst thousands of local Australian students. This was my very first introduction to the idea that education illuminates political, social and cultural complexities. Ironically I felt I was excluded during my teacher-training course in that my educational and cultural background was not of value in this context. Yet, we studied about diversity and inclusion in a multi-cultural society. I remember in one of the lectures that students come into the classroom with their life experiences and teachers are there to include their valuable prior-knowledge in teaching. But my background as a Japanese person and my status as a minority ethnic group member in Australia society was not fully included within the teacher-training community. One day I was told by an Australian lecturer that I will never be able to become a teacher in Australia. In her opinion, my lack of 'experience' (i.e. being brought up in Australia) meant I could not possibly deliver successful teaching in an Australian schooling context.

When *P*olitics Meet *P*olitics Within the Language Classroom

Grand terms, like grand narratives, are easily banded about and easily *told*. Politicians, social commentators in the media and public policy makers are eager and interminably in the extolling of plans, processes and procedures towards a better or brighter future. Educational visions of equality, justice and social cohesion are as compelling as they are enrolling. This is especially so for those of us who have a story from their educational memory that resonates with the affect of exclusion or some kind of struggle. Consequently, like our past selves, many of our present teacher education students are drawn, understandably, to the ideals of 'making a difference' in the lives of learners. However, virtuous intent without critical reasoning may add to the suffering within a pedagogical context. Sweeping simplicity as grand ideas or plans is often reduced to platitudes, and fail to recognize or appreciate the complexity and devil in the detail.

We use the term 'suffering' intentionally here in the way it is commonly used in the discourse of critical pedagogy, but we also use the term in the Buddhist sense. Attachment to what was, or to the way things are, can create suffering within an individual and it can inhibit adaption and change. In the way we see this in a pedagogical context, attachment to beliefs that are not regularly interrogated lead to an ontological paralysis: change or action that may be truly transformative cannot occur. The ensuing suffering is not just of the individual in which this paralysis rests, but also in the social fabric around them. When one person suffers, we all suffer in some way. Again, whilst our responses to the circumstances we found ourselves differed, in the following passages both authors share their undoing and unraveling of their ontological paralysis in their classroom.

Alleviating Suffering through Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning: Kim's Approach

The first year of teaching is always a difficult period yet the leadership team of the school where I took up my first position was proactive and generous in their support and concern for new teachers. It was a young school in a growth area with a mix of highly experienced staff and newish graduates. I was paired with a mentor, had regular meetings with our head teacher of Social Sciences and Languages, and the principal made a point of informally 'checking in' and chatting with me about my classes and how I was settling into the school. My mind and energy was taken up with the day to day business of *being* a teacher rather than the why of teaching – and in particular the why of teaching Japanese.

I didn't really think about it until a series of minor events and interactions in my classroom. In the first instance, as young people are want to do, some of the more outspoken students wanted to know if my Japanese was really any good. "Of course", I said, "I may not be Japanese but I studied the language at university both

here and in Japan". "Well", was the comeback, "if you are so good at it why aren't you working at a big Japanese company making lots of money." My students clearly associated a capacity in Japanese with lucrative job prospects even though we lived in a town with no major industry or any large Japanese companies. This was not unsettling on its own; I was glad to reap the benefits of any motivation to learn. On another occasion, a discussion arose over the difference between 'polite' forms of verbs and the 'plain' forms of verbs. The students wanted to know why I was teaching them 'polite' language. "Because polite language is what most people use at work. Plain language is used in at home or amongst friends", I replied. The students accepted my explanation but it began an uncomfortable feeling within me: was it only about work? I looked around my class and really looked about me in this, sometimes deeply, challenging school. Was I simply there to provide industry with a generation of workers? Was I teaching to alleviate concerns in the community about the chances these students had in getting a job and staying out of 'trouble'? What relationship did I want the students to have with Japanese and language?

During this tumultuous first year it hardly felt like a 'ride'. The comment post at a staff meeting that opened this chapter was but one of many instances or occasions that on their own seemed insignificant, but continued to bother me. Bother turned to aggravation over a period of time as I noticed that many students constantly came to me to ask permission to train during class time. The requests would come in the form of a note from one of the Physical Education (PE) teachers that I would be asked to countersign so that students could be released from my class for a number of sessions. When I took up the concern that this seemed to becoming more than just an occasional thing with the head of the PE department I was told: "What these kids need is sport and discipline – most of them will be lucky to get to Year 12. Training for cross country or the school team gives them self-esteem and a great sense of achievement. So what do you want to do? Take that away from them? Can't they just catch up on your stuff? Give them a hand out on what they miss."

In my undergraduate degree I had read Paulo Friere's (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. It made sense of the political struggle in South and Central America discussed in tutorials. Nicaragua. Liberation, education, freedom and determination: it was all there in our conversations and debates. Silently I felt the tug of recognition as a daughter of working class parents to some struggles to my right to a seat in this tertiary institution. But these struggles seemed small by comparison to the bloodied and sacrificing path taken by others. I could empathize, but the dramatic nature of these larger struggles seemed a long way from my life in Australia. Years later, the PE teacher's comment changed all of that. It wasn't as simple as uncovering a system of oppression at work and then doing something about it. Nothing is that simple. I was part of the problem as well. I wondered about who students might be or want to be and I certainly questioned what kind of relationship I wanted them to have with the language, however I had never asked them. I was furious that the PE teacher, and I am sure he was not the only colleague with similar views, thought he had the right to determine who the students were and what they needed. Yet in my own way I was doing the same. This realization spurred me to raise my concerns with my mentor within the school, an experienced English and

History teacher. She introduced me to the writings of John Holt (1976) and Maxine Greene (1973) as well as inviting me to come along to team-teach in some of her classes. My colleague was radical, unashamedly subversive and passionate about learning – learning for everybody. We discussed ways in which we might make learning the focus of our teaching. We pondered how we might disrupt the confines of the timetable to give our students and ourselves greater time for indepth discussion and to work in flexible ways.

In my second year of teaching, my colleague and I had recruited a social science educator into our plans and lobbied support from our principal to trial an interdisciplinary program for Year 7 and 8 students. We collapsed the times allocated in the timetable for English, Japanese and Social Science to create space for our 'new' classes. Rather than teaching Japanese straight away, we began with the social science curriculum concerns of place and identity. Through various tasks and activities we asked students to think about who made up our community and explored what role language played in the life of our students. We encouraged questions. We deliberately provided no answers but encouraged students to seek their own and work towards discussion forums. We followed the students into history rather than taking them there. I found myself reading letters of kamikaze pilots with year 8's who were fascinated by the 1983 film '*Merry Christmas Mr. Lawrence'* and grappling with the concepts of war, torture and power. We discussed primary, secondary and interpretative sources of information. The classes were difficult and challenging to prepare and co-ordinate, but they provided opportunities to hear my students and for them to hear each other. At times I was fearful that by letting go of a formal or traditional approach to teaching Japanese, I was not meeting the expectations of a language teacher. And yet, with the assistance of my mentor I learnt to see how to introduce components of the language curriculum alongside the exploration of culture, identity and history. The Year 8's learnt the parts of the body in Japanese (and some I didn't even know) from a book in the library that had diagrams from a samurai text describing the dissection of criminals.

At the end of year 8 students no longer had to study a LOTE and Japanese became an elective subject in year 9. Classes at my school were very healthy and at one point we had the highest number of students electing to stay on to study Japanese in the public schools of our region. There may be many reasons for this, but what I believe now is that our interdisciplinary approach to learning, and our teaching, respected 'the social web of human life' (Kincheloe 2010, p. 204). It enabled us to see and listen to our students and to engage them in dialogue about their lives and aspirations; not in the grand sense but in ways that were attentive to the dramas of their everyday lives and hopes.

Alleviating Suffering with Drama Pedagogy: Naoko's Approach

The distance the Australian students and their parents felt towards Japanese language influenced students' motivation and attitudes in the language classroom. In other words I focused more on the complexity of 'hidden curriculum' within the classroom and within the school community as Aoki (in Pinar and Irwin 2004) suggests curriculum as 'a living experience'. After several attempts were made with alternative approaches in my Japanese classes, I decided to do a trial of drama pedagogy in the Japanese language classroom. In order for the students to feel more familiar with Japanese, the use of the target language needed to become 'a living experience' in their daily life of Australia. Being immersed in an imaginary world that drama pedagogy provided, I was able to set a realistic scene where Japanese language became alive within the classroom environment in Australia.

The dramatic world empowered these students to fully utilise their prior knowledge and experiences, and consequently a feeling of urgency to communicate in Japanese emerged from inside of the learners. Drama pedagogy insinuates one of the concepts of critical ontology (Kincheloe 2011), "the biotic web of the natural world" (p. 204) with the full use of physical movement in drama. As previously stated, Japanese was considered as an elitist subject, but the urgent feeling of 'wanting' to use Japanese in a meaningful context was seen in students while they were participating in a drama focused Japanese class, in particular the ones who were less confident with the language. This was the very first moment when they took initiative in their learning that they became more active and responsible about what they were learning, why they were learning it, and whether they wanted to learn. One girl who always said she hated learning Japanese because she could not read the basic scripts of *Hiragana* also joyfully engaged with the drama focused Japanese class. The focus was for her to act out being in someone else's shoes. The focus in the class was not Japanese language itself. It even surprised the girl that she was able to read some *Hiragana* characters when giving a Japanese name to her imaginary character. Her curiosity and keenness to participate in character building activities had unconsciously overridden a negative impression towards learning Japanese. From this moment, Japanese language became no longer 'foreign' to her.

Drama allowed participants to discover and re-discover others and self. Joe Kincheloe (2011) extensively discussed that a notion of Critical Ontology recognizes reconnecting 'self' and 'others' that refers to "new and better ways of being human, being with others, and the creation of environments where mutual growth of individuals is promoted and symbiotic learning relationships are cultivated" (p. 208). Through the drama focused Japanese language curriculum, the students were conceptualising "new ways of analysing experience and apply it to the reconstruction of selfhood" (Kincheloe 2011 p. 202). While I was seeking innovative approaches for Japanese language teaching in Australian schools, I had never known anything about Kincheloe's notion of Critical Ontology and Critical Pedagogy. My students certainly appeared to be more active in their learning and showed motivation

to grapple with using Japanese in their own words. The change in students confirmed that my attempt was meeting the students' needs at that time, however I sought collegial support and affirmation. I received positive and warm support from drama educators, but not so much from the Japanese language teachers. Language teachers' support was always qualified. They thought this approach was 'a nice approach' but possibly deviated too much from what needed to be covered. Looking back at my own teaching from the perspective of a researcher in education now, I wish I could have met Kincheloe's books during in my teacher-training years. Gaining a better understanding of Critical pedagogy in a teacher-training course would give assurance and encouragement to teachers who question 'standalised' curriculum and pedagogy. Critical pedagogy should not be introduced as an 'advanced' notion. It should be taught rather earlier. If we see curriculum as 'a living experience' as Aoki (in Pinar and Irwin 2004) insists, it requires the critical lens in Kincheloe's notion of Critical Pedagogy (2008, 2010, 2011) to view the classroom environment, assess students' progress, and alternate the use of certain pedagogy. It encourages questioning 'the norm' within each discipline in education.

Conclusion

> "意味がある授業をする先生というのは、*Norm, Value, Belief* が熱意になって現れていて、それが自分にも伝わってくる、そんな先生だった。逆に意味がないと感じた授業をする先生は、その教科に対する価値観とか熱意とかが見えず、ただ作業的に授業をこなしている印象だった。おそらくそれは、自分が教育という現場の中心にいるんだという、主役としての意識の差かなと思います。*As a student, I viewed teachers who deliver meaningful classes as the ones with passion. The ones who worked from an awareness of norms, values, beliefs. On the contrary, teachers who delivered meaningless classes did not project their passion and values. They gave an impression that they simply taught lessons. Perhaps, the difference is whether they are fully aware of their stance of being a main character within a middle of the field of education."*
>
> – a recent pre-service student, *Keisuke Hattori"s*, reflective comment

When critically reflecting a professional stance as teachers, we learn that "no teaching, curriculum development, knowledge production is value-free, no language [including additional language] is politically neutral, and no meaning making process is objective…Thus, human "being" itself is never a disinterested dynamic and must always be self-monitored for the ways it has been shaped by power" (p. 207). These teachers are aware of the political influence within larger and smaller narratives. They do care about the little 'human suffering' that goes on in an everyday teaching situation. Despite being immersed in the discourse of 'managing' their teaching and student learning, they do not fail to problematise the inherently political nature of the everyday classroom. Some students in each classroom like the one in the above quote fully recognize the teachers' little sufferings based on their compassion as well as their critical and ontological views on pedagogy in the modern society. The recognition gives relief from those little sufferings. As teacher

researchers, we therefore ask ourselves and our students in teacher-training courses not to practice in education from a position of perfection but to make visible the political influences and to critically reflect on every moment.

References

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice*: *A critical study of learning to teach* (Rev. Ed.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Cambridge: Westview.

Doll, M. (2000). *Like letters in running water: A mythopoetics of curriculum*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 90–119). New York: Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Holt, J. (1976). *How children fail*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hooks, B. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. (2010). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kincheloe, J. (2011). Critical ontology: Visions of selfhood and curriculum. In K. Hayes, S. Steinberg, & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Key work in critical pedagogy* (pp. 201–217). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Pinar, W., & Irwin, R. (2004). *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scarino, A., & Liddicoat, A. (2009). *Teaching and learning languages: A guide*. Carlton South: Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Naoko Araki has worked in higher education both in Australia and Japan and was a Senior Lecturer in Languages Other Than English/Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages at Deakin University, Australia. She studied at The University of Melbourne in the 1990s as an international student and later taught additional languages in both Australia and Japan. Her research interests are pedagogical relationships and theorizing integrated curriculum with applied theatre in additional language education.

Kim Ann Senior is a Senior Lecturer in Pedagogy and Curriculum at Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia. She has over two decades of experience as an educator in Australia, Japan and Vietnam. Her research interests focus upon pedagogical relationships, literacies and visual methodology/methods in research.

Part III
Joe L. Kincheloe: “A Man for All Seasons”

Knowing Joe L. Kincheloe Through a Medium

Gresilda (Kris) A. Tilley-Lubbs

October 25, 2013

Shirley Steinberg sends me an email asking if I am going to AESA (American Educational Studies Association) since it is in Baltimore, close to Roanoke, Virginia, where I live. I decide to go so we can get together and talk about next year's meeting for the Critical Pedagogy Institute in Mexico the next October.

When I ask where the conference is being held, Shirley replies to my email:

Baltimore Inner Harbour Hyatt.

I reply:

This feels very mystical—that's the hotel where I first met you and your kids and grandbabies and when my life got turned totally upside down and I started the long process of feeling like there might actually be a place for me in the academy. I got back to Virginia and told Jim Garrison that you had asked me to take him greetings from you and he told me I could trust you—my trust level in academics was all but non-existent right then—after I talked to Jim, there were two academics I trusted—him and you. After that day, you and Joe have been present in everything I write or present whether I mention you by name or not.

Shirley messages me on Facebook:

i added you in to speak a few minutes in the Joe session. Eelco's theme is the holograph and the man, in that he never knew joe. You sort of have the same experience.

G.A. Tilley-Lubbs (✉)
School of Education, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA
e-mail: glubbs@vt.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_9

> So I start thinking about how to write about a man with whom I had chatted for maybe 10 minutes, but who has had such an impact on my work since I first learned of his existence. I felt even more apprehensive reading this sentence in the note Shirley sent to all of us:

> Let me give a quick introduction to the first four speakers who represent friends, really family, who go back with Joe and me for decades. I just want to articulate the personal with each of them, their scholarship will speak for itself.

> I certainly feel like family to Shirley, but decades? Hardly. However Shirley added:

> I asked some of our closest friends to speak a few minutes after the 4 main papers, and hopefully you will have time to tell some stories and remember the contributions that Joe made…his foundations were foundations. I am hoping Dennis, Rochelle, Tricia, and Kris will add to this celebration.

> Setting: American Educational Studies Association Annual Meeting

Baltimore Inner Harbour Hyatt, 2013.

I sit in silence, waiting for my turn to speak. Since I am toward the end of the session, I have the opportunity to listen to four people who present papers. They talk about Joe as an amazing colleague, as a beloved teacher/advisor, and as a treasured friend. They tell stories that bring him to life. They blink back tears. They bring the circle of listeners to tears of laughter. They share the personal side of Joe Kincheloe, but they also drop nuggets of information about a remarkable scholar who forged a path for those of us who can't buy the academic formulas that dictate most scholarship in the academy. The closer it comes to my turn to speak, the more I realize what I missed by not knowing Joe personally through the years. Ellie, Randy, Mary Frances, and Bill share stories, and bring to life the man I met briefly at the annual meeting American Educational Research Association in New York in April 2008. He and Shirley were running to another session, so we didn't do more than exchange basic greetings. As I listen to the presenters and the rest of the audience talking about Joe, my sense of having missed knowing someone whom I would have liked a lot, both personally and professionally, grows.

I clear my throat, and begin, "Knowing Joe Kincheloe through a Medium."

Meeting Joe Through a Medium

I first became aware of the existence of Joe Kincheloe when I met Shirley in this same hotel in November 2007 at the annual meeting of the National Association of Multicultural Education space (NAME). At the time, I was planning to teach a course on diversity and multicultural education for preservice teachers of English as a Second Language. After dinner, I decided to check to see if any of the book stalls were open so that I could find some books for my new course. Since it was after 9:00, of course everything was closed, but Shirley was still at the Peter Lang booth waiting for her daughter-in-law to finish feeding the baby. I had never met Shirley

before, so rather tentatively, I approached the booth, trying to ignore the fact that the lights were all out.

When she asked if she could help me find anything, I told her what I needed. Shirley ran around grabbing books and telling me the virtues of each one. Understandably, many of them were written by Joe. Shirley and I ended up talking for a long time, and I told her how I felt like such a misfit at my university and how concerned I was about tenure since I didn't do things like everyone else. By the time I left, she had told me, "You're one of us. You're a critical pedagogue. Join the Freire SIG, and we'll take care of you. You have to meet Joe. You'll love Joe."

I met with Shirley again at NAME in November 2008 in New Orleans. That time, she talked about having a videotaped conversation with Joe for the Freire website about Joe's and my shared hillbilly heritage. But Joe died in December 2008.

Unpacking My Resonance with Joe

As I read the books Shirley had recommended for my course, "Diversity and Multicultural Education in Teaching English Language Learners", I continually found myself thinking, "That is what I do/think/say, and everyone looks at me as if I am not worthy of being a real scholar." For the first time since I had begun my Ph.D. and then continued as an assistant professor at the same rural university in Southwest Virginia, I began to develop a sense of confidence in following the path at which many of my colleagues scoffed. Similarly, my students, many of whom are natives of Appalachia, have demonstrated a similar resonance with Joe's writing. Reading Joe somehow provides us with a sense that being Appalachian and navigating life as we do is acceptable, and even laudable. We can be scholars, but we can still talk with the soft twang that causes us to recognize each other no matter where we met. We can still use our Appalachian ways of thinking and create new theories.

Teaching Joe

"Diversity and Multicultural Education in Teaching English Language Learners" is primarily intended for traditional students who pursue master's degrees with licensure, which is the first license to teach, immediately or within a few years of receiving their bachelor's degrees, or for practicing teachers who have licensure in content areas, but who seek master's degrees with endorsement to teach English as a Second Language (ESL) in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. For this course, I use *Diversity and Multiculturalism: A Reader*, and repeatedly, students are particularly drawn to Joe's chapter, "No Short Cuts in Urban Education: Metropedagogy and Diversity." Many of my students are from rural areas in Virginia, but many are also from the Washington, D.C. area, a large urban landscape about five hours from the

university. This chapter appeals equally to both groups as they seek ways to understand what it means to be a teacher in classrooms where the majority, if not all, their students are marginalized and vulnerable, due not only to the language barriers they face, but also because of their life circumstances.

Often, urban education refers exclusively to large metropolitan areas and to primarily African American student populations, but in this chapter, Joe allows for a broader conceptualization of metropedagogy, which Joe describes as constructing its "philosophical foundation on notions of empowered, professionalized teachers working to cultivate the intellect and enhance the socioeconomic mobility of marginalized urban students" (p. 383). He addresses the issues that my preservice teachers face in their placements in the largest city in Southwest Virginia, with a metro population of 97,032 (Census 2010), and a metropolitan area of 288,309 (Census 2009). The city school system has 1014 students who are receiving ESL services, and they represent approximately 42 countries and 37 languages. These students represent nearly 8 % of the total student body of 13, 127, and they receive services from 12 teachers at all grade levels. My students do both their Early Field Study and their Student Teaching with licensed ESL teachers in the city, since that is where the refugee and immigrant families tend to settle in this area. Although the number of students and the percentage they represent do not match the numbers or percentages in the cities whose school systems are normally identified as "urban school systems," these students' needs are just as pressing and significant as the needs of similar students who attend schools in those large urban areas whose populations are more than a million inhabitants. The issues these urban students face often mirror those faced by students in large urban areas as well—unsafe neighbourhoods; lack of adequate shelter, food, and clothing; inadequate support for academics at home, whether due to parent (and student) work schedules or other factors such as parental levels of education and English proficiency; faltering motivation due to perceived lack of prospects following graduation; and so on. Joe strongly advocates establishing connections among "students, teachers, families, communities, and schools" (p. 385), all with the intention of "facilitat[ing] learning among their young people" (p. 386). By incorporating communities in the curriculum, the curriculum becomes place-based, which addresses local needs rather than needs that were identified at the federal or state level.

Perhaps one reason this chapter resonates so deeply with my students is that it reflects the philosophy of the ESL and Multicultural Education program in which they are participating. All students are required to perform 20 h of service-learning in an afterschool program at the middle school that has been designated as the English Language Learner (ELL) Centre for the city. In this experience, they learn to know students personally, in ways that transcend the normal academic day. As they describe their work in the afterschool program, they often use the vocabulary they learned from Joe regarding the "macro-, meso-, and micro-dimensions of urban education, and the multiple ways such dynamics intersect in the teaching and learning process" (391). They speak of "how bright these kids are," or about how much they bring to the classroom. They rant about the deficit notions they hear about "their kids," about whom they become extremely defensive. They talk about ways

they adapt the curriculum to make sense for students who come from such different backgrounds and who are in the process of learning to navigate in an alien system with alien customs. In other words, they learn to advocate for the students.

In this chapter, Joe provides a brief history of urban education, and then he goes on to push against the deficit notions that are prevalent toward urban students. Since the students are also required to read selections from *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (Payne 1996), the class discussions become lively as the students problematize Payne's stereotyped generalizations about students living in poverty, calling her chart "Hidden Rules Among Classes" (pp. 42–43), countering her generalizations with arguments from metropedagogy. Just as had happened with me, I observed and heard my students developing the vocabulary and the concepts to problematize the deficit notions they encountered in their field experiences in a school district that provides every new teacher with a copy of this book. Joe writes that "[M]etropedagogy works to make sure that schools in the poorest and most marginalized areas operate simply to *not* (italics in original text) retard the intellectual growth of their students" (p. 386). Joe poses questions that indeed create teachers who leave the course feeling empowered to make changes for their students whose circumstances often cause them to be marginalized, whether due to socioeconomic circumstances, language, religion, race, or other cultural perspectives that can result in oppression.

By providing the words and ideological understanding to question who determines what knowledge counts, Joe helps me to shape teachers who leave the program ready to challenge existing curriculum based on dominant culture ideas of what students need to know. Teachers feel empowered to challenge the dominant voices that describe their students in deficit terms, voices that ascribe failure to their students from the outset. They become warriors against tracking, stepping forward as advocates for extremely bright students whom other faculty characterize as lacking due to their developing English proficiency.

Preservice and practicing teachers also develop an understanding of their roles as professionals, rather than as powerless workers in the neoliberal educational system. They learn to "transform diverse forms of knowledge, subjugated insights, and academic subject matter in ways that make them immediately useful to [their] students" (p. 393). They become agents of change with an understanding of urban education in in their own contexts.

Joe and Doctoral Students

After teaching my diversity and multiculturalism course for several years, I decided my doctoral students needed an advanced course on critical pedagogy to help them develop their theoretical perspectives for their dissertations. Once again, I contacted Shirley, who suggested a number of books, mostly written or edited by Joe, or by Joe with Shirley. Through Shirley, I had also learned of the Freire Project webpage (http://www.freireproject.org/), where I found numerous resources for teaching the class.

The first time I taught "Introduction to Critical Pedagogy," I showed the video *Why Critical Pedagogy*, using the DVD Shirley had given me when I saw her at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in New Orleans (now available on the Freire Project [http://www.freireproject.org/freire-project-tv/]) on the first night of class. Since this was a doctoral level course, and I was the advisor for a number of the students who were preparing to be university professors in teacher education for teachers of English as a Second Language and Multicultural Education, they had taken an early iteration of the diversity and multicultural education class, *Topics in Diversity and Multicultural Education* course, which meant they had a basic understanding of critical pedagogy. However, the other students, who represented a variety of disciplines, were not at all familiar with critical pedagogy.

As we watched the video, I noticed that the students were becoming increasingly engaged, especially with Joe's laid-back, easy-going style. Sitting there on that red leather couch, he made us feel as if we were in the room with him, listening to him talk about his relationship with Paulo Freire and Pato Gómez. Following the video, I asked the students to form small groups to discuss what they expected to learn in the class as well as how they expected critical pedagogy to shape their doctoral work, particularly as they worked toward writing the dissertation. From that point, we launched into reading and discussing *Critical Pedagogy Primer* (Kincheloe 2008) the following week.

Thus the journey continued with teaching Joe Kincheloe. During each of our three-hour classes, Joe was a viable presence. After watching the video, the students began to refer to him as "Joe," rather than "Kincheloe," which is how many students refer to the authors of the literature they read. I believe having that sense of familiarity with Joe created an open space for the discussion of tough topics. The syllabus stated the justification for the course, the mission statement, and the learning objectives, all of which resonated clearly with what the students were learning from the *Primer* and from *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now* (McLaren and Kincheloe 2007). When I prepared the syllabus, I referred directly to the body of "Joe literature:"

Justification for the Course

This graduate seminar will introduce the ideas, theories, and practices that together constitute the field known as critical pedagogy. We will read the work of several authors whose contributions inform the field in significant ways. These writings will guide the exploration of some key themes within critical pedagogy:

- the relationship of education to power;
- issues of difference and pluralism;
- the meaning of teaching for equity and access for all students;
- the social construction of knowledge;

- dialogic relations in the classroom;
- teaching for social justice; and
- moral and ethical dimensions of education.

Mission Statement

In facilitating a course focused on critical pedagogy, I plan to create an inviting and stimulating environment for participants to form a learning community based on mutual respect and interests with the common goal of pursuing research and inquiry that includes developing a deep understanding of critical pedagogy as a theoretical framework. Students will construct their own knowledge, including knowledge of their own beliefs in ways that are meaningful and applicable to their own projects and goals, and that grant them ownership of the class and its outcome. The class will create a third space of freedom to engage, discuss, and examine critical issues that shape educational practice and subsequently society as a fluid entity. Class participants will react to the readings to explore conundrums that interest, perplex, concern, and puzzle them.

Learning Objectives

Having successfully completed this course, the students will be able to:

- Identify how critical pedagogy can inform their research agendas.
- Analyse how power and privilege influence their research.
- Make evident through deep questions their understanding of the literature that undergirds critical pedagogy as theory and methodology.
- Develop an extensive bibliography of critical pedagogy works that inform their own research topics.
- Develop a theoretical framework appropriate for a dissertation using critical pedagogy as a lens.

I could well have stated all these in first person plural, because during the three iterations of this course, I have continually deepened my own knowledge of critical pedagogy, most especially my understanding of teaching Joe. Now I also use the video *Seeing through Paulo's Glasses: Political Clarity, Courage, and Humility* (Cucinelli and Steinberg 2012), but my students continue to be captivated by Joe's down home approach to talking about profound topics in the original video. As we read, discuss, reflect, and argue with Joe and with each other, we develop or deepen our understanding that we live in a flawed world that we need to work hard to change.

As we discuss bricolage, we find a place to situate the beliefs and the paradigms that compel us as scholars, all with the realization that it is possible to work interdisciplinarily and intermethodologically—and Joe gives us the freedom to invent words when none are available. My student Rebecca writes, "Reading Kincheloe (2007), for example, taught me about the role of criticism in critical pedagogy, and I began to 'appreciate the fact that all education spaces are unique and politically contested'" (p. 16). She continues, "[C]ritical pedagogy forces us to 'defamiliarize the world of schooling'" (Kincheloe 2005, p. 19). Citing Kincheloe, she states that:

> [A]s budding critical pedagogues, we would be able to articulate our arguments for critical emancipation (Kincheloe 2007, p. 21) by explor[ing] a robust yet complicated second language. Words like hegemony, bricolage, neoliberalism, criticality, problematize, positivism, poststructuralism, postdiscourses, and many more slowly began to build a critical, shaky foundation.

We read "Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualizing a New Rigor in Qualitative Research" (Kincheloe 2001), and we begin to see the possibilities for doing research that matters, research that can generate change. We read as he challenges those who state that "[I]f one is focused on getting tenure he or she should eschew interdisciplinarity;" stating that "[I]f one is interested in only doing good research, she or he should embrace it" (p. 680). He reinforces our belief that there are no fixed answers. We all stand reaffirmed in our beliefs in the absence of The Truth. He provided all of us with the words and the theory to push against the positivist waves that try so hard to drown those of us who don't buy into that tradition.

Joe and Mexican Doctoral Students

Once again a conversation with Shirley changed my life's path, and started me on another journey that would result in my teaching Joe and Shirley to groups of doctoral students at the *Instituto de Pedagogía Crítica* [Institute of Critical Pedagogy] (IPEC) in Chihuahua, Mexico. While we were chatting at yet another meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Shirley mentioned that she had been at a critical pedagogy conference in Chihuahua, Mexico. Knowing that I was a Spanish literature major for my first two degrees, and that much of my work is in the Spanish-speaking community, she said, "I have to get you connected with the Chihuahua group. You'll love them!"

I did have the chance to meet the IPEC group, and I did love them, and much to my surprise, I received an invitation to deliver a keynote at a conference they were hosting in the *Universidad Nacional de Pedagogía* [National Teaching University] Chihuahua. They also asked me to do several seminars and workshops while I was there, and after that experience, I received an invitation to teach courses for them via WebEx. One of the courses I teach is *Pedagogía Crítica y Multiculturalismo* [Critical Pedagogy and Multiculturalism], and when I once again turned to Shirley for advice on finding an appropriate text for the IPEC doctoral students in the course, she said,

"Use Joe's and my book *Changing Multiculturalism"* (Kincheloe and Steinberg 1997).

> "But I need a text in Spanish," I protested.
> "It *is* in Spanish," she replied. "They have it somewhere in their files at the IPEC."

After the exchange of several frantic emails, the folks at the IPEC sent me the eBook, *Repensar el multilculturalismo*, which I sent to the students just in time for the first session. As I read and prepared class, I constantly worried that the book was too US-centred for a Mexican audience. The first class was an introductory session, and for the second class, the assigned chapters dealt with defining multiculturalism and with "rethinking educational purpose"[1] (p. 27). From there, we went on to look at power and democracy; hegemony, representation, and the struggle for justice; class, gender, race, white privilege,[2] and critical multiculturalism. When preparing each week's class, I struggled with how the students would make these US-centric concepts their own. For example, multiculturalism with its roots in the United States tackles racism with an emphasis on African Americans, who are virtually non-existent in Mexico. However, the students were fascinated with the topic, wanting to know more about the racism that is still predominant in the United States. The class occurred in the midst of the Ferguson police brutality, which prompted many questions, since the Mexican news media covered the situation fully. As the conversation continued, one of the students, José Luis, commented that although in Mexico, there are not instances of racism against African Americans, racism certainly exists toward indigenous people throughout the country. From there, students began to construct their own meanings of racism, and as a final comment at the end of class, José Luis said in Spanish, "Kris, how can we as teachers examine ourselves to fight against being racist oppressors? This discussion has helped me to identify my own racist attitudes, which I never before knew I had."

I had similar concerns when I prepared the class on white privilege. I knew from the time when I served as the interpreter for the IPEC faculty who attended the critical pedagogy conference in Malta that Mexicans don't tend to be familiar with the concept. If they haven't spent time in the United States, they probably aren't familiar with white privilege, which I translated literally, not realizing that in Spanish, the translation is not literal. As I did a simultaneous translation of a conversation about white privilege, I saw blank stares that indicated total lack of comprehension. I finally realized that white privilege doesn't exist in Mexico. So I decided to start the IPEC class with a question: after reading the chapter on white privilege, how can you transfer this to Mexican culture and society? Once again, I was surprised by the ensuing conversation. Comments moved from obvious ones about skin colour, with a general consensus that discrimination and loss of power increase as the colour of an individual's skin becomes darker. The lighter skinned Mexicans tend to have

[1] I also purchased the English version of the book, and the citations I use in this chapter refer to the English version of the book, *Changing Multiculturalism.*

[2] White privilege is translated as *idiosincrasia blanca*, which literally translates to "white idiosyncrasy or peculiarity."

more European heritage, whereas darker skin provides evidence of increasing amounts of indigenous heritage and subsequent loss of power and privilege. This led to a discussion about the ways that skin colour often determines social class and opportunities as well. The students in this class are all teachers or administrators in schools, and soon the discussion focused on the deficit notions that schools enact toward indigenous students.

The translator of the book translated critical multiculturalism as *multiculturalismo* teóricos [theoretical multiculturalism] Kincheloe and Steinberg (1999). When I mentioned that I had been apprehensive about the transferability of the book to a Mexican audience, the students referred to the theory of multiculturalism as universal and applicable across all cultures. With each successive class, their comments and questions indicated growth in thinking by the application of theory. They began to talk about how they would need to change the focus of their dissertations after having their thinking disrupted in such powerful ways. At that point, I realized that Joe and Shirley had managed to create a book that espoused theory that knew no borders, either geographic or linguistic.

Concluding Thoughts

So my elusive relationship with Joe began with Shirley as the medium who faithfully channelled Joe and made him a presence, both visible and invisible in all my scholarship and teaching since November 2007. The more I have taught Joe to doctoral students, the more I have realized that his influence is professional, but also personal. When I read Ryan Clements' blog (http://www.freireproject.org/what-joe-kincheloe-taught-me-about-life/) about his father-in-law's influence on his life, his words resonated deeply with me. From the time that Shirley first told me I had to meet Joe, another hillbilly soul, I began to feel hope, something that had been in short supply in my career as an older Ph.D. student and then as a tenure-track faculty member in a university that prizes all the things against which Joe wrote. From the time I watched the first video and the interviews with just Joe, the hope grew into a fighting spirit that told me not to accept the traditional norms espoused by the neoliberal university, but rather to carve my own way, and in turn, to encourage my students to do the same.

References

Cucinelli, G., & Steinberg, S. R. (2012). *Seeing through Paulo's glasses: Political clarity, courage, and humility*. Canada. freireproject.org.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*(6), 679–692.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical constructivism*. New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: Evolution for survival. In P. McLaren & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 239–261). New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer* (5th ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L. (2009). No short cuts in urban education: Metropedagogy and diversity. In S. R. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader* (pp. 379–410). New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Philadelphia: Open University.
Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1999). *Repensar el multiculturalismo* [Changing multiculturalism] (J. Real, Trans.). Barcelona: Ediciones Octaedro.
McLaren, P., & Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York: Peter Lang.
Payne, R. K. (1996). *A framework for understanding poverty* (4th ed.). Highlands: aha! Process.
Steinberg, S. R. (Ed.). (2009). *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader*. New York: Peter Lang.
United States Census Bureau. (2009). 2009 National Population Projections (Supplemental). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/projections/data/national/2009.html?cssp=SERP
United States Census Bureau. (2010). United States Census 2010. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/2010census/data/?cssp=SERP

Gresilda (Kris) A. Tilley-Lubbs is Associate Professor of English as a Second Language (ESL) and Multicultural Education in the Teaching and Learning Faculty of the School of Education at Virginia Tech. Her qualitative research uses autoethnography and ethnography to focus on conducting research in immigrant communities, interpreted through a critical pedagogy lens. She presents her research in alternative literary genres such as poetry and ethnodrama. Her work has been widely published in international journals, including *Qualitative Inquiry, International Review of Qualitative Research*, and *Creative Approaches to Research*. Her scholarship has been published in English and Spanish.

Teaching/Learning Radical Listening: Joe's Legacy Among Three Generations of Practitioners

Melissa Winchell, Tricia M. Kress, and Ken Tobin

"Joe Kincheloe is not just an objective researcher or teacher—and neither are you." (Kincheloe 2008, p. 36)

In Knowledge and Critical Pedagogy In *Knowledge and Critical Pedagogy*: *An Introduction* (Kincheloe 2008) and *Critical Constructivism* (Kincheloe 2005), Joe Kincheloe challenges his readers to develop critical consciousness by rejecting techno-rationalist models of schooling and instead seeking out learning as an interconnectedness and exploration of self and other in the world. These works are exemplars of the ways in which the body of Kincheloe's work demystifies the roles of epistemology, ontology, and axiology in teaching and learning. Together, they highlight that: (1) knowledge can never be separated from the knower; it is situated and cannot be understood out of context; (2) the ways of knowing and being that we practice and reward as educators reflect what we value, which is necessarily shaped by our particular locations in the web of reality; and (3) in order to reframe our understandings of the world, we must listen to and learn from others, especially those who are dissimilar from us. Through the lens of critical constructivism, we actively and continuously participate in the construction of the social world, and our interpretations of the world are necessarily diverse depending upon who we are and the vantage point from which we see the world. As such, a given truth is never singular; it is always plural. Teaching can therefore never be a simple transmission of

M. Winchell (✉)
Humanities and Fine Arts, Massasoit Community College,
1 Massasoit Boulevard, Brockton, MA 02302, USA
e-mail: mwinchell@massasoit.mass.edu

T.M. Kress
College of Education and Human Development, University of Massachusetts Boston,
100 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, MA 02125, USA
e-mail: Tricia.Kress@umb.edu

K. Tobin
The Graduate Center, City University of New York,
365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA
e-mail: ktobin@gc.cuny.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_10

facts; to do so is an exercise of power that reduces the complexity of lived experience and imposes a particular (and ostensibly correct or superior) truth upon students. From a critical constructivist perspective, presenting one's own understanding of the world as inexorable fact is an act of oppression. Schooling, from this perspective, is an institution that maintains systems of domination; teachers and students are dehumanized into depositors and receptacles of information, and human potential is limited to predetermined social schemas that normalize and maintain social inequalities. In the United States, such inequalities often fall along race, class, ability, sexuality, and gender lines.

As an alternative, Kincheloe proposes that teachers become researchers of their students, themselves and the world (Kincheloe 2003). This is crucial because, like proverbial fish unaware of the waters in which we swim, often teachers are unaware of the preconceived understandings of reality that teachers and learners carry with them into classrooms. If education is to be a liberating act that fosters social transformation, this transformation must happen in each of us. None of us is objective or all knowing, and there is much we can learn about ourselves and the world by listening to our students. While Kincheloe did not write about "radical listening" in the aforementioned texts, the act of listening (to students, our inner voices, the world around us) is foundational to how his works frame what it means to be a teacher and researcher. In this chapter, we aim to bring to the forefront radical listening as praxis. As three "generations" of scholar-practitioners—and we use this term not to denote age differences, but to highlight the continuation of the teacher-student, mentor-mentee relationships represented among us (Ken-Tricia, Tricia-Melissa)—we layer our contexts for radical listening with our practices of it. In each section, we provide a conceptual discussion of radical listening followed by our individual experiences with it. We begin by introducing our readers to each of our first encounters with radical listening. Next, we think together about the implications of radical listening within and among our particular teaching and research contexts and explain why Joe's early conceptualizations of radical listening are particularly, historically, and currently salient. Then, we each present our own practices of radical listening as we seek to demonstrate how "teaching Joe Kincheloe" necessarily suggests that we practice radical listening, and that such practices are, of course, multiplicitous, diverse and incomplete. We conclude by highlighting crosscutting themes that characterize our individual/collective conceptualizations of radical listening. Throughout, we aim to preserve our individual voices, while drawing new understandings from our collective "listening" as we co-author this chapter.

Radical Listening as New-to-Us Praxis

Each of us has come to radical listening in varied ways. Ken was introduced to the concept through Joe's unpublished works; Tricia was introduced by engaging in teacher-student relationships with Joe and Ken; and Melissa was introduced in a

doctoral course taught by Tricia when reading an article written by Ken. Since 2009 when Ken was first introduced to the concept, each of us has contemplated and begun to apply radical listening within our contexts. Ken has developed heuristics so that teacher education students can monitor the extent to which they listen to and feel heard by others in the classroom. Tricia has used Ken's work to encourage doctoral students to be open to multiple perspectives in her doctoral classes and in the schools in which they work. Melissa has engaged with the concept as both a former student (in Tricia's doctoral course) and as a teacher of undergraduate and graduate education in public and private higher education institutions. In each case, radical listening involves consciously valuing others by attempting to hear what the speaker is saying for the meaning he or she intends, rather than the meaning the listener interprets through his/her own view of the world.

This runs counter to how teaching and learning typically happens in U.S. classrooms. In an educational system framed by Western epistemology, singular "correct" answers are typically valued, leaving little room for multiple interpretations. In the classroom, Western ways of knowing encourage individualism and competition. When working with in-service and pre-service teachers who are or will soon be working with diverse students, this can be problematic because students' diverse knowledges may be devalued in the classroom, which can lead to misunderstandings and feelings of disrespect between teacher and student. As students and teachers listen and are listened to (i.e., engage in dialogue in a Freirean sense), radical listening affords opportunities for new awarenesses and mutual culture to be collaboratively generated by classroom participants. In the section below, each of us provides a brief description of the beginnings of our individual experiences with radical listening, followed by a discussion about the significance of radical listening in our professional contexts.

Ken (and Kincheloe) Soon after Joe Kincheloe died in 2008 I read some text he had written for a co-authored contribution with me. In it he introduced the idea of radical listening, whereby an individual listened attentively to what was being said with the goal of fully understanding what was said and considering its potential. Rather than focusing on pitfalls and shortcomings, the focus of radical listening is on making sense and exploring possibilities. Listeners set aside the temptation to suggest alternatives until it becomes time to explore the downsides of what has been suggested. Examples of characteristics from a radical listening heuristic include the following: when I talk others listen to what I have to say; when others talk I listen to what they have to say; I maintain focus; I value others' perspectives; others value my perspectives; when I talk I build on what others have said; when I talk others build on what I said; I test the potential of others' contributions; I try not to judge the quality of others' contributions until I understand them; others do not judge the quality of my contributions until they understand them; and others test the potential of my contributions. Possible transformations that might arise from being reflexively aware of radical listening included learning from the other, setting aside one's own standpoints, and messing with axiology by intentionally dis-privileging cherished values. These revolutionary actions create conditions for learning from the other by

being with the other, and learning from difference by valuing difference as a resource for learning. Also, doing these things is an example of counterclockwise conduct. Mainstream practices, which reproduce the status quo, recommend listening, comparing and resulting. These intend to make harmony from disharmony, creating cognitive equilibrium and generating awareness of the strengths of new equilibria. But these practices fall short; frequently absent are efforts to understand fully the affordances of others' perspectives and their relative strengths—somewhat independently of personal constructions and associated values. To undertake radical listening is to open the door to transformation, and to act in new ways of being, doing, and understanding.

Tricia (and Kincheloe) I entered into my doctoral studies in Urban Education at the CUNY Graduate Center as a teacher educator who helped teachers learn to integrate technology in their classrooms. Though I was confident as a teacher educator, I felt deeply insecure as a doctoral student. I listened as my classmates talked about social justice; I mulled over what that term meant as it was tossed around casually, and I wrote down words like "hegemony," "axiology," "hermeneutics" and "epistemology" so I could look them up later to learn their definitions. Mostly, though, I felt like I was in over my head. Everyone else seemed to be so much smarter, more well-versed in theoretical ideas, and so much more radical than I was. I remember sitting in Joe's office as he read a draft of my first-ever doctoral paper. My approach to the topic was unorthodox and felt risky because, in my mind, it wasn't academic enough—I used metaphor and satire to illuminate my understandings of urban education. But as Joe read the paper, he responded, at first, with small interjections: "Wow!" "My God, that's good!" and then finally a howling "Sweetbreads!" Joe laughed and it shook his whole body until he collapsed over his desk seemingly exhausted, and he looked me in the eye and said, "Tricia, this is brilliant." Unlike previous professors I had, Joe read and listened for what I was trying to say, rather than overlaying onto my words what he wanted or expected to hear. Through that encounter I gained a role model for who I wanted to be as a professor. I wanted to be able to engage with students in such a way that I could hear what they were trying to say without projecting my vision of the world onto them. I wanted to be unassuming, suspend judgment, and consider the plausibility of the world as my students experienced it. I wanted to radically listen as Joe did and guide my students to do the same.

Melissa (and Kincheloe, Tricia, and Ken) A second-year doctoral student, I returned to my studies after an unexpected yearlong leave of absence. Sitting among a new-to-me cohort of colleagues in a class on urban school culture, it seemed to me that my position within that cohort was a tenuous one—they did not know me, and I did not know them—and I was often afflicted with a painful, middle school-esque self-consciousness in those early weeks of class as I tried to navigate their competitive, professionally distant cohort culture, which was so different than my previous cohort's culture had been. And as I soon learned, the cohort was struggling through interpersonal conflict that predated me. A few weeks into the class, Tricia chose to address the tensions of the cohort head-on. As I recall it, she explained that the

group dynamics needed to be improved—there had been conflicts and strife among them, and between them and other professors in the program—and offered us an article to read as a framework for changing the cohort's culture. That reading was Ken's editorial on radical listening, a concept about which Joe had begun writing before his passing (Tobin 2009). Reading Ken's editorial about Joe and his conceptualization and practice of radical listening had a profound effect on my experience within Tricia's class. I began to learn from Joe—via Ken via Tricia—the import and opportunity "to tune into the emotional structures of fields" and to understand and transform them (2009, p. 506), and the piece gave me courage to bring my whole self—not just my academic self—to the group via a personal narrative I dared to read as a part of an academic presentation. The cohort's positive response to my reading resulted in a compelling conversation that day; in addition, it began a process via which the cohort and I began moving in and through and out of our differences to respect and know each other.

Radical Listening Within Yammering Contexts

As we work within the educational landscape of the twenty-first century in the United States, we find ourselves confronted by contexts dominated by loquaciousness—the yammering of politicians, classroom scripts, policy changes, and other monologues of the powerful. Much of the constant chatter emanates from contemporary educational policies, which are driven by high stakes mandates and which turn a blind eye to the importance of social context in teaching and learning and so-called achievement gains on standardized tests. In urban education settings, such as those in which we (Melissa, Tricia and Ken) work, concerns about "achievement gaps" and improving test scores are intertwined with questions about race and class inequities and the (im)probability for schooling to act as a buffer or even a remedy for social problems that are deeply rooted in our nation's colonial history. Pressures on students, teachers and school administrators mount as standardized measures (both tests and teacher evaluations) hold very real consequences for individuals whose futures hinge on improving student and teacher performance. This constant "progress" mentality is reminiscent of the efficiency logic of the Industrial Revolution, harkening back to Adam Smith's pin factory in the eighteenth century (Kress and Patrissy 2014). Despite the fact that educators are in the business of developing unique and dynamic people, rather than uniform and inanimate pins, school adults and youth find their practices bound by epistemological, ontological and axiological schemas that prioritize social efficiency and sameness, maintain the status quo, and squelch out possibilities for social change. Meanwhile, it is becoming increasingly clear on a global scale that change is necessary. The forward march of neoliberal capitalism and the contemporary iteration of industrial progress logic have had disastrous effects on the lives of people around the world; these schemas have proven to be industrially productive but socially, economically, and environmentally destructive.

Within this context in which talk without dialogue is incessant, radical listening dares to suggest that the ear holds potential for transformation. As Conquergood (2003) explains, "metaphors of sound privilege temporal process, proximity, and incorporation. Listening is an interiorizing experience, a gathering together, a drawing in…" (p. 357). Because listening is multidimensional in so many ways—we "hear" others' words, content, inflection, and body language, while also "hearing" via our perceptions, histories, and cultures—radical listening teaches us about the speaker and the hearer and multiple spaces in between, affording new ways of knowing and being. Radical listening is thus prismatic and transformative, involving multiplicities of culture, experience, and self, which works to counter the monochromatic epistemologies and ontologies that are prized by social efficiency and put forth as "universal truths" for all of humanity.

The contexts in which we each learn, teach, and research—science education (Ken), educational leadership (Tricia), and undergraduate and graduate education (Melissa)—too often eschew the values of radical listening, including subjectivity, learning from others, meaning-making, and the valuing of difference and contradiction. Instead, the pressures of conformity, clear answers, singular explanations, uni-voiced curricula, dichotomies, and positivity prevail. Critical pedagogy has provided both theories and practices of resistance within the aforementioned ethos, but even calls from critical pedagogues may raise the volume levels, adding to the yammering educational culture more and more battle-crying for particular ways of thinking and doing. Joe's concept of radical listening offers critical pedagogues a way to reinvigorate the radical spirit of critical pedagogy as a praxis of coming together, rather than battling or destroying, and seeking out the potential for transformation within each of us and within the spaces between us. Radical listening emerges from a love of humanity and a love of life—it is a praxis of celebration of the world that is yet to be, which we will create in the in-between spaces of dialogue and listening (Kincheloe 2008). As a celebration of the praxis of radical listening, we present here the importance of radical listening within the particularly loquacious contexts in which we each teach.

Melissa I am a full-time assistant professor of English at an urban community college; I am also an adjunct professor of undergraduate and graduate education within private and public colleges. In both of these contexts—2- and 4-year schools of higher education—radical listening is desperately needed. On the one hand, as a community college professor, I experience the stronghold of power-talk first-hand: in the state in which I teach, community colleges have become the new frontier for increased state oversight and management, as state dollars become tied to college performance criteria and gubernatorial talk of increased state control and centralization is becoming reality.[1] On the other hand, I also teach prospective teachers, educators, and administrators at 4-year colleges who are working in an increasingly tense bureaucratic educational environment. Among the yammering

[1] http://www.bizjournals.com/boston/print-edition/2012/02/03/community-college-presidents-push-back.html?page=all

directive discourses of national and state educational reforms, state-mandated curricula and assessments, and the tying of teacher evaluation to student test scores,[2] my students struggle to practice education as a human endeavor. The challenge for my colleagues and me is how to help our students forge professional identities and practices in such a talk-heavy, dictate-driven culture; we continue to look for ways to inspire our students to think in and outside the yammering construct and ultimately, to resist it.

Ken A persistent problem in science education is the continuing dominance of crypto-positivism and theories of learning that emphasize conceptual change of individuals. A massive wave has morphed research on conceptual change into research on argument focused tightly on learning canonical science. Science is not valued as contextualized knowledge that reflects individuals' positioning in social space. Instead, there is a strong emphasis on using argument to show the shortcomings of positions that deviate from the canonical representations. Difference is often regarded as a deficit rather than an indication of lived experiences and an opportunity to see how science differs according to social criteria. As a praxis of science education, radical listening positions differences as opportunities for expanding knowledge of science and revealing its connections to society.

Tricia As a professor in an educational leadership doctoral program, I work with students who are accomplished educational leaders in some way, whether they are teacher leaders, school or district administrators, or community leaders. As experienced education professionals who know how to be successful within contemporary yammering contexts, my students are experts in their local settings, and they are adept at administering, receiving, and implementing directives in those settings. They are accustomed to providing answers and assessing impact in order to continue to reform and streamline day-to-day operations in their workplaces. These are important skills in the fast-paced, results oriented culture of K-12 urban education reform, but they create challenges when students are asked to take an inquiry stance as doctoral students. As my students engage with each other in their courses, they are exposed to the varied perspectives of their classmates who come from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds and work settings. At the same time, they are introduced to new theoretical lenses and research literature. Often, their instincts are to consider the likeness or application of what they hear or read to their own life experiences and settings and to reject ideas that do not fit neatly into their pre-established social schemas. Learning to listen for difference can be challenging because difference is often a destabilizing force (at least initially); instability is problematic when trying to implement monological school reforms. In addition, as my students are acquiring a new social science vocabulary, they might not yet feel fluent in academic language that expresses how they are making sense of complex theoretical ideas. This requires that as a professor, I model radical listening as we dialogue. When students express opinions or viewpoints, I ask them questions like,

[2] http://www.commonwealthmagazine.org/News-and-Features/Online-exclusives/2011/Spring/011-MCAS-becomes-test-for-teachers.aspx

"I am hearing you say X; is this what you mean?" Or, "I'm not sure I understand, could you tell me more about that?" Or, "This sounds like or reminds me of X; was that your intention? How did you come to that?" Usually, within a few class sessions, the students notice and begin to follow this discourse pattern, which is meant to help them develop each other's ideas by being listeners and creating a platform for the whole class to deepen our learning.

Radical Listening as Praxis: Teaching Joe Kincheloe

For Kincheloe, listening includes rather than ostracizes, making varied and changing dialogic spaces. From our perspective, this radically loving, radically hopeful dynamic is sorely missing within contemporary conversations about critical pedagogy, which too often feel like static and defined battlefields. Contemporary educational reforms underpinned by ideologies that privilege standardization and efficiency promote a type of schooling that is intrinsically dehumanizing, which necessarily positions practitioners of critical pedagogy in an oppositional stance. As the political becomes personal, frustrations run high and tempers get hot, and understandably so as multiple waves of reform suppress the very humanistic and democratic teaching and learning dispositions that critical pedagogues embody. Our instincts may be to protect the sovereignty of our teaching-learning spaces within critical pedagogy by raising the volume of our protests to guard the fortress of our critical positions. Radical listening, on the other hand, re-theorizes teaching-learning spaces (even seemingly hostile ones) as multidimensional and heterogeneous, prismatic spaces of possibility for transformation. These spaces leave us vulnerable; they expose us as constantly in process, and reframe so-called battle grounds as fields of listening and learning. Yet, we also must feel free to maintain our sense of self and our convictions—radical listening does not mean we must assimilate into others' ways of knowing and being in the world. Knowing is forged in the spaces between the self and other, and how and what one knows in that in-between space can be different from others who are also in those dialogical spaces. It is this complicated, humane, collaborative, and hopeful dynamic that Joe's passing and his theorizing of radical listening has inspired and that we would like to reclaim as critical pedagogues.

Kincheloe's conceptualization of critical constructivism, which provides the impetus for a praxis of radical listening, is informed by theorists like Haraway (2003) who privilege the voices of the marginalized over the powerful. In her essay, she focuses on the eye and visual perspective, claiming that the most objective visions of reality are those that are offered by the subjugated, precisely because their visions are not in denial of others' knowledges. As she argues, "there is good reason to believe vision is better from below the brilliant space platforms of the powerful" (p. 29). For Haraway, embodied, situated knowledges and partial perspectives are a resistance to the perspectives and oppression of the majority, but for the majority, these powerful perspectives are not often known by the powerful. The majority are

not aware of their perspective as historic, socially constructed, and even heterogeneous. For this reason, despite critical pedagogues' resistances to majority perspectives that historically and presently serve to oppress marginalized groups, listening and re-listening to the majority and creating spaces for dialogue both deconstructs majority perspectives as normative and provides a model positionality (radical listening) for working and living within diverse communities. In other words, Kincheloe's radical listening seeks not to resist the powerful with another perspective or narrative the powerful will only ignore, it enters into the vision of the majority, seeks to hear it for the first time, and works in a dialogic, active, cooperatively engaged relationship to explore its iterations throughout history and culture. Moreover, as majority educators (whether via race, gender, sexual orientation, or able-ness), we also need to recognize the limitations of our own perspectives and deconstruct our own privilege, and we cannot do this on our own. In this regard, we must practice listening to the voices from "below" and "above." For Kincheloe, it is the eye-mouth dynamic and all the prismatic contexts in-between that have power to transform our vision of the world. He reminds us that the ear provides a peaceful, loving, and humble way to work with others to resist and reframe the contested educational milieus in which we work. In that hope for transformation, what follows are individual moments of radical listening as praxis within our own teaching and learning.

Moments of Radical Listening as Praxis

Ken In research on cogenerative dialogue that I helped to begin in Philadelphia in the 1990s, there was an ideal opportunity to practice radical listening as a desirable practice that has important applications for all citizens in the conduct of social life. Specifically, in most classroom contexts we used cogenerative dialogue as an activity to ascertain what was working well to support teaching and learning and what was not working well and needed to be changed. Since the participants in cogen were selected because of their differences from one another, there was an obvious niche for radical listening, making it possible to objectify differences of perspectives, examine the affordances of each, and negotiate ways in which agreements can incorporate differences as strength. The idea that consensus can and should embrace difference as strength is important for cogen and in a larger context, for social life.

Even as I look at my earlier work, I see alignment between radical listening and my 1970s research on using wait time to improve the quality of classroom environments and associated learning. When teachers and students extended their wait times from about a half second to an average of almost three seconds, the quality of verbal interaction greatly improved. This indicated that the use of silence generated deeper thinking and attentive listening, and perhaps repair work related to the rise and fall of emotions.

It seems like an imperative for teachers to have routines and rationale for conducting classroom dialogues that can transform learning environments and expand the possibilities of functioning effectively as literate citizens in the world outside of the classroom. Radical listening is a component of teacher education that fits well with teaching and learning practices such as extending average wait time and increasing mindfulness of classroom practices. In a context of teachers being researchers with the students in their own classrooms, the adoption of radical listening in relation to a rise in equity and social justice is a necessary focus for beginning teachers.

Tricia The semester that I worked with the Young Researchers Club (YRC) of Urban High School[3] was perhaps the most wonderful but also the most frustrating semester I have encountered in my more than 15 years as an educator. The YRC and I worked together to design and conduct research in an afterschool club, and the learning we engaged in together was profound. The Young Researchers went to a public school that had been labeled one of the worst schools in the city. The school's standardized test scores and graduation rates were bleak, with more than 70 % of 10th grade students not proficient on the Math and English Language Arts state-mandated MCAS exams, and only a 50 % graduation rate. In contrast, the Young Researchers, many of whom were also on the school's statewide championship debate team, were conducting sophisticated critical social research complete with theoretical frameworks in their free time after school. The contradiction between the failing school and the academic prowess of the YRC led me to question why some students were outshining their peers in better performing schools even as the school as a whole was failing. One of the YRC's discoveries was that teachers and young people in the school held deficit views of each other and the school as a whole, which often made it difficult for students and teachers to work together in the classroom. In my own research, I found that deficit views of urban youth, even youth as academically talented as the YRC, are pervasive. Caring adults like me who think we approach students from an asset-based perspective can slip into damaging deficit mindsets when we are not mindful of them. Developing this awareness was humbling but empowering because the Young Researchers and I held a deep respect for each other and the learning that was happening in the spaces in between their world and mine. They taught me to listen to them openly and to consider their interpretations of reality as truth; from that, my outlook on education, the students, myself, and the world has been greatly changed.

With this in mind, I experienced intense disequilibrium when, after working with the YRC, I would attend a weekly university faculty development seminar for improving teaching. This seminar was designed as a space for junior faculty to reflect on and improve their practice. What I encountered was a hostile environment; most of the people in the seminar held beliefs about teaching and learning that ran counter to everything I know as a critical pedagogue and urban educator. Conversations about students often included words like, "they can't," "they're just,"

[3] Urban High School is a pseudonym.

"they don't know," "they won't," and "they're only." All of these deficit phrases tended to precede the faculty members' dissatisfaction with their students' preparedness to learn college materials or their lack of engagement in class discussions or their general apathy toward the course material. As the professors lamented about how the students just wanted them to tell them what they needed to know to pass their classes, I had visions of the Young Researchers who fit the demographic profile of these professors' students. And I considered how the Young Researchers who fought daily to receive a quality high school education would soon be sitting in college classrooms facing the same deficit lenses. I often found myself angry with my colleagues, nearly all of whom were White females from privileged upbringings who had never worked with urban lower-income youth and youth of color prior to this. In an attempt to make them aware of their privilege, I pointed out that their students would have no motivation to engage in their classes because there was a power imbalance, and there was no reason to engage when all they needed to do to pass their classes was to memorize information that was stored in their professors' heads. Finally, I brought video of my time with the YRC. I wanted to help the group see their students differently. These sessions were not my best radical listening moments; my attempts to show and tell my colleagues how to see or not see their students implicated them and created a culture of silence around issues of race, class and power. I wonder what opportunities for learning and improving education for urban youth were missed because I was unable to assume a radical listening stance.

Melissa In the fall of 2014, I conducted an ethnographic study of an undergraduate class on urban education I was teaching at Stanton College,[4] a private, religious, 4-year college on the East Coast. Like many undergraduate programs in the United States, most of my students in the course were White, female, and middle-class. As part of my course design, I decided to require my students to email me each week rather than writing frequent, more formal papers throughout the course. The assignment was intended to be, and became, an ongoing dialogue between me and each student—students wrote to me following our weekly class seminar with their reflections and questions on course content, and I wrote each one of them in return. The following week, students would respond to my previous email and to the latest class seminar; in this way, the dialogues unfolded over the semester as each student and I wrote to one another every week. The dialogues helped me—an adjunct professor who was an outsider to their learning community—come to know my students better, even as they came to know me. And, for the purpose of my study, these email dialogues provided important artifacts of the learning of both my students and me within our critically multicultural course.

I found within my data multiple evidences of the email dialogue's ability to further, challenge, and disrupt thinking and to call out White silences and privilege. This was particularly salient in my work with White teacher candidates, whose very privilege in society perpetuates a silencing of dialogue about race; a majority of my students reported in a survey at the beginning of my course that they were "very

[4] Stanton College is a pseudonym.

uncomfortable" talking about race, even with other White people. All of them created space within the email dialogue for more honest conversations about race, and most told me these were the most honest, challenging, and transformative conversations they had yet had. One outcome of the email dialogue was that it created a forum in which White teacher candidates represented themselves as unique individuals; as a teacher, the dialogues pushed me away from thinking of my students in generalizations. The dialogues made space for silence, for difference, for disequilibrium, and for an ongoing practice of listening to one another. As a result, I learned that the White teacher candidates in my classroom were not a monolith, but were a diverse group of thinkers. And, because White teacher candidates are often stereotyped as ignorant and in need of multicultural remediation (Lowenstein 2009), I looked to radical listening—via email dialogues and other practices in our course—to reposition my students as active, engaged learners. My ethnography highlighted the ways in which radical listening is also necessary and useful when working with, and listening to, students who are privileged. The email dialogues demonstrated change and movement for both my students and me as our listening with and to one another made impact on our racial identities.

Radical Listening as Praxis: Learning Joe Kincheloe

For all three of us radical listening is a praxis—a theory and practice, an embodiment of an always-evolving, incomplete idea. Joe's legacy has inspired the three of us to work with, through, and within radical listening in our particular teaching, learning, and research contexts. As teachers, we simultaneously live radical listening and live it imperfectly. As an ongoing process of becoming, teaching from a radical listening standpoint is a misnomer. Radical listening is not teaching, it is learning and in learning we as educators teach by example. Educators are therefore learners-teachers and our students are teachers-learners.

In co-authoring this chapter, we have made evident our thinking about and working with radical listening, placing these moments side-by-side so that our imperfect attempts with radical listening and the differences of our practices and contexts might generate new meanings. In writing together, these in-between spaces between our work have generated new learning for us. We discover again that teaching—and here, teaching Joe—is really about un-learning and re-learning Joe, again and again. Our learning can best be described via a number of themes evidenced throughout this chapter. We aim to conclude here by drawing our attention—and our readers'—to these themes as a way of making plain how Joe's vision of radical listening has been realized in us as we moved in this chapter from thinking about teaching radical listening to learning it.

First, radical listening is a risky, insecure positionality, particularly for academics accustomed to performative acts of intelligence, competence, and argumentation. In choosing to engage with radical listening, we make space as educators to engage as our authentic selves. This is not always comfortable—as evidenced by our

experiences in this chapter, radical listening makes us vulnerable. Whether we are listening intently to teachers and students in Philadelphia, young researchers in an urban high school, or White teacher candidates in a multicultural education course, radical listening assumes that there is so much that we do not know. It re-positions us as learners who are incomplete and in want and need of our students to build our knowledge and to make plain for us new ways for difference to transform us. At times, we have each found that radical listening is hard precisely because of its vulnerability—we have been schooled so well to act like smart know-it-alls that it can still feel painful to move off the stage of intellectual prowess and performance and into the backstage shadows of our human, listening selves.

Still, even as radical listening is scarily vulnerable, this vulnerability is mitigated by its axiological stance of valuing all of those engaged in dialogue. The silence of radical listening—in which we learn to hold our yammering tongues—itself comforts, envelops, and supports the listeners and the one who speaks. In preferring our ears to our mouths, radical listening offers a quiet space removed from the harsh critiques and judgments of our politically contested contexts, a space in which we can all become aware of our own minds, our own preferences, our own thinking—and the thinking of others. Within the heuristics of radical listening which value difference, disequilibrium, and knowledge co-construction, every perspective is heard and respected. In time, these heuristics work their way into allowing the imperfections and partial perspectives we ourselves hold, too, such that we who teach become less threatened by the vulnerability radical listening invites.

Finally, in many places in this chapter we talked about radical listening as a model or example positionality for our students. Certainly this positionality was one we modelled for each other (Joe with Ken, Joe and Ken with Tricia, Tricia with Melissa), and in fact, learning radical listening (and thus, teaching radical listening) is a collective process. Notably, this collective is best modelled when our critical sensibilities are threatened, attacked, or marginalized—in fact, radical listening is a resistant practice within a conflicted environment, and when we ourselves feel that conflict. Sometimes (as in Tricia's moment with other junior professors), the threat to our critical stance causes us to yammer back; at other times (as in Melissa's work with some White teacher candidates lacking critical race consciousness), structures of radical listening within the conflicted context keep our ears open. Radical listening, then, preserves healthy silences, opens dialogue, and communicates value of all perspectives—those above and below. We learned—and are learning—it through each other's model and example, and from our students. And best of all, we are learning radical listening through Joe's hopeful, jovial, and loving legacy.

References

Conquergood, D. (2003). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. In Y. Lincoln & N. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 351–374). New York: AltaMira.

Haraway, D. (2003). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. In Y. Lincoln & N. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 351–374). New York: AltaMira.
Kincheloe, J. (2003). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical constructivism primer*. New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. New York: Springer.
Kress, T. M., & Patrissy, P. (2014). Hope – Faith – Fortitude – Praxis: Retheorizing schooling with Erich Fromm. In S. J. Miri, R. Lake, & T. Kress (Eds.), *Reclaiming the sane society: Essays on Erich Fromm's thought* (pp. 203–214). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
Lowenstein, K. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education: Reconceptualizing White teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 163–196.
Tobin, K. (2009). Tuning into others' voices: Radical listening, learning from difference, and escaping oppression. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4*, 505–511.

Melissa Winchell is Assistant Professor of English at Massasoit Community College in Brockton, Massachusetts, where she teaches innovative courses in accelerated composition as part of a nationwide effort to reinvent institutional structures to further student learning and close achievement gaps. She also provides leadership to a number of campus-wide and departmental initiatives, including a collaborative, student-centered writing portfolio program, which she founded. Melissa's publications and research interests include critical race theory within teacher education; recently she has begun researching contemplative education and its implications for community college transformation.

Tricia M. Kress is Associate Professor in and graduate program director of the Leadership in Urban Schools doctoral program at the University of Massachusetts Boston. She received her Ph.D. in Urban Education from the City University of New York Graduate Center. Her research uses critical pedagogy, cultural sociology, and auto/ethnography to rethink teaching, learning and research in urban schools. She is co-editor of the book series ***Imagination and Praxis: Criticality and Creativity in Education and Educational Research*** with Sense Publishers. In April 2014, she and her co-editor Robert Lake (Georgia Southern University) received The Society of Professors of Education Book Award for ***Paulo Freire's Intellectual Roots: Toward Historicity in Praxis***.

Ken Tobin is Presidential Professor of Urban Education at the Graduate Center of CUNY. In 1973 Tobin began a program of research on teaching and learning that continues to the present day. Tobin has published more than 20 books, 200 refereed journal articles, and 125 book chapters. Tobin is recipient of numerous awards, including ***Distinguished Contributions to Science Education through Research Award*** (2007, National Association for Research in Science Teaching), ***Mentoring Award*** as an exemplary scholar and mentor (2008, Division G, American Educational Research Association), and the National Science Foundation Director's award for Distinguished Teaching Scholars (2004).

The Life of an Educator: Thank You, Joe L. Kincheloe

Paul Chamness Miller

I grew up in a family of educators. Both of my maternal grandparents were educators, as was my great, great aunt on my mother's side, with whom I was very close. My mother also wanted to be a teacher for children with special needs when she started her college career. However, she took a break from college to have her family and continued her studies once I was in high school. Being the eldest child, I was able to help take care of household chores while she resumed her degree and began her career running alternative education programs. It was, at least in part, this influence of educators in the family that led me to a career as a teacher.

My childhood and adolescence, as well as the years I spent in my undergraduate teacher preparation program, also had an influence on my career, particularly in my perception of what it means to be a teacher. I grew up with privilege being white, male and Christian. At the time, I was not aware of the privilege I have merely based on biology and upbringing; upon reflection, however, I have enjoyed the capital that comes with these aspects of who I am, especially given that I grew up in predominantly white communities. In fact, the county where I went to high school is called White County for a reason; signs at the edge of the county line used to read "No Blacks after sundown," illustrative of the attitude that community has towards people of color even today. Rumor has it that this same county is also the headquarters for the state's Klu Klux Klan. My educational background from Kindergarten through my undergraduate degree, unfortunately, did not include much in the way of understanding difference, nor of critically thinking about how the educational system continues to favor those with privilege, while systematically perpetuating its disenfranchisement of those without the privileges that favor certain individuals.

P.C. Miller, Ph.D. (✉)
International Liberal Arts, English for Academic Purposes Program, Akita International University, Yuwa, Akita-shi, Akita-ken 010-1292, Japan
e-mail: pchamness@gmail.com

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_11

Despite the privilege I have enjoyed, there is one aspect of who I am that has afforded me the opportunity to understand what it is like to lack the social capital that others enjoy; I am gay. As anyone who has read much on the lives of queer childhoods certainly knows, growing up in a rural community of Bible-thumping, fundamentalist Christians is not easy, no matter what other social capital you may have. Growing up in that environment fostered a lot of confusion in my life. Deep down I knew that I was gay, but as a child or a teenager, I was not about to actually admit that to myself, let alone anyone else. So I tried to "pray the gay away." I also attempted to masque my true self; I was a hard-working, virtually straight-A student, and I was even president of my high school's Bible Club. I was elected class president during my sophomore year, was a member of National Honor Society and a few other clubs. Despite these efforts to conceal this dark secret about myself, I was not successful, and students made sure to let me know at every chance they could, with no intervention from teachers or administrators. I learned by example that school was not about promoting acceptance (or even tolerance) of those who are not like the majority. Instead, the expectation was assimilation, rather than being an individual. Consequently, those individuals who possessed the characteristics of the dominant group, who assimilated and thereby acquired those characteristics, or who were able to hide differing characteristics successfully had the necessary social capital to gain significant favor in school from their peers, teachers and administrators. In addition to these lessons learned in my own K-12 schooling experience, my teacher preparation program failed to teach me that schooling should be any different than what I experienced. We had no discussions about helping under-represented groups of learners, neither about challenging the educational system, nor the political forces that drive education in today's society.

Regardless of the lack of experiences and education to teach me to challenge the educational system, as a result of my personal hell that was school, I knew internally that there were many problems with school, especially with learners who did not "fit in." It was my personal experience that led me to becoming an educator, because I believed that I could become the teacher that did not exist when I was in school; I could create a safe environment for students, and truly make a difference in the lives of their learners. I don't mean "to make a difference" in the cliché way that many pre-service teachers do as they naively explain why they want to become a teacher. For me, I dreamed of having students that were disenfranchised because of not having the cultural capital that is needed to become a full member of the learning community, and creating a space in my classroom where all students felt valued and appreciated for who they were, an experience I would have appreciated having myself. Sometimes teachers are lucky enough to see the fruit of their labor, but more often than not, the benefits of our hard work to change the lives of our students comes over time, long after they have left the classroom. Whether I see the effects of my efforts, my goal is for the impact to be long lasting, to bring about change in society.

Just as I hope I have helped my students experience life-changing moments, I also reflect on those who have had the same kind of impact on my own life. One individual who has had a significant impact on who I am today as an educator is the

late Joe Kincheloe. I believe it was when I was in graduate school, while I was still teaching high school French classes, that I first had the pleasure to read any of Kincheloe's works. My first experience with Joe was *Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment* (Kincheloe, 2012/1991). The words in this book spoke profoundly to me; this is where I first realized the dangers of what was happening to education in America, a discussion we never had in my teacher preparation program. As I previously noted, my experience in school highlighted the expectation of learners to all be the same; those who dared be different were outcasts. The standards movement, as Joe noted in this book, was taking homogenization to the next level. Politicians and other powers were attempting to create a cookie-cutter, one-size-fits-all approach to education, removing the power that teachers once had from the equation, and instead reducing teachers to warm bodies regurgitating curriculum developed from a stagnant, impersonal approach to education that did not encourage critical thinking. This book showed me that one way to challenge this dangerous approach to education was by becoming a researcher in my own classroom, getting to know my students, researching their needs and how best to meet those needs. In order to defy the trends taking place in the educational system, it was up to me to find ways of enriching the curriculum that has been stripped of any personal connection to learners.

What Joe wrote about the direction of education in the U.S. rang true to what I was witnessing at the school where I was teaching. The state where I taught started implementing a standardized test when I was in high school. During its initiation period it was mandatory to take it, but it wasn't a requirement to graduate. By the time I was teaching in the same state, it had become a requirement for graduation, and in recent years is also being used as one instrument in teacher performance evaluations through the so-called "value-added" model, which has also infiltrated the evaluation mechanism of teacher education programs (see, for example, Lincove et al., 2014). All of these actions by the state government are indicative of the top-down system that Joe described in his work, where curriculum is being stripped down to memorization and teaching to a mindless, "low-skill" job. The danger, as Joe warned, is that this approach to education results in students and teachers being disengaged with the curriculum. This was certainly the case in my own experience as a learner and educator. I was mostly a straight-A student, but that was only because I understood the game, and simply did what I had to do. But I was far from engaged in education. We were rarely challenged to think beyond what we were told to memorize, and certainly not encouraged to think critically about the content.

Unfortunately, in my teaching, I witnessed the same effects among students in most of their classes. Students in Language Arts, for example, were no longer exploring literature as a means of engaging in dialogue. Instead, they had a list of possible books they could read, and they had to read so many books per grading period and pass a computerized multiple-choice test about basic details of each book on a computer in the library. There was no opportunity for students to discuss what they read, to think critically about the literature or discuss how it connected to their lives. In social studies, a colleague of mine attempted to engage students with the real world in her course by inviting a member of the community who was living

with HIV to discuss the stigmas society has on HIV and persons living with HIV. My colleague went through the proper channels to receive permission, clearly explained what the nature of the visit was, and her request was approved. After the guest's visit to her class, however, she was chided severely by the administration because a parent complained about the guest. These actions discouraged teachers from thinking beyond the limited curriculum, taking away any future engagement between students and community members.

Despite the state's many actions to stifle critical thinking and reduce the curriculum to mere meaningless "teaching to the test," as a French teacher, I was fortunate to be teaching an elective course that still hadn't been affected by the disease of standardization, at least at my school. When I saw what my colleagues and students were facing, I knew the future of public education was in serious trouble. It was reading Joe's book and seeing what he wrote manifesting before my very eyes, in my own school, that served as the catalyst for me to pursue my doctorate and become a teacher educator. I believed that becoming a teacher educator and researcher would afford me greater opportunities to fight against this machine that has been systematically destroying K-12 education in the U.S. for decades.

Not only was I concerned with the direction of K-12 schooling in general, but haunts from my past also surfaced during my years as a classroom teacher. These experiences also triggered my desire to become a teacher educator. As I previously mentioned, I worked very hard to conceal my sexual identity when I was in high school. I came out to myself and slowly to others in the years leading up to my teaching career. But as soon as I returned to high school, this time as a teacher, those fears and emotions returned. Sexual identity was by and large still taboo in most schools, reinforced by my colleague who was punished by the administration for inviting her guest living with HIV. In all the years I taught high school, I only told a handful of colleagues that I am gay, and never any students.

The silence imposed on teachers and students alike in school about sexuality does not fool students; they are perceptive. I inadvertently outed myself my first year of teaching to one class who suggested that the teacher (a male) whose room we were using for my class "liked" me. Without thinking, largely due to panic and embarrassment, I quickly replied, "He's not my type," which was followed by an eruption of laughter from the students, who cooed, "Awww, Mr. Miller came out to us!" I think being real and honest with them, despite it being an accident, actually strengthened our rapport. Later that year, that particular class attempted to play matchmaker between our security guard and me. At the second school where I taught, students were incessantly trying to get me to come out to them, sometimes indirectly by asking such things as "How do you say 'rainbow' in French?" Other students were bluntly direct, asking if I had a boyfriend. I really hated hiding myself from my students, especially since they made it clear they knew who I was despite my attempts at keeping my life private (even living in different town than where the school was located). Sadly, I was occasionally reminded why I had to keep it secret. One student, who barely said ten words to me the whole semester despite my effort to connect with her, left a note on my bulletin board on her last day at our school. I knew it was she because of the distinctive green ink with which she wrote all of her

assignments. Her note simply said, "Goodbye, you f**king fudge packer." The curiosity of many students and the occasional homophobic remarks led me to the realization that teachers need to learn how to address sexual identity in meaningful ways. Although progress is being made throughout the U.S. thanks to movements such as Gay-Straight Alliances and the work of the Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network (GLSEN) (see Kosciw et al., 2014), the topic of sexual identity is still taboo in many schools, where anyone who deviates from the heteronormative path is shunned at best, killed at worst.

I am reminded of a chapter that Joe wrote not all that long ago entitled, "Selling a new and improved Jesus: Christotainment and the power of political fundamentalism" (Kincheloe, 2009). This chapter spoke to me very much in the way that it did with Joe as he wrote it. We both grew up in fundamentalist communities, but managed to escape and realize that so much of what spews from the fundamentalist's mouth is about control and power, and is especially true when concerning education. Although Joe did not discuss in this chapter specifically the attempts of the "Christofascists" to silence the voice of the queer student, such actions by school boards, administrators and teachers most definitely qualifies as one of the effects of fundamentalism.

This silence that is prevalently found in schools works to make LGBTQ teachers and students invisible. The influence of Christofascist ideology removes any representation of the LGBTQ community from the curriculum. In some states, legislatures have attempted to even ban teachers from using words like "gay" or "lesbian" (see McDonough, 2013). Administrators and teachers are working to ban same-sex couples from attending school-sponsored dances, and to ban student-led groups such as Gay-Straight Alliances (see Glenza, 2015; Miller & Mikulec, 2014). Even more dangerous, many teachers and administrators turn a blind eye to the bullying of self-identified or perceived LGBTQ students. This behavior results in a metaphoric form of what Joe referred to as the new "home alone" childhood in his essay, "The new childhood: Home alone as a way of life" (Kincheloe, 1996). The behavior of adults toward children and youth that Joe described in this work relates to how non-conforming students are treated in schools. They are ignored, excluded, punished, bullied, often friendless, and living in fear. As Joe noted, this treatment of youth negatively affects their intellectual development and psychological well-being, which is supported in much of the literature of queer youth (see Reece-Miller, 2010). The more severe consequence of this hostile environment has been a surge of suicides of children and teenagers who find death to be a better option than enduring another day of invisibility.

Joe's writing has reinforced for me what I already knew to be true. A great teacher is one who accepts all students for who they are, not forcing them to conform to some heteronormative ideology. It is based on this truth that one of the goals I have for each course I teach is to help my students understand the struggles of the LGBTQ community, whether it is in a teacher educator course, a Freshman writing course, or any other course I may be teaching. In order for society to change, it is our job as educators to not only plant the seed in our students, but to model for them how to stand against the injustice that the Christofascists would force us to preach

in our classrooms and fight for an education that is for everyone, regardless of the journey in life on which they are traveling.

So the question is, how does one counter the actions of Christofascists who are systematically destroying the educational system and the students it serves? Kincheloe's (2008) review of Manturana and Varela's notion of *enactivism* has inspired me greatly. We have to move beyond understanding the critical concepts of critical pedagogy, to putting our understanding into practice.

I became an enactivist while teaching French in high school. I could not turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to the bullying I witnessed in my classroom, no matter what other teachers were doing. My teaching career began around the time the phrase "That's so gay" was becoming common. I had to put an end to that, but I knew that simply banning the phrase as a classroom rule would not work. I explained to all of my classes why such phrases were hurtful, and what the consequences of such actions could be. Inspired by Jane Elliott's "Blue Eyes/Brown Eyes" experiment, I chose one student in each class and substituted his/her first name for the word "gay" (e.g., "That's so Jeff.") and told the students to use that expression instead for the day. The new phrase spread like wildfire throughout the school. The next day, we discussed the results and how the individual felt, making the exercise much more meaningful than simply telling the students they were not allowed to use the expression.

As an educator in higher education, being an enactivist is equally important. As an example, my university teaching positions have been in communities that are predominantly ethnically/racially homogenous communities, while our teacher preparation goals emphasized the importance of pre-service teachers becoming culturally responsive educators. To achieve these goals, I knew that my students needed opportunities to work with diverse K-12 learners, not just read about them. To challenge the limited resources available to my students and me, I applied for a grant so that I could take my students to spend some time at a very unique school that was about 3 h away from our campus. This public school is in one of the poorest cities in the U.S., most of the students are not white and are on free or reduced lunch, and about half of the students self-identify as a member of the LGBTQ community. Although the characteristics of the student population were reason enough to visit this school, the most important reason for visiting the school was that it is structured in a very different way from the schools my students attended. Modeled after the Summerhill School in the United Kingdom, students call their teachers by their first names, have a significantly more relaxed environment and attendance policy, and students have a voice in making decisions about the school. The school implements a restorative justice model for conflict resolution between students, combined with the use of peace circles, and it works (see Miller & Endo, 2012)! Students learn these tools early on, and teachers there witness students initiating peace circles without any teacher direction. I have visited this school on many occasions, and I have not seen a group of students who are happier to be at school. I wanted my students to witness firsthand a school that works well, yet does not follow the rigid, almost prison-like model of education we have resorted to in most of the public schools in this country.

Following our visit to the school, my students also visited traditional public schools in the communities surrounding our campus as a point of comparison. I asked them compare the schools, especially looking at how the students and teachers interacted, how the school day was structured, the needs of the students, and so forth. They wrote reflective essays, and we had numerous discussions in class about the experiences. The whole point was for these privileged college students (all white, middle to upper-middle class) to understand that school is not the same for everyone. The first school we visited is a safe haven for most of its students. For many, my students learned, that school keeps them alive (literally and figuratively), because they are lucky enough to escape the incessant bullying in their previous schools. It is a last resort for many, who confessed to my students that without this school, they would no longer be in school. My students saw an example of a school that challenges the rigid, prison-like structure of traditional forms of education. I asked them to think about the validity of a non-conforming school such as this one, and they came to the realization that school can't and shouldn't be a one-size-fits-all model. The rigid structure works for some students, but as they witnessed, it fails many students. If not for teachers willing to think outside the box, those whom traditional schooling fails are left with nowhere to go.

These are but two examples of how I've found Joe Kincheloe's work to influence me. He confirmed for me that how I felt about school as a student was good and right, and he gave me the words to express my feelings. I've learned from Joe that it is okay to go against the flow, to challenge and critically examine school and society and to find ways to meaningfully fight against the injustices of our world. Although I am far from achieving all of my goals as a critical pedagogue and enactivist, it is Joe's work that continues to inspire, teach, and motivate me to keep reaching.

References

Glenza, J. (2015, January 15). Mississippi schools under fire over efforts to curb Gay-Straight Alliance. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jan/15/mississippi-schoolsefforts-gay-straight-alliance-membership

Kincheloe, J. L. (1996). The new child: Home alone as a way of life. In H. Jenkins (Ed.), *The children's culture reader* (pp. 159–177). New York: NYU Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2009). Selling a new and improved Jesus: Christotainment and the power of political fundamentalism. In S. R. Steinberg & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Christotainment: Selling Jesus through popular culture* (pp. 1–21). Boulder: Westview Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2012). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. New York: Routledge (Original work published 1991).

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. A., & Boesen, M. J. (2014). *The 2013 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools.* New York: GLSEN. Retrieved from http://bit.ly/1Do0qmV

Lincove, J. A., Osborne, C., Dillon, A., & Mills, N. (2014). The politics and statistics of value-added modeling for accountability of teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(1), 24–38.

McDonough, K. (2013, March 28). Tennessee “don’t say gay” bill dies, again. *Salon*. Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2013/03/27/tennessee_dont_say_gay_bill_dies_again/

Miller, P. C., & Endo, H. (2012). Restorative justice: A model for meeting the needs of LGBTIQ youth. In A. Honigsfeld & A. Cohan (Eds.), *Breaking the mold of education for culturally and linguistically diverse students* (pp. 31–38). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, P. C., & Mikulec, E. (2014). What every straight educator needs to know about queer youth. *The New Educator, 10*(3), 222–230.

Reece-Miller, P. C. (2010). An elephant in the classroom: LGBTQ students and the silent minority. In M. Fehr & D. Fehr (Eds.), *Teach boldly* (pp. 67–76). New York: Peter Lang.

Paul Chamness Miller is an Associate Professor of International Liberal Arts at Akita International University in Japan, where he teaches undergraduate writing courses and a teacher preparation course on using pop culture to teach language. His scholarship focuses on two areas: instructional methods of language learning and teaching, and the critical examination of under-represented groups of learners and teachers in the K-12 setting. His scholarly work can be seen in *Multicultural Education*, *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *International Journal of Educational Research*, and *Journal of Thought*, as well as in several books and book chapters. He is also co-editor of the book series *Research in Queer Studies*, published by Information Age and editor of *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, published by Taylor & Francis.

A Broken Arch, a Broken Bridge, and a Broken Promise: Using Kincheloe's Critical Pedagogy Concepts to Teach About Race in an Urban Graduate School Classroom

Brett Elizabeth Blake

> *Critical pedagogy believes that nothing is impossible when we work in solidarity and with love, respect, and justice as our guiding light*
>
> (Kincheloe 2008, p. 9).

The fall of 2014 was a challenging time to teach and work with a group of graduate students around the ideas of multicultural education. Here was a group of New York City teaching fellows, having left their first careers in law, business, banking, engineering, acting, and social work to get a master's degree in education and to simultaneously be assigned to teach in some of the most "challenging" schools in New York City. Smart and ambitious, this group of students believed (as many, many groups before them had) that they knew a lot about teaching (because they themselves had gone to school) and knew a lot about the poor, students of color in their middle school classrooms (because many of them were of color themselves; and those who weren't simply, "weren't prejudice"). And then grand juries in Ferguson, MO and Staten Island, NY handed down decisions that exonerated two heavily armed white police officers of killing of two completely unarmed black men.

A Democratic Society?

In Ornstein's new book, Education vs. equality: Can society achieve both goals? (2015), he urges us to consider the concept of equality not solely as a political and social philosophy (such as difference among and within racial and ethnic groups,

B.E. Blake, Ph.D. (✉)
The School of Education, St. Johns University,
Marillac Hall, Queens Campus, Queens 11439, NY, USA
e-mail: blakeb@stjohns.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_12

culture and class) but also asks us to consider the root causes/rationales for the differences between the "high-achievers" and the "low-achievers" among us. In his words, the very founding principles of a democracy require that we "curtail a reward system based on inherited privilege and power, so that we don't consistently have the same winners and losers from one generation to the next." (p. 3). These principles must, then, assure that those who are perceived with having abilities and talents, "do not use them against society or an individual," (p. 3) such as the white male privilege exhibited, albeit in extreme and deadly form, in both Ferguson and Staten Island.

Ornstein continues by reminding us that:

> As a democratic nation, we need to provide safety nets, second chances, and multiple chances for those less able or less lucky…we (also) need to recognize different forms of excellence. If we remain blind sighted to different kinds of abilities and talent, then the principles of democratic equality will be lost…education, today, IS (emphasis added) the link between excellence and equality (p. 4).

An education has, for decades, been seen in this country as a great equalizer. Today, however, while a vast majority of our African-American school age children attend public schools concentrated in what I term, "low-resource" urban areas, most white students attend public schools concentrated in "middle" and "high" resource schools, both in urban and suburban and (less so in) rural areas. Brown vs. Board Of Education (1954) guaranteed the equal education of all society's students, and yet 60 years later, that promise has been broken—represented (above) with references to iconic landmarks (the St. Louis Arch and the Verrazano Bridge) that evoke openness, movement, and freedom.

Course Curriculum: The Personal IS Political

I hadn't intended on using Kincheloe's (2008) teachings in this class (specifically his 14 "introductory" concepts that constitute critical pedagogy), but I struggled in finding a way to talk about race during this particular moment in time with these particular graduate students. When I talked about multicultural education, they responded that they were (primarily) math teachers, so how/why were the ideas of a "multicultural pedagogy" important to them; when I introduced the concept of "white privilege," I was told I didn't like white men; when I defined and refined what was meant by, "internalized oppression," I was told by the African-Americans in my class that they (i.e. poor, uneducated Blacks, unlike them) "deserved it." And when I asked about police brutality, I was told by a member of the class (who was married to a NYC police officer) that I just didn't understand. It, indeed, was a difficult time to talk about race in a graduate student classroom in the fall of 2014.

Much of Kincheloe's work lies in the tenets and teachings of Paulo Friere. Friere always maintained that teaching resided in the heart as much as the mind, and that without a "healthy dose" of a thing called, "radical love" (love that is compassionate,

creative, and informed), education did not really occur. That is, love is at the *center* of an education that seeks justice, equality, and in the end, to assuage human suffering (Kincheloe p. 9). Through the love of the teacher, then, students (and teacher) "problem-pose"—"the posing of the problems of human beings in their relations with the world" (p.60), through which people, "develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world…" (p. 64). Education, then, is always transforming and transformative to students and their teachers—"in thought and dialogue and action—to transcend themselves and transform the world" (Quinn 2014, p. 1).

Kincheloe takes the idea of problem-posing to another level and shows us how we can seek and connect, in very real ways, a knowledge of both the heart and mind with one that is both personal and political. Within a critical pedagogy perspective, then, teachers "reconstruct" their work not only to help students learn to empower themselves, but also to help both students (and teacher) to understand that, "such an effort takes place in an increasingly power-inscribed world where dominant modes of exclusion are continuously naturalized by power wielders' control of information" (p. 9) Democracy is fragile, Kincheloe maintains, and is so deeply and inextricably embedded in education, that we must take care to not separate its most fundamental features (e.g. justice, equality) from our teaching and learning.

Using Kincheloe's Concepts and an Assignment

Critical pedagogy, of course, cannot be broken into discrete pieces, and yet presenting them in this format (below) was very helpful in arousing the curiosity of my students as they began to wrestle with translating their beginning understandings into concrete ideas for their urban classrooms. Kincheloe (2008) defines critical pedagogy as:

1. Grounded on a social and educational vision of justice and equality
2. Constructed on the belief that education is inherently political
3. Dedicated to the alleviation of human suffering
4. Concerned that schools don't hurt students—good schools don't blame students for their failures or strip students of the knowledges they bring to the classroom
5. Enacted through the use of generative themes to read the word and the world and the process of problem-posing—generative themes involve the educational use of issues that are central to students' lives as a grounding for the curriculum
6. Centered on the notion that teachers should be researchers—here teachers learn to produce and teach students to produce their own knowledges
7. Grounded on the notion that teachers should be researchers of their students—as researchers, teachers study their students, their backgrounds, and the forces that shape them

8. Interested in maintaining a delicate balance between social change and cultivating the intellect—this requires a rigorous pedagogy that accomplishes both goals
9. Concerned with the "margins" of society, the experiences and needs of individuals faced with oppression and subjugation
10. Constructed on the awareness that science can be used as a force to regulate and control
11. Dedicated to understanding the context in which educational activity takes place
12. Committed to resisting the harmful effects of dominant power
13. Attuned to the importance of complexity—understands complexity theory—in constructing a rigorous and transformative education
14. Focused on understanding the profound impact of neo-colonial structures in shaping education and knowledge (p. 10).

As part of their final reflective paper/project in which I asked them to rethink their original "Identity Stories" (adapted from Noel 2008, pp. 5–7) I added a short excerpt of Kincheloe's (2008) book from Chapter 1 (pp. 6–15) where he introduces the above 14 concepts. From there, I asked that they identify 5 of these concepts of most interest to them, re-define in their own words, and then attempt to connect each of the 5 to a personal/professional experience they may have had since becoming a teacher. (Each student whose work appears below, has signed an "Informed Consent" statement and has agreed to having his/her name and excerpts published here).

Students' Voices and Identity Shifts

Hossein Fassa, born and raised in Iran, moved to the United Kingdom and then to the United States with his parents after the fall of the Shah of Iran. Boarding-school educated, he found himself "frantically searching for (his) place in the social order—"discriminated against on a daily basis—he was constantly reinventing and re-building his identity. His former career of acting seemed to help him accomplish this:

> Acting is really the art of identity construction and you begin to appreciate very quickly the rich and different parts of yourself that you can bring to the table when creating a character. At the same time, you are required to study and understand identities and cultural affiliations outside of yourself with openness and acceptance.

And yet (or as a result of), Hossein often questioned my introduction of particular concepts and our class discussions and readings. Coming from Iran under the Shah, I just naturally assumed that he simply saw the United States as a friend; as a leader in democracy throughout the world; a place where math, science, and technology were held in high regard. He didn't seem (at first) to have any place or need for talk of "multicultural education" or a/any larger discussion that questioned "democracy." And yet, Hossein surprised me, choosing to focus his writing on a

larger societal/global-scientific perspective in a thoughtful, yet powerful, way that showed that he was indeed wrestling with the very concepts (i.e. democracy is always good) he appeared to hold so dear.

Hossein began his reflective piece by quoting Pink Floyd, "All in all you're just another brick in the wall," adding this:

> Since education is one of the primary contributors to the socialization of a citizenry it is inherently political. The curriculum we choose to teach or that which is thrust upon us and how we deliver this curriculum is a political choice. The corporations that publish our curricula are not altruistic charities. They are enterprises that have a vested interest in a political system that holds profit above freedom of thought and diversity of view point. How we choose to manage our classrooms, whether we are authoritarian or involve our students in everyday decisions models for them their relationships with power structures. Do they question or follow as sheep? The choices we make will either reinforce the narrative of the dominant culture or allow our students to question them. (Based on Kincheloe's first concept).
>
> And on concept number 5, Hossein begins with this quote:
>
> "Now I have become Death, the destroyer of worlds" (quote attributed to Bhagavad Gita after first test of atomic bomb).
>
> Critical pedagogues realize that physical and social sciences can be used as forces to regulate and control society. Science cannot simply be viewed as the expansion and accumulation of knowledge but subject to our values and priorities as a society. Einstein's theory of relativity indirectly led to the development of the atomic bomb because priorities (winning the war) and values (our Japanese enemies are less than ourselves) dictated that path. Similarly the computer science that has led to internet and eased the exchange of information has also been used simultaneously as a tool for surveillance and repression. Psychology, sociology and anthropology have opened windows into the minds of people and the mechanisms of society and by the same token have been used to repress people and control populations. Critical pedagogues are aware that although science requires an objective observer this observer must retain the power to make decisions.

Carmen Lopez, who as a self-proclaimed "unwed mother at the age of 16," is now the proud mother of one college graduate and one high school graduate who is pursuing his dream of becoming a professional athlete. Carmen was older than the rest of the students in the class, and she often prefaced her comments with, "I'm older and I remember…" a perspective that most students admired. Carmen already held an administrative certificate in New York State, but needed to complete her master's degree to become permanently certified. She was highly critical of the rigidity of education today, and particularly of the New Common Core State Standards, and her response reflects this as she weaves her thoughts throughout Kincheloe's teachings:

> For Kincheloe, it is imperative that education approaches the matters of the workplace. The failure of American schools today is a, "failure of vision, an inability to connect the tenets of democracy with the construction of our institutions (Kincheloe 2008, p. 1). This lack of vision has left both schools and workplaces with failures in many other domains: motivation, creativity, self-awareness, and social justice. The nonsuccess of many educational reform movements can, according to Kincheloe, be credited to their incapacity to see the critical association between the world of education and the world of work… a lot of the instruction has been too confined… Teachers can empower students by spending more time mentoring them rather than managing them.

And yet, too, with further reflection on our class readings, she revealed how little she understood about appreciating her own culture and instilling that appreciation in her sons, writing:

> I did not respect my own culture enough to learn who I am and how this makes me who I am today. My (first) objective with my sons was to teach them the difference between being 'ghetto' and being 'from the ghetto.' I can honestly make the statement (now) that I have created my own monsters of not understanding their own culture (and instead) complying with the idea that, 'the white culture is better.'

She left class fearing for her "minority" sons' safety in such an unsafe world.

Kelly McTague, a Long Island born, Irish-Catholic American, on the other hand, was raised in relative privilege in New Jersey, reporting having had a "normal" upbringing. Now teaching English in the South Bronx where 100 % of her students receive "free" lunch, Kelly begins her reflection by stating: "The community is in my classroom and my students are the future of their community." She continues:

> I am a great teacher… my new goal is to become a "critical" teacher. The excerpt of Kincheloe's "Knowledge and Critical Pedagogy" has given foundational steps to all the things I wished I could do as teacher but did not know how. In my original identity story, I stated, 'the disconnect between schools and the community which they serve was so prominent that I began pondering jumping into education to bridge the gap in my own little way.'

However, it seems to be in Kelly's new understandings centered about tenet 1, i.e. that, "education is inherently political," that she made the biggest "jump." She says:

> Education is an extremely lucrative field to be in, for the people at the top. I spent hours every night researching activities to do with certain novels…however, middle school students no longer read novels…but are forced to read excerpts compiled by corporations like Scholastic…Education is not just the foundation of knowledge for children, but a money-making business.

Danielle, too, was one of a handful of students who connected Joe's teachings in more personal ways—with students or with one's own children. Danielle Ingoglia, is a certified teacher for students with special needs working in a public school in Queens that she describes as "very diverse." And because she is, "a white woman teaching in this school and interacting with the community," she was able to "recognize that white privilege is real…I see it every single day" as she began to listen more clearly and carefully to students, teachers, parents, and other community members around her. And yet, it was in her new understandings of "the need for a social and education vision of justice and equality," that she felt the most moved, sharing this encounter in her classroom that helped her connect to this concept in much more concrete ways:

> I recently had a beautiful and raw conversation about the tragedies that continue to occur in Ferguson. I was so enlightened about what my students had to say in regards to this matter. They were discussing the need for equality amongst the community in all communities, especially Ferguson. They spoke in a very mature manner about our justice system, and how they sometimes feel fearful around people of power because of the color of their skin. One very powerful moment for me, was when one of the black students stated that she actu-

ally feels scared of her own race. I want them to know that life isn't fair, but it is important to fight oppression and racism.

Michael Boccio, an attorney living on Long Island, came to teaching to "climb out of the trudge" of the law. Successful at his trade, he often discussed the wealth and privilege of many of his clients juxtaposing their lives with the poor, urban kids he now taught.

One male student in my class was having a very difficult time. He was initially very aggressive, he did not raise his hand and would constantly call out and interrupt, would speak too close to the face of adults who were teaching him/trying to speak to him (scaring a number of the teachers and support staff), and at first glance, appeared to always have something to prove to his teachers and class mates. He even expressed early on that "the system was rigged against him" and that no one would listen to him. His aggressive nature, calling out, seeming lack of respect for adults, and close talking was consistently landing him in "in-house" suspension, which caused him to then lose 2–3 days of instruction, causing him to fall behind his peers and become angrier with the "system".

Some of my teaching colleagues, as well as support staff members, began saying that they "feared" him, and often referred to his STH status and broken home when discussing the student. Because of this seminar class, I realized that I not only needed to change how this student was treated in my class, but would need "buy-in" from my colleagues to effectuate a larger change throughout the school community. I developed a trust with him by allowing him to place his black leather jacket and baseball cap (his prized possessions) each morning in a locker within my classroom (he was not in my homeroom), and talking with him each afternoon at dismissal when he came to retrieve his hat and jacket. During this time, we discussed issues of respect for his teachers, knowing how to make valid points without emotional outbursts, as those outbursts were perceived by many as evidence that he was just another "an angry black man". He listened.

Kincheloe provides that "[c]ritical middle school math teachers in this counter-hegomonic context see their goals as cultivating a love for math, developing student interest in discovering more and more uses for math in their lives, finding applications for math that improve the lives of oppressed peoples, an producing a passion for students to know more about the subject". During his morning and afternoon visits to my room, we discussed his need to make an effort to channel his energy in a positive manner. I explained to him that I believed he could be a role model and could not only excel in middle school, but attend a specialized high school and thereafter a top college. I also began spreading this belief among my colleagues.

On occasions, he described his personal and family financial struggles, lack of internet access and he let me know that he felt that he needed to fight in order to be heard in all other aspects of his life. We discussed how math could help him build useful skills that would make him marketable in getting a job as a teenager and allow him to then budget his earnings to obtain the items he needed to better himself. He could also use these skills to teach and help his family members how to elevate their situation. We used the time where he came to my classroom outside of math class to learn about one another, and build a trust. We also discussed how to appropriately act in school, treat other adults and students, and how to use all of his energy to excel.

Early on, I admit, it was very difficult. I held him to very high standard in my class, and on one occasion after a minor failure, he walked out of my class into the hallway, began banging his head repeatedly against the brick wall in frustration. However, this negative behavior has all but disappeared from my room, replaced by leadership qualities. Moreover, I have really attempted to influence my sphere of colleagues, and they are now treating him differently across all of his classrooms (as well as in the lunchroom), and he has remained

> out of in-house for the last 8 weeks, and has developed as a group leader among all of his subjects.

Chaunte Thompson, a young African-American, single mother of an elementary school- aged son, came to our seminar in the fall of 2014 angry at the community where she grew up. Because she had "broken free," she couldn't understand why others she knew hadn't, couldn't, or wouldn't. In her introduction to her final reflective piece, she shares:

> Most family dynamics [in my community] were composed of single parent households, generations of poverty, poor academic backgrounds, minimal high school, low wages, money struggles (living from paycheck to check) and low performing schools…childhood friends became criminals, drug addicts, drug dealers, young parents—welfare depended—just mimicking their environments. The local jails and cemeteries are full of us…again this is normal my community and…explains why I hadn't begun to examine my life until now.
>
> I [now] question why schools in urban communities struggle to supply textbooks, qualified teachers, adequate training for new teachers, or just…the essentials…given in white communities? Why are the police officers killing off the Black community…why must black people have to work twice as hard…why do Black people have to modify themselves (lose their ethnicity) to meet the minimal acceptance of the world?
>
> At this point, I am very aware of who I am and my position as a black woman in America. It is my duty to produce change and is very important to leave a great impact on those I serve…change has to start in my household and in my classroom. I must teach my son and my students to advocate for themselves, to believe in themselves, offer lots of support, encourage them to never settle, to ask questions, perform research, and most importantly never stop educating themselves. Every choice is a political choice.

Each student who has shared his or her thoughts (above) lay bare his or her own vulnerabilities for all to read--to one's personal connection to society at large (Hossein & Carmen), to connections between school and family (Kelly); to school and particular students (Danielle & Michael) and to school and students but also a young son (Chaunte).

Finally, I share the writings of Katherine Bencosme. Born in the Dominican Republic, Katherine was brought to this country as an infant by her family and gained citizenship when she was 8 years old. Through her words we feel the empathy of the "outsider;" an outsider looking in trying to piece together the realities of her chosen profession: teaching. Here, she writes about her first days as an urban educator, ending the story as Joe might have: with love at the center. Katherine writes:

> The first tenet states that those who are in this field for the right reasons all share a relentless commitment to alleviate human suffering. We are compassionate humanitarians who, as Kincheloe states, "believe nothing is impossible when we work in solidarity and with love, respect, and justice as our guiding lights." When I first began my position last year at my school, one of the professional development days (before the school year began) included a staff circle. The purpose of this circle was to reflect on two students who passed away the previous year—one was mentally ill and committed suicide by jumping off his apartment building, and another, was the innocent victim of a cop shooting. Since I did not know the students, I quietly sat in the circle and listened to the other staff-members speak about them. A handful of the staff-members could not help but break down into tears while talking about these two young men and the unfortunate events they faced. Even though I did not know the students and barely even knew the staff-members yet, I too began to cry, just from the pain

I heard in their voices. My heart reached out to them. And it was in that moment that I knew I was in this for the right reasons.

A school and its members are supposed to be a community. The second tenet states that a school is a safe space where students should feel welcomed and wanted. Traditionally, schools respond to misbehavior through discipline—such as removing privileges, detention, isolating the student, and suspension. These practices essentially place the student at blame for the behavior—when in actuality the student may just be exerting a natural reaction to frustration. This frustration may stem from a combination of issues at home, among friends, or with schoolwork. At my school, instead of a "Dean's Office" we have a "Youth Development Office" and within this office we use a system called "Restorative Justice." Under Restorative Justice, when an issue arises between two students or between a student and staff-member, one of the individuals involved in the issue can call for a "circle" to be held. In this circle, each party communicates about the problem and attempts to come to a solution. Punishing an individual doesn't always necessarily provide a permanent solution, therefore the point of the circles is to identify and tackle the underlying issue that sparked the behavior. Along these same lines, stripping students of the knowledge they bring to the classroom also doesn't seem to create a safe space. Our goal is to add on to their knowledge, not say "your knowledge is useless and tasteless, therefore you must replace it with mine". It is important to appreciate students' interests and try to incorporate it into the community. We must work in solidarity with love and justice as our guiding lights.

How Joe Saved Me Once Again: Implications for Teaching and Learning

As the semester ended, and 2015 unfolded, winter weather hit St. Louis and New York City, and the cold and the snow seemed to quiet the bruising, brutal beatings of the summer and fall of 2014. Newspaper headlines turned their tales to talk of economic improvement domestically, while terrorism riveted the world internationally. Even as President Obama delivered his 6th inaugural speech, reviving the hope we all once felt from his words, the word "race" was barely a whisper, if at all, on his lips.

And yet, Joe's teachings had, once again, in an important moment in time, when we all felt like all promises had been broken, saved us. It certainly saved me as a struggling professor amidst all the furor, blame, and confusion, and it most assuredly saved, and changed, my graduate students, who still get up every morning and teach among the shattered promises they now know, too, lay all around them in their public school classrooms. But they feel hopeful, and empowered, and committed to helping their students learn better.

With the simple act of acquiring the knowledge of our students and understanding how it may influence their lives, we can then make better decisions for the classroom that will in turn foster academic excellence which will in the end lead to the 'larger social good.' When students are educated in an environment and want to dwell there, learning happens, and with a wealth of knowledge students will be prepared to accomplish dreams and creations that may lead to the social betterment of society.

Gesai Abadia, Middle School Math Teacher, New York City.

References

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. Montreal: Springer.
Noel, J. (2008). *Developing multicultural educators*. Long Grove: Waveland Press.
Ornstein, A. (2015). *Education vs. equality: Can society achieve both goals?* Boulder: Paradigm.
Quinn, M. (2014). *Peace and pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Brett Elizabeth Blake is Professor in the School of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction at St. John's University in New York City where she is also Senior Research Fellow in the Vincentian Center for Social Justice and Poverty. Brett has worked extensively with what Ayers has called "multiply-marginalized" populations in urban schools, jail classrooms, and migrant camps, publishing much of this work in various articles and books. Professor Blake is a Board Member of The International Institute for Critical Pedagogy and Transformative Leadership in conjunction with The Paulo and Nita Freire International Project for Critical Pedagogy.

Joe L. Kincheloe: Marxist *Kritik* and the Tender-Hearted

Marla Morris

It is the morning of January 20th, 2009. Today is the inauguration of Barack Obama, the first African-American to become President of the United States. Joe would have loved today.

I cannot believe I am speaking in the past tense about Joe. When we got the phone call about Joe's untimely death, we were stunned, horrified, shocked and deeply saddened. How could it be? I just spoke with him on the email about book projects and so forth. I can hear his voice and see his image. How is Shirley I wonder? For as long as I have known Joe, my association with him is with the word 'and.' Joe 'and' Shirley. How can Shirley *be* without Joe? I think of Shirley every day and hope she is okay. Scholarly life is more than teaching and writing, it is also about the friendships we build in our scholarly communities. Joe was my friend. I loved him dearly. I miss him and am very sad as I write this. The Personal is the Political and the personal matters. It matters what goes on in our personal lives and when we lose one of our own, like Joe, our community of scholars mourns that loss.

What can I do, what can anyone do in the face of death? As a scholar, the best I can do is to write about Joe and what he meant not only to me but to the field of curriculum studies. Before going on here, I would like to say that Joe's loss is profound. We write not only for the dead but also for the living. The living live with memory and loss. This piece is written in memory of Joe and it is also written in the spirit of my friendship with Shirley Steinberg.

Those of you younger scholars who do not know Joe's work should go back to his texts and study his work. What I would like to do here is touch on only a few of Joe's pieces that have meant a lot to me as a scholar. Joe was prolific; his books are

I dedicate this piece to Shirley Steinberg, Joe's longtime partner.

M. Morris (✉)
College of Education, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA 30458, USA
e-mail: marlamor@georgiasouthern.edu

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8_13

many and various. The purpose of this piece is not to do a comprehensive survey of his work, but to talk about pieces that have made an impact on me as a scholar.

The first thing that comes to mind when I think of Joe is critical theory. I do not like to peg scholars, or categorize their work, but I think that Joe has always been associated with doing critical theory. If one studies his books, there is a critical theory through-line that runs throughout his work. Joe and Shirley in recent years have founded a Center for Paulo Freire at McGill University. Students should consult the Freire Center website for more information on the projects undertaken there.

As I read Joe, it is Freire, I think, who influenced him most. One of the most moving autobiographical portraits that Joe paints of himself can be found in the introduction to the expanded edition of Freire's (2005) book titled *Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those who Dare Teach*. Again, I urge you to read the text for yourselves but here let me make a few remarks. What strikes me in Joe's introduction is his heartbreaking story of growing up in the Appalachian mountains as a working class youth being insulted by a college professor who couldn't believe that somebody like Joe (a working class boy) could write about something like that (liberation theology). How could a young working class mountain boy write so eloquently about liberation theology, the professor wondered? Joe tells us,

> I replayed the "someone like you" portion of his soliloquy. In retrospect I think he was referring to my Appalachian markers: the Tennessee mountain accent, cheap clothes, the nontraditional scholarly persona. Whatever he meant, it was not a compliment. (xIiv)

Joe often joked about his Appalachian background but clearly in this piece, the memory of the way he was treated by a haughty professor marked Joe, it was painful to him. And out of that the joking and pain came Joe's lifelong commitment to undoing that hurtful, classist insult to him. Anybody who has suffered the working class life understands where Joe is coming from. Classism is a terrible problem especially for working class kids who are constantly belittled. And then there is the terrible reality of working class life. I know, I lived it for many years in New Orleans. Poverty can happen to anybody. At any rate, Joe writes further on in his introduction to Freire's book about how he came across Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970/1994) and how this book changed his life. Joe tells us that,

> Later that afternoon I found a reference to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Much to my delight there was a never-checked-out-copy of the book in the stacks. I began reading. The next thing I remember the lights were switched on and off as the library was closing for the night. I had been reading for hours with no sense of time, place, or the pain of my earlier encounter with Dr. L. (xIiv–xIv)

Many people report of this kind of experience when reading Freire. The profound influence that he has had on so many of us in education is truly astounding. But I mention this here because after I read Joe's intro, I began to understand him a little better in light of his love for Freire and his struggles growing up as a working class youth and his struggles with his identity against a culture that does not have much sympathy for the working class. In the United States, class issues are not much discussed except among critical theorists like Joe and Shirley. It seems to me that class

is a missing element in much of our literature(s) in education still, even though critical theory is one of the largest sectors of curriculum studies scholarship. In the larger arena of American culture, people do not really notice class issues—unless of course they are working class. Everybody else—that is, middle class and upper class people—act as if poverty is not their problem. But poverty is everybody's problem.

Reading Joe's story inspired me to return to the work of Paulo Freire. Although I had read him in graduate school many years ago, I thought I might re-read him. Joe was right about Freire. He is a life changing read. He was the kind of writer that you cannot stop reading once you start. Recently I taught an undergraduate social foundations course and the entire course was built around Freire's (1970/1994)*Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* What surprised me was that some of my students—who are mostly white, Southern, rural, working class and non-readers—said that Freire's book was the most important book they had ever read in college. This astounded me. Joe was right. Teaching critical theory in the deep South is no easy task. There was much resistance to this kind of knowledge as well. But I refused to whitewash or water down Freire's work. Some of the students protested of course.

Peter McLaren (2005) remarks that many the scholars who do critical theory, whitewash it. He says that for most, critical theory has become watered-down and sanitized. McLaren (2005) tells us that if we read Freire closely we know that he was not about the "domesticat[ion]… [of] both heart and mind…" (xxxv). America is the land of domestication. Joe often writes about the way in which Disney has taken hold of our youth and domesticated their understandings of race, class and gender (see, for example his book he edited with Shirley called *Kinderculture: The Corporate Construction of Childhood* (1997)).

Joe never domesticated anything. He understood the hard edge of critical theory and was not afraid to speak about that hard edge. Joe and Shirley together speak and write with a hard edge, they are not afraid to say what is on their mind. Here I am thinking of the Preface to a book called *Critical Theory: Where are We Now?* (which is edited by Joe and Peter McLaren) Here, Shirley Steinberg (2007) puts it this way:

> … wherever we are now, we are being insubordinate—at least I hope so. Refusing to compromise to the standards-wielding, neo-liberal, pedagogical pundits, the contributors to this book are engaged in a pedagogy of insubordination. Insubordination borne by the fact that we have been pedagogically violated by conservatives, liberals, quasi-critical pedagogues, and just about everyone else who just doesn't get it. (ix)

Insubordination indeed. Very strong words. Joe and Shirley have a book series with Peter Lang Publishing called "Counterpoints." When we think about what this means, we think of what is counter to something or that which is "insubordinate." You have points and then you have counterpoints. Counterpoints are counter to the points at hand. Counter-intuitive, similarly, means going against one's intuition to make sense of what does not make sense. Under the shadow of critical theory, counterpoints means taking power apart point by point. Or, another way to think of it is that a counter-narrative takes on and deconstructs corrupt power. Corruption is not just something politicians are good at. Education has a history of corruption in its

tendency to colonize, as Joe points out in his remarkable collection of essays that he co-edited with Ladislaus M. Semali titled *What is Indigenous Knowledge? Voices From the Academy* (1999). Thinking for a moment more about Shirley's emphasis on the "insubordinate", I am also reminded of Paulo Freire's (2004) book titled *Pedagogy of Indignation.* Indignation is a very strong word. One should be indignant about wrongs done to people. A pedagogy of "insubordination" (Shirley) is also one of "indignation" (Paulo). Americans tend to be uncomfortable with such strong language. Anger is not something that Americans like to express. But just take a look around and you will find lots of reasons to be angry with this country and the way minorities are treated and the way children are (mis)educated and mistreated, at the way health care is only for the rich and good schools are only for those who are wealthy. Just take a look around at the poverty in your own town, or the homophobia or the anti-Semitism or the sexism in your own university and you will get very angry. Some scholars work out of this anger. I know I do. I think Joe also was a scholar who worked out of this angry place. And yet he was a tender-hearted man.

To further deconstruct Shirley's quote above it is important to pay attention to what she calls "quasi-critical pedagogues" I think again of Peter McLaren's reminder that Freire taught that we ought not domesticate critical theory. Part of this domestication comes, I think, from not studying primary sources. I wonder if scholars who do critical theory have forgotten to read Freire, or have forgotten to return to Marx. Returning to Marx is essential if one calls oneself a critical theorist. Studying Marx helps students to better understand not only Freire, but also Joe Kincheloe, Shirley Steinberg, Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux and Michael Apple. These writers are all tough-minded critics of corruption. And they owe a debt to the writings of Marx. Marx is not easy reading, by the way, he is tough. So too are the critical theorists who have returned to him. Here I am thinking especially of Peter McLaren. And Joe. I am always thinking of Joe these days. I miss him and still am in a state of disbelief. I loved Joe for his toughness and his tender-heartedness.

Here, one of the reasons I mention tough-minded critique is also because of what Joe tells us in another important book that Joe edited with kecia hayes (2007) titled *Teaching City Kids: Understanding and Appreciating Them.* What strikes me in this collection is Joe's emphasis on the way city kids *feel* about being put down, oppressed, and belittled. Joe says that "the affective dimensions of urban education are very important" (p. 6). This is what separates Joe from the pack. Joe's sensitivity to feeling is a reflection of his character and personality. Joe was a tough-minded—tender-hearted man. And he wasn't afraid to write about feelings. This is, I think, one of the missing elements in much critical theory. How kids feel about being insulted or belittled is also a psychoanalytic question. That is the sort of question that I deal with throughout my own work which is primarily psychoanalytic. So when I read Joe's intro I was delighted to see that feelings and critical theory could be discussed together. And whenever scholars talk about feelings they take a risk. In academe, talking about feelings is sometimes thought to be-well—unacademic, beside the point, not scholarly, soft. Tender-hearted. There is no place in the academy

for the tender-hearted. But Joe was a tender-hearted man. Joe addresses this critique as he talks about tough-minded versus "soft" scholarship. Joe states,

> Conservative critics often characterize scholarship such as City Kids as soft-pedagogy, lacking in rigor, concerned not with subject matter but with how students feel. This is such a cowardly misrepresentation of what critical educators are attempting in that it fails to account for the emotional/affective dimensions of marginalized students' lives … (2007, p. 28)

Joe is right on the mark here. As soon as scholars begin talking about emotions they get excoriated—as if emotions don't matter. What strikes me here—once again—is that Joe has combined the emotional element with critical theory—this is something that many who domesticate critical theory do not do. If we go back to Freire, he talks of what he calls radical love. In *Education for Critical Consciousness*, Freire (2007) says, "Education is an act of love…" (p. 33). And in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Freire* (1970/1994) says,

> Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and for people. The naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, is not possible if it is not infused with love. (p. 70)

Is love not an emotion? Does talk of love make Freire soft? I don't think so. Freire was a revolutionary thinker who changed the lives of millions of people through his work and his writings. Peter McLaren also talks about love in his work. He too has changed the lives of millions of people through his work and writing. And so too Joe. And so too Shirley. Being a Marxist does not mean being devoid of feeling. And sometimes these feelings are not nice either. Sometimes Marxists write under the shadow of anger. And this anger is justified. Marx clearly writes emotionally. He is not ashamed to express his rage. In a letter to Arnold Ruge, Marx in 1843 states,

> … I am speaking of a *ruthless critique of everything existing*, ruthless in two senses: The criticism must not be afraid of its own conclusions, nor of conflict with the powers that be. (1843/1978, p. 13)

To me, it seems that the word "ruthless" is a rage-filled word. A ruthless critique is an angry critique. I am thinking here of the work of Richard Wright. Here was a great fiction writer and a man who wrote through his rage at the injustices of American racism. If you ever have the chance to read his autobiography called *Black Boy* (1944/2006) do so. If you want to understand what it was like to live through the Jim Crow years in the USA, read Richard Wright. He too had a Marxist bent to his writings, although he eventually gave up his Communist affiliations because of the dogma associated with Communism. And Marx warned in his writings of not falling into the trap of dogma. But the Communists clearly lost their way, as history bares out. At any rate, if you are not angry about the inequitable conditions of your country, you are not paying attention.

Critical theorists engage in what Marx calls a ruthless critique of *everything*, especially now as many have moved into an area called cultural studies. Cultural studies is about the critique of everything in culture. Culture is not just high culture but all culture. Here, scholars look broadly at issues of power and culture and cri-

tique what is wrong. Joe's work in cultural studies can be seen as a critique of everything from McDonald's to Piaget. (see for example, Joe's book called *The Sign of the Burger: McDonald's and the Culture of Power* (2002) and his book called *The Stigma of Genius: Einstein, Consciousness, and Education* (1999)). (In these books Joe talks about everything from sweatshops and child labor violations to a critique of Piaget and problems of normalization, and a term Joe and Shirley talk about called postformalism, which is a critique of Piaget).

Joe was always a fighter for the rights of children and the oppressed; he was always opposed to any kind of normalization. Here I am thinking of a book he edited with my dear friend Gaile Cannella called *Kidworld: Childhood Studies, Global Perspectives, and Education* (2002). Here Gaile and Joe talk about the ways in which children are colonized and abused. Colonizing is the act of normalization. Colonization is imposition and erasure. Talking against normalization, imposition and erasure means talking about the importance of understanding difference. Joe didn't just talk the talk—about embracing difference—he walked the walk. Joe was one of the few men that I have ever met who was truly not racist, not homophobic, not anti-Semitic and not sexist. I think he so identified with all of these struggles—with all of the dispossessed—partly because of his working class upbringing and the insults he endured and the pain of living the working class life. Joe was truly a good man. Joe was a tender-hearted man. I cannot say this about many people. Joe was generous and was always there when you needed him.

Marx and the Embodiment of *Kritik*

Joe Kincheloe not only worked out of Kritik but lived it. And sometimes Kritik can be angry. I think Joe worked out of anger. But he also worked out of love. Kritik is driven by anger and love.

Here I want to deconstruct Marx's notion of *Kritik* because it has everything to do with the way Joe lived his life. *Kritik*—in the sense that Marx meant it—is a sustained analysis of the mis-use of power and the subsequent wrongs done to people. Marx was certainly insubordinate—to draw on Shirley's word and he certainly was indignant—to draw on Paulo's word. Marx was angry.

Here I want to emphasize the German spelling of the word *Kritik* because I think when this word gets translated it loses its meaning in a way. *Kritik is not just critique.* First off, returning to Marx, we read that *Kritik* means avoiding "dogmatic abstraction" (1843/1978). I am thinking that Marx was responding to his dislike of Hegel's abstract system of Spirit or the Idea. Recall, that for Hegel, Spirit makes history and people get swept up in history. The Spirit is a force and abstraction that people have no control over and Spirit gets its way. Marx had no truck with abstractions because he saw what poverty did to people, he saw what was happening in Prussian society and he anticipated revolution because he knew that people could only take so much abuse. Hegel did not see people, he saw abstractions. For Marx,

people make history. People make revolution. Abstractions are "specters." Marx (1845–1846/1994), in "The German Ideology: Part I," says,

> It has not, like the idealistic view of history, in every period To look for a category, but remains constantly on the real ground of history; it does not explain practice from the idea but explains the formation of ideas from material practice; and accordingly it comes to the conclusion that all forms and products of consciousness cannot be dissolved by mental criticism… or transformation into "apparitions," "specters," "fancies," but only by the practical overthrow of the actual social relations which give rise to this idealistic humbug… (p. 164)

Ghosts, *Geist*. It is interesting to note that in Marx the term 'specter' was used in two different ways. In early Marx specter was used as a slam against Hegel's notion of *Geist*, or Spirit. We see in Marx in the above quote the fundamental idea that it is people who make history and that 'material' reality is what needs to be unpacked, not the ghost in the machine of abstractions. Not to say that Marx's writings are not abstract. But his abstractions were always made concrete, material. We read later on in his "Manifesto of the Communist Party" that "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism" (Marx 1883/1978 p. 473). Here the notion of specter gets turned on its head as now the ghost seems a helpful one. The ghost warns that those who oppress will be overpowered by those who are oppressed. Revolution is at hand. And revolution is about the material conditions in which people struggle.

When I read these passages, I think of Joe and how he fought for the little guy, the underdog. How he really lived this Marxist dream. He wrote about fighting for the underdog and he fought for the underdog. Joe was not an armchair philosopher. Joe was a fighting man and lived the *Kritik.* I think of Joe when I read the following passage from Marx. "Nothing prevents us, then, from tying our criticism to the criticism of politics and to a definite party position in politics, and hence from identifying our criticism with real struggles" (1843/1994, p. 14). Joe's work was always about the struggles of people and he helped people and opened avenues for marginalized scholars to publish. The many book series that Joe and Shirley have demonstrate this openness to the scholarship of marginalized people and ideas that run counter to the status quo. The scholarship you find in Counterpoints Series (Peter Lang Publishing) or Transgressions (Sense Publishers) is the scholarship of real struggle, of concrete struggle, of struggle left out of the conversation by a sterile academe. Joe and Shirley have opened many doors to people who otherwise would not get published. And as I see it this is doing the real work of *Kritik.* As I have said a million times to my colleagues, Joe and Shirley have done so much for our field, they have opened so many doors to us, they have allowed us to speak when otherwise our voices would not be heard. We owe them a debt of gratitude.

In the spirit of Kritik, Joe and Shirley have never been afraid to take on people—in academe—who have done wrongs. Here I am thinking of the likes of Herrnstein and Murray in their scandalously racist book called *The Bell Curve.* Joe, Shirley and Aaron Gresson (Eds.) (1996), in their book *Measured Lies*, take these conservatives to task for their racist arguments. *The Bell Curve = specters of Eugenics.* This is a good example of *Kritik. Measured Lies* (1996) is one of the most important texts students need to read to understand what is wrong with using numbers to 'measure' intelligence. One of the points that stands out to me in *Measured Lies* is that Joe,

Shirley and Aaron point out that the racist pseudo-science of phrenology (measuring skulls) is not that much different from using numbers to 'measure' intelligence. The history of intelligence testing is clearly racist. Intelligence, in a word, cannot be measured and to think that we can do so is a lie. This is the thesis of their book. We learn also from Steven Selden (1999) and Ann Gibson Winfield (2007) that the social efficiency movement (measurement of intelligence was part of this movement and was a pre-cursor to the standards movement today) dovetailed with the Eugenics craze and many of the advocates of social efficiency in the early twentieth century like Bobbitt, Charters and Thorndike were actually advocates of Eugenics!! Here is an example of the way in which education has been used as a tool of colonization and racism. What are the implications, then, of the standards movement and standardized testing today? The answer to this question is not a happy one.

Kritik is sustained analysis of oppression. It is the sustained analysis of power gone wrong. It is intellectual labor. And it is study done in the spirit of love and anger; it is the intellectual labor of telling what is wrong in order to try to make what is wrong, right.

Kritik is the heart of what Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg's work has always been about. Much of their work has been a collaboration of love and anger. Anger against the machine of right-wing lunacy and corporate corruption. Education should be about righting wrongs, not about colonization and racism. And as I've mentioned, Freire teaches that education—at root –is about love. This is what Joe and Shirley have always been about: love. The tender-hearted ones.

I hope that younger scholars who are not familiar with Joe's work (or the many collaborative projects in which he was involved not only with Shirley Steinberg, but also with many, many other scholars) read the primary texts, read Joe's writings and study his thought. We are a scholarly family and we need to pay homage to people especially when they vanish from our world; we must work at memory and archive the work that has been done so as not to forget the legacy they leave. Many of the readers of JCT are young scholars trying to find their way in the academy. I hope that they take the time to study the important contributions Joe Kincheloe has made to our field. I am sure that Joe's work will help you find your way through academe. Let us follow Joe's example and do our work in the spirit of *Kritik, love and tenderheartedness.*

References

Cannella, G., & Kincheloe, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Kidworld: Childhood studies, global perspectives, and education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Freire, P. (1970/1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Freire, P. (2007). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

Kincheloe, J. (2002). *The sign of the burger: McDonald's and the culture of power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). Introduction. In Paulo Freire's *Teachers as cultural workers: Those who dare teach* (The Expanded Edition, pp. xIi–xIix). Boulder: Westview Press.
Kincheloe, J. (2007). City kids—Not the kind of students you'd want to teach. In J. Kincheloe & k. hayes (Eds.), *City kids: Understanding and appreciating them* (pp. 3–38). New York: Peter Lang.
Kincheloe, J., Steinberg, S., & Gresson, A. (1996). *Measured lies: The bell curve examined*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
Kincheloe, J., Steinberg, S., & Tippons, D. (1999). *The stigma of genius: Einstein, consciousness, and education*. New York: Peter Lang.
Marx, K. (1843/1978). For a ruthless criticism of everything existing (Marx to Arnold Ruge). In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader* (pp. 12–15). New York: W.W. Norton.
Marx, K. (1845–1846/1978). The German ideology: Part I. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader* (pp. 146–200). New York: W. W. Norton.
Marx, K. (1883/1978). Manifesto of the Communist party. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader* (pp. 473–500). New York: W.W. Norton.
McLaren, P. (2005). Preface: A pedagogy for life. In Paulo Freire's *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach* (Expanded Edition, pp. xxvii–xxxix). Boulder: Westview Press
Selden, S. (1999). *Inheriting shame: The story of Eugenics and racism in America*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Semail, L., & Kincheloe, J. (Eds.). (1999). *What is indigenous knowledge? Voices from the academy*. New York: Falmer Press.
Steinberg, S. (2007). Where are we now? In P. McLaren & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. ix–x). New York: Peter Lang.
Steinberg, S., & Kincheloe, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood*. Boulder: Westview Press.
Winfield, A. G. (2007). *Eugenics and education in America: Institutionalized racism and the implications of history, ideology, and memory*. New York: Peter Lang.
Wright, R. (1944/2006). *Black boy.* New York: Harperperennial.

Marla Morris is Professor of Education at Georgia Southern University. Her books include On Not Being Able to Play: Scholars, Musicians and the Crisis of Psyche (2009). Rotterdam: SENSE Publishers; Teaching through the ill body: A Spiritual and Aesthetic Approach to Pedagogy and Illness (2008) Rotterdam: SENSE Publishers; Jewish Intellectuals and the University (2006). New York: Palgrave; Curriculum and the Holocaust: Competing Sites of Memory and Representation (2001). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates Publishers. Currently, Morris is working on a two volume work which is titled Curriculum Studies Guidebooks (Vol 1 & Vol 2): Concepts and Theoretical Frameworks (in press) New York: Peter Lang.

Poem -José, Paulo, y Pato (From the First International Critical Pedagogy Congress in Baeza)

Mary Frances Agnello

Tres hombres de alma
Tres espíritos de la mente
Tres amigos de la causa
Tres escritores que aman el pueblo y la gente
Tres poetas inteligentes
Tres héroes de mi coraje
Tres sabias y patrones del arte
Me parecen ser de nosotros una muy importante parte

This poem was dedicated to Joe, Paulo, and Pato at the First International Critical Pedagogy Congress in Baeza, Spain, September 2009.

M.F. Agnello
Akita International University, Japan, Akita 010-1292, Japan
e-mail: maryfrancesagnello@aiu.ac.jp

M.F. Agnello, W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Practicing Critical Pedagogy*,
Critical Studies of Education 2, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-25847-8