



Late 19th Century Navajo Textile

Education in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Theoretical Discussion of Citizenship, Democracy and Multiculturalism

CARLOS ALBERTO TORRES
University of California, Los Angeles

ABSTRACT: *The paper discusses the development of education in Latin America and the Caribbean and its impact on indigenous and other minorities. Theories of citizenships, nationalism, democracy and multiculturalism are used to frame the critique of current educational practices in the region's multi-ethnic capitalistic states. The author argues that the concept of citizenship has been overly exclusionary, often addressing the needs and identities of powerful groups, while marginalizing those of immigrant and indigenous minorities. The author further contends that the tensions between democracy and multicultural citizenship should be recognized and addressed in public education. A new and dynamic concept of democratic citizenship should be constructed through education, taking into serious consideration the aspirations, identities, histories and rights of native peoples and other minorities*

The question of citizenship, democracy and multiculturalism lies at the heart of the discussion on educational reform in the world but also constitutes a fundamental demand of indigenous people. The Chiappas' uprising of an Indigenous Army, part and parcel of a social movement against the Mexican state in 1994, exemplifies these demands. Indigenous people were displaced from their lands, subject to all sorts of vexations, systematically discriminated against, and there were even attempts made to suppress or silence their languages. It is not surprising then that they forcefully demand that citizenship and democracy should include them. Political activism by indigenous people, as Chiappas exemplified, may also reflect a criticism of the lack of equality in the world system. In choosing for their political appearance the first of January of 1994, the day of the Free Trade Agreement between Mexico, the United States and Canada, they seem to suggest that the slogan of the first demonstration against free-trade and globalization in Seattle, "no globalization without representation" applies also to communal lands and native Latin Americans.

Cloaked in different robes, questions about citizenship, the connections between education and democracy, or the problem of multiculturalism, affect most of the decisions that we face in dealing with the challenges of contemporary education. Theories of citizenship and theories of democracy mark the advent of modern political science and reflect, in their complexities, the theoretical and practical challenges to democracy in contemporary societies. Both theories of citizenship and theories of democracy also underline the dilemmas of negotiating power in democratic societies.

Theories of citizenship relate to every problem of the relations between citizens and the state and among citizens themselves, while theories of democracy relate clearly to the connection between established -- hidden and explicit -- forms of social and political power, the intersection between systems of democratic representation and participation with systems of political administrative organization of public governance and with political party systems. Ultimately, theories of democracy need to address the overall interaction between democracy and capitalism.

Finally, theories of multiculturalism, so prevalent in the educational field in the last twenty years, have emerged as a particular response not only to the constitution of the pedagogical issue in schools, or to the interaction between the pedagogical issue and the political issue in democratic societies, but also as a way to identify the importance of multiple identities in education and culture. In short, theories of multiculturalism are intimately connected to the politics of culture and education.

Thus, theories of multiculturalism relate to the main analytical purpose of theories of citizenship. Both attempt to identify the sense and sources of identity and the competing forms of national, regional, ethnic, or religious identity. Yet, theories of multiculturalism have addressed the implications of class, race and gender for the constitution of identities and the role of the state, in a way that, by and large, mainstream theories of citizenship have not. Theories of democracy are preoccupied mostly with issues of participation, representation and checks and balances of power. Yet, some types are also concerned with ways to promote solidarity beyond particular interests or specific forms of identity.

Theories of citizenship, theories of democracy and theories of multiculturalism, in their specific spheres of influence and empirical locus, not only strive to identify a sense of identity (for the notion of a democratic citizen and a multicultural political subject) including all its contradictory sources, but they also seek to define vigorously the limits and possibilities of forms of sociability which will promote the ability in individuals to tolerate and work together with people who are different from themselves. Likewise, these theories may enhance people's (or in a more restricted formulation, citizens') ability and desire to participate in the

political process of promoting the public good and accountability. Finally, these theories will help individuals' willingness to exercise self-restraint and personal responsibility in their economic demands and in personal choices which affect the health and wealth of society and the environment, as well as the process of community(ies) formation. This is so, because as Habermas so aptly has argued (1992: 7): "the institutions of constitutional freedom are only worth as much as a population makes of them"

Democracy, Citizenship and Education: Our Thesis

The dilemmas of citizenship in a democratic diverse multicultural society can be outlined as follows: Theories of citizenship had been advanced, in the tradition of Western political theory, by white, heterosexual males who identified a homogenous citizenship through a process of systematic exclusion rather than inclusion in the polity.¹ That is, women, identifiable social groups (i.e., Jews, Gypsies), working class people and people representing specific ethnic and racial groups -- in short, people of color -- and individuals lacking certain attributes or skills (i.e. literacy or writing, reading and mathematical abilities) were, in principle, excluded from the definition of citizen in several societies.

Theories of democracy, while effective in identifying the sources of democratic power, participation and representation in legitimate political democratic systems, had been unable to prevent the systemic exclusion of large segments of the citizenship. Thus, formal democracy drastically differs from substantive democracy. More worrisome, indeed, is the fact that theories of democracy had been unable to differentiate the roots of representative democracy (based on the notions of equal representation, equity and equality) from their immersion with the foundational principles that articulate capitalist societies. By definition, capitalism requires differential representation in power and politics and fosters inequity formation through hierarchies and competing interests and inequality through the workings of a profit-seeking system.

Theories of multiculturalism, while effective in discussing the politics of culture and identity and the differential sources of solidarity across and within

¹ While I am aware that "the classics" of political philosophy reflect by and large male, European and heterosexual views and therefore cannot be made uncritically a cultural cannon of any sort, I will contend, however, that properly deconstructed and analyzed with a nuanced historical sense, they continue to be an invaluable source for thinking and praxis. A similar argument is made by Carole Pateman (1986: 3) discussing the pertinence of the classics for feminist political science: ... "it is impossible completely to turn our backs on the classics or on contemporary methodology, because all modes of discourse reflect and are implicated in the past to a greater or lesser degree. Moreover, there are valuable insights to be gained and lessons to be learned from male-stream theory".

specific forms of identity and even insightful in showing the remarkable complexity of multiple identities, had been unable or unwilling to embrace a theory of citizenship and a theory of democracy that could be workable, in practical, procedural terms; ethically viable, in moral terms; and politically feasible in the context of capitalist civil societies.

What is needed is a theory of multicultural democratic citizenship that will take seriously the question of developing a theory of democracy that will help to ameliorate (if not eliminate, altogether) the social differences, inequality and inequity pervasive in capitalist societies. In addition, such a theory of democracy will be able to address the draconian tensions between democracy and capitalism, on the one hand, and between social, political and economic democratic forms on the other.

Citizenship and Education

To undertake a discussion of theories of citizenship and their importance to education, it is important to move beyond historical or legal considerations. Likewise, it is important to move beyond the notion of citizenship as a kind of personal status, a combination of rights and duties which all legal members of a nation-state hold. The discussion of theories of citizenship requires stating a premise from the outset: a theory of a good citizen should be relatively independent from the formal premises of the legal question of what it is to be a citizen.

The most significant development in citizenship theory in this century has undoubtedly been linking the welfare state and its network of services, with the full expression of democratic citizenship. T. H. Marshall's celebrated and much cited "Citizenship and Social Class" article, written in 1949, articulates, like few other works, the new post-war consensus about the notion of the liberal welfare state as a precondition for the exercise of citizenship in capitalist societies. (Marshall, 1950; Marshall, 1963; Marshall, 1965; Marshall, 1981; Marshall, 1983)

For Marshall, citizenship developed over 250 years in England, classifying citizenship into three elements: civil, political and social rights. Western civil society obtained civil rights in the 18th-century, political rights in the 19th-century and social rights in the 20th-century. Civil rights encompass all rights required for individual freedom (i.e., right to own property, freedom of speech, and the right to justice). Political rights comprise all rights surrounding the electoral process (i.e., the right to vote, to elect and be elected, etc.). Finally, the social rights are the rights which appear as the most controversial of all rights and include not only a modicum of economic welfare and security, but also what is necessary for individuals to live a full life: "to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in society. The institutions most closely connected with welfare are the educational system and the social services" (Marshall, 1963). T. H. Marshall's arguments on citizenship are embedded in the arguments of

the ongoing democratization of society, which illustrates a central principle of the enlightenment. Yet, as Carole Pateman points out, citizenship is not synonymous with democracy (Pateman, 1996: 6).

Traditional theories of citizenship are challenged by different forms of social theory which I will now discuss, including the criticism of Feminism, post-colonialism, critical race theory and new social movements.

Feminism

T.H. Marshall -- and with him many other scholars -- took for granted that in the 18th-century all people in England were legally free and therefore enjoyed civil citizenship. Yet, a most serious challenge to this assumption is the idea that adult English males had enjoyed their legal freedom and citizenship because of the commodification of women's labor and women's lack of legal power, in households controlled through patriarchal practices (Gordon, 1990). As Pateman (1996: 7-8) puts it:

. . . despite the increasing volume and range of criticism, his commentators typically fail to appreciate the peculiar narrowness of Marshall's interest in citizenship, which runs in one direction only...He fails to ask whether rights are of equal worth to all citizens, or to make the point in another way, whether citizenship means the same for all individuals. He asked about the social integration, and the material and cultural conditions of the male-working class. He did not consider whether there were other citizens who might be described as second class."

This commentary by Pateman points to three most insightful criticisms of T. H. Marshall: (a) that his analysis, with the drastic ideology of the (male) working class, may no longer account for changes in citizenship due to a restructured globalized capitalism; (b) that he failed to take into account the issue of ethnicity (which describes a sizable segment of what Pateman chose to call 'second class citizens') and (c) that he obviously failed to account for the subordination of women in his analysis of citizenship. Hence, it is the importance of the feminist challenge to citizenship which I now briefly discuss.

The feminist discussion highlights three rather intractable themes for the traditional liberal conception of citizenship: First, the notion of identity as an elusive, disputed, ever-changing assemblage of narratives and positions which will make it very difficult to speak of citizenship as a single identity correlated either with a territory, culture, or experience. Hence, Mouffe's criticisms of essentialized positions is based on the premises that: "conceptualizing identities and differences as

discursively constructed instead of as objectively given" (Fraser, 1989: 183). Second is the notion of the patriarchal foundations of liberal democracies and the indispensable criticism and changes in those foundations if all men and women are to be considered full citizens. As Pateman instructs us (1992: 28), "By a genuinely democratic citizen, I mean that both sexes are full citizens." This, in turn, invites one to criticize the political usage of the notions of the public and the private. Last, the Feminist criticism of the 'public' as a male, patriarchal concept and the need to understand democracy as method as well as content encompassing the private and public domains -- a distinction which should incorporate the value of caring as related to, though not necessarily exclusive of, motherhood -- are important challenges to the traditional notion of citizenship as measured by voting patterns and participation rates.

Critical feminist perspectives help in understanding the constitution of the subject as constructed through different discourses and positions. This is a view which is more adequate than the reduction of identity to one single position -- such as class, race or gender -- and appears a prerequisite to understand how relations of power are constructed and, despite the claims of liberal citizenship, what forms of exclusion prevail.

Debates within feminism, however, show the importance of the new contributions of border feminists, most predominately Chicana feminists, criticizing as cultural imperialism white Eurocentric feminism for its inability to imagine the needs, desires and rights of their women of color counterpart: "Feminism affects and influences Chicana writers and critics, but feminism as practiced by women of the hegemonic culture oppresses and exploits the Chicano in both subtle and open ways." (Saldivar-Hull, 1994: 204)

Post-Colonialism

As the 'adult English male' subject was the citizen par excellence for T. H. Marshall, looking back at his contribution we need to recognize that the citizen that Marshall had in mind was the British citizen, but, as Pateman points out (1996: 9), Marshall does not draw in detail the notion of the 'British subject' nor does he look at the implications of a three-staged citizenship built in England fully supported by the expansion of British imperialism in the world.

Colonialism is linked to the imperialist expansion of mostly European metropolitan societies over Third World societies, a historical process that Lenin defined as imperialism, a superior phase of capitalism.² Colonialism was also an

² Of course, this description should include, in the case of the United States, its colonial experiences in the Philippines, Cuba and Puerto Rico and in the case of the former Soviet Union, its

attempt of forced modernization through territorial, political and technological invasion from industrial advanced societies over less technologically developed societies. For instance, the expansion towards “new territories” (Africa and Asia most prominently, but Latin America as well) served to address the need to expel population from Europe given the overpopulation and European crises of the last quarter of the 19th-century until World War I. It also addressed the superabundance of labor as well as the declining rates of return to capital in need of new markets for investments and rough materials. Finally, colonialism was based on geopolitical considerations of European nation-states and elites trying to enhance their planetary reach while trying to settle (military and diplomatically) their differences in European nation building.

Post-Colonialism, connected with Liberation Movements fighting against colonialism, emerged as an attempt to criticize the rational foundations of colonialism and to decolonize ‘the mind,’ as Franz Fanon liked to say. Post-colonial thought is above all a criticism of the Enlightenment and its legacy of modernity. Joining the criticism of Feminism, post-colonialism critiques the notion of an unqualified reason and universality, the progressive unfolding of history, the notions of national sovereignty, or the integrity of a self-identity subject which holds specific, self-reflective interests.

For post-colonialism, the analysis of the various dimensions of transnationalization, of what constitutes a nation and what role the territorial spaces play in the articulation of the notion of national sovereignty are central. This also implies a serious challenge to the notions of political community and political identity.

Critical Race Theory

Despite T. H. Marshall’s contribution to a theory of citizenship, a glaring omission was the consideration of ethnicity and race in the analysis. Race and racism continue to be central concepts in understanding the US racial formation. Despite much lip-service paid to discussions on race and the liberal discourse of tolerance, race and racism are perceived by critical race theorists as muted and utterly marginalized in the analysis of public policy and citizenship (Lanson-Billings and Tate, 1995: 1).

Critical race theory was born in the United States in the context of Legal Studies in an attempt to address the differential treatment of people of color by the prison and legal systems. Critical race theory is the result of progressive legal scholars of color who see American law as permeated by racism and who make the

colonial dominion toward East Europe and Afghanistan. To the dismay of many conservative analysts and given historical peculiarities, socialist Cuba continues to be an exception to colonialist doctrine

elimination of racism in American jurisprudence a central goal in the elimination of all forms of subordination.

Derrick Bell views civil rights achievements in the United States in the last century with growing skepticism: "In our era, the premier precedent of *Brown vs. Board of Education* promised to be the twentieth century's Emancipation Proclamation. Both policies, however, served to advance the nation's foreign policy intent more than they provided actual aid to Blacks." (Bell, 1995: 2) Derrick Bell argues that in the United States, the legal rights framework has been sacrificed on behalf of whiteness: "Even those whites who lack wealth and power are sustained in their sense of racial superiority by policy decisions that sacrifice black rights. The subordination of blacks seems to reassure whites of unspoken, but no less certain, property rights in their "whiteness" (Bell, 1995: 7).

Critical race theory, as Solorzano and Villapando explain, is related to five key insights. They are: 1) the primary focus on race and racism; 2) the challenge to dominant ideology; 3) the commitment to social justice; 4) the importance of experiential knowledge; and 5) the use of an interdisciplinary perspective (Solorzano and Villapando, 1997). Critical race theory, then, will be useful to prove that racism is endemic and deeply engraved in American life. These culturally sanctioned beliefs, no matter how symbolically concealed, involve the defense of pre-established social, cultural and economic advantages. Therefore the challenge to racism entails a serious challenge to the superordinate position of whites over racial minorities. To address this racial inequality, Ladson-Billings and Tate claim the civil rights acts have been ineffective because, ultimately, having not challenged the basis for property subordination, whites have, paradoxically, benefited from school desegregation. Even more, when desegregation was launched, new models of re-segregation through ability grouping came into operation, reproducing the conditions for a learning imbalance between whites and colored people.³

A third important insight of critical race theory and very prominent in the discussion of citizenship, is that claims of neutrality, objectivity, meritocracy and the goal of a color-blind society need to be challenged (Ladson-Billings and Tate IV, 1995). For critical race theorists, racism is so deeply ingrained in America that a rethinking of citizenship needs to incorporate systematic challenges to the practice of racism in the legal system and, by extension, in the school system. This rethinking of citizenship should not only challenge racism, but also the prevalence of the logic of property rights over the logic of personal rights and the foundation of human rights as the basis for equality and justice. Given the magnitude of the task, there are no naive assumptions that anti-racist positions can be easily organized in a coalition to

³ The classic text of how ability grouping structures inequality continues to be Jeannie Oakes, (1995) *Keeping Track*, New Haven: Yale University.

challenge prevailing racist structures, sentiments and values.

By putting the question of race first, critical race theorists argue that the discussion of citizenship can no longer be treated as a homogenous identity in search of the exercise of rights and obligations. Along the same lines as critical race theorists, another important claim on the state and the constitution of citizenship is provided by old and new social movements. I now turn to a discussion of these movements.

New Social Movements

If we understand politics as a struggle for power, new social movements should not be interpreted exclusively in political terms, as they also represent cultural and moral practices centered on the construction of collective identities and spaces. They originate around certain demands and specific social relations, becoming increasingly autonomous from traditional institutions of political representations of interests. This is so, argues Ernesto Laclau—joining other proponents of social movement theory—because individuals no longer exclusively define their identity in relation to the means and relations of production, but also as consumers, residents of a particular neighborhood, members of churches, ethnic or gender groups, and participants in the political system (Laclau, 1985: 27-42; Garcia et al, 1981; Lechner, 1987).

New social movement theory has provided the basis for a dramatic shift in understanding the relationship between social movements and education. A distinctive characteristic of new social movements is their cognitive and ideological focus on rethinking preexisting social and cultural paradigms as part of a politics of identity. As a consequence, one of their key strategies is broadly educational, as opposed to a focus on gaining power and its implications for citizenship are numerous. To cite just a few, consider the gains that the environmental movement has made in schools, promoting a democratic citizenship which is responsible, at a collective and even planetary level, for the protection of endangered species, for the levels of pollution in the air and water, or for the control of dangerous substances in food. Consider the role of the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, redressing the inequality built into the interaction of Mexican aboriginal people and the post-revolutionary Mexican state and their consistent and impetuous political program linking those ethnic and political demands to the constitution of a true radical democracy in Mexico and the constitution of a democratic citizenship without exclusions.

In summary, new theories of critical modernism, including feminism, critical race theory and subordinate social spaces theory nested within the theoretical net of post-colonialism and the practice of new social movements, have also enhanced the

possibilities of citizenship, particularly in multicultural democratic societies. The question, then, is how citizenship relates to the notion of democracy and education.

Democracy and Education

The notion of democracy that has gained currency at the end of the twentieth century is liberal representative democracy with its principle of the active citizen. As it is defined by Held (1995: 254), it constitutes "a cluster of rules, procedures and institutions permitting the broadest involvement of the majority of citizens, not in political affairs as such, but in the selection of representatives who alone can make political decisions."

Yet, it will be convenient to distinguish at the outset, as the Italian political scientist Humberto Cerroni does, between democracy as content and democracy as method. Democracy appears to be primarily a method of political representation, a cluster of rules that includes "...elected government; free and fair elections; universal suffrage; freedom of conscience, information and expression; the right of all adults to oppose their government and stand for office; and the right to form independent associations." As a principle, democratic governments seek to develop parliamentary and judicial systems free from the control of the executive, hence the importance of the notion of checks and balances in the system. Finally, given the liberal impetus, liberal democracy upholds the belief in the predominance of individual rights over collective rights, which implies a serious consideration for the potential tyranny of majorities.

The notion of democracy as content is related to the notion of democracy as a system of political participation by the people in public affairs. It is related to the power of the people over any other regulatory institution (such as the kinship), the idea of equal rights for all citizens and, particularly in the U.S. Constitution, a political philosophy of egalitarianism. However, a notion of radical democracy goes beyond the attempt to prevent forms of exclusion that preclude political and social participation. Radical democracy postulates radical equality in racial/ethnic, class and gender interactions, both at the level of the public sphere and in the intimacy of the household. Thus, a first important tension occurs between democratic regimes that uphold formal rules, but fail dramatically to uphold democracy in terms of class, race/ethnicity and gender interactions.

A second important tension, then, is to explain how the notion of democracy became intimately intertwined with the notion of capitalism as the most conducive mode of production for the development of democratic systems. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis offer a very persuasive argument (Bowles and Gintis, 1986). They argue that the dynamics of democracy rely on two logics of expansion of the capitalist system: personal rights and property rights, which are often opposed. The conflict between these two logics (represented perhaps in the clash between business

ideology and social movements in advanced industrial capitalism and in dependent-development capitalism) is over the use and appropriation of societal resources, and also about the question of setting ethical standards of social behavior. However, capitalism as an economic and social system of accumulation, production, reproduction, and distribution of commodities is intrinsically conflictive and marked by internal contradictions.

If capitalism is a conflictory system, and democracy has two different logics of development, then the question is, why have democracy and capitalism become intermingled, and why has this working relationship of politics and economics not fallen apart. Bowles and Gintis claim that the connection between democracy and capitalism has been made through four historical accommodations of the system: (a) in Europe, the Lockean proposal that accommodates the system by limiting the political participation of the propertied; (b) in the United States, the Jeffersonian proposal that distributing property widely among the citizenry (of Anglo-Saxon origin) reaccommodates the system in the face of increasing political strains; (c) the political proposal of Madison to foster a sufficient heterogeneity of interest among citizens to prevent the emergence of a common political program of the nonpropertied; and (d) the Keynesian model, in which economic growth and distribution of income generate a communality of interests between the dispossessed and the wealthy.

Is there a new accommodation of the system in the face of the current crisis of democracy? What is the situation of democracy and capitalism at the end of the millennium? It seems that a new accommodation is emerging with the notion of citizen as consumer and the predominance of globalization from above.⁴ These are

⁴ Globalization has been defined as "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa." (David Held, 1991: 9). Held suggests, among other things, that globalization is the product of the emergence of a global economy, expansion of transnational linkages between economic units creating new forms of collective decision-making, development of intergovernmental and quasi-supranational institutions, intensification of transnational communications and the creation of new regional and military orders. I have suggested elsewhere that globalization puts limits to state autonomy and national sovereignty. These limits are expressed in the tension between global and local dynamics in virtually every decision and policy domain in the social, cultural and economic spheres. (Torres, 1998a).

Globalization therefore not only blurs national boundaries but also shifts solidarities within and outside the national state. Globalization cannot be defined exclusively by the post-Fordist organization of production but emerges as a major characteristic of a global world economy. Issues of human rights, regional states and cosmopolitan democracy will play a major role affecting civic minimums at the state level, the performance of capital and labor in different domains, and particularly the dynamics of citizenship, democracy and multiculturalism in the modern state.

relevant questions that go beyond the reach of this article. The next section will connect the discussion between democracy and multiculturalism.

Democracy and Multiculturalism

The connections between democracy and multiculturalism are among the most contested polemics of our time. Let me start this section with the prophetic voice of Cornel West (1993a: 11-12) who argues that:

The new cultural politics of difference are neither simply oppositional in contesting the mainstream (or *malestream*) for inclusion nor transgressive in the avant-gardist sense of shocking conventional bourgeois audiences. Rather they are distinct articulations of talented (and usually privileged) contributors to culture who desire to align themselves with demoralized, demobilized, depoliticized, and disorganized people in order to empower and enable social action and, if possible, to enlist collective insurgency for the expansion of freedom, democracy and individuality.

Cornel West sets the right tone for the discussion. Multiculturalism, in any form, shape or color, relates to the politics of difference and the emerging social struggles over racialized, gendered and classist societies. Yet, discussions on multiculturalism in the United States should start with a subtle, but important, differentiation between notions of multiculturalism as a social movement and a theoretical approach, multicultural education as a reform movement and citizenship education as a curriculum-oriented specialty which, particularly given the characteristics of the US racial formation, needs to take into account issues of racial identity and cultural diversity for citizenship building as an anti-racist pedagogy.

As a social movement, multiculturalism is a philosophical, theoretical and political orientation which goes beyond school reform and tackles the issues of race, gender and class relations in society at large. As multicultural education, however, the landscape in the United States has been dominated by liberal multiculturalism.

The proponents of liberal multiculturalism will argue that it: (1) will increase fairness (by representing the range and richness of America's different ethnicities) and (2) will increase tolerance by exposing students to multiple perspectives on the meaning of history: "In this view, multiculturalism pluralizes the notion of an American identity by insisting on attention to African-Americans, Native Americans and the like, but it leaves in place a unified concept of identity." (Scott, 1989: 13)

Within the pluralist framework, *identity* "is taken as the referential sign of a fixed set of customs, practices, and meanings, an enduring heritage, a readily identifiable sociological category, a set of shared traits and/or experiences." (Scott, 1989: 14)

From an existentialist and not merely a sociological standpoint, identity is also related to key feelings and experiences of protection, association and recognition. As Cornel West so forcefully claims: "People identify themselves in certain ways in order to protect their bodies, their labor, their communities, their way of life; in order to be associated with people who ascribe values to them; and for purposes of recognition, to be acknowledged, to feel as if one actually belongs to a group, a clan, a tribe, a community. So that any time we talk about the identity of a particular group over time and space, we have to be very specific about what the credible options are for them at any given moment." (West, 1996: 57)

Diversity, on the other hand, as Scott argues, "refers to the plurality of identities, and it is seen as a condition of human existence rather than as the effect of an enunciation of difference that constitute hierarchies and asymmetries of power." (Scott, 1989: 14) Cornel West will agree since he argued that: "...this historical process of naming is part of the legacy not just of white supremacy but of class supremacy." (West, 1996: 57)

Power and difference in multiculturalism narratives are always interrelated with a discussion of identity. Yet, *national identity*, the most important form of territorial solidarity based on notions of a single nation-state, and the experience and feeling of patriotism and a common cultural heritage, is not a fixed marker which guides citizens in their choices of loyalties and solidarities. Historically, the concept of national identity is better defined in opposition to 'others' (i.e. another national identity or an enemy of the nation) than in reference to a set of uncontested historical properties of a nation and the national experience of its people as a homogeneous group.

Therefore, identities are constructed in a process of contestation and struggle and are subject to multiple interpretations. Identities are social constructions with material and historical bases, and indeed they are based on (or, if one allows for the Althusserian lapse, are interpellated by) perceptions of knowledge, experience and power, particularly what knowledge is (or should be considered) legitimate and should count, what experiences should be celebrated and learned from, and how power can be negotiated among different kinds of knowledge and experiences. Yet, the same notion of experience which seems to underlie the notion of identity, as Joan Scott has so forcefully argued, is something historically, culturally and discursively produced. Once again, as Michael Apple has so aptly argued for more than two decades, the connections between power and knowledge become central to any practical agenda of research and policy making in education, particularly in this new face of the conservative restoration (Apple, 1982; Apple, 1986; Apple, 1993; Apple, 1997).

Identity, as I have argued, is not a fixed marker, an essential substance that some people share in virtue of their origin, race, religious affiliation, sexual

preference, gender, or class, but a process of learning which is context dependent and indeed open to interpretation. As such, it also depends on the historicity of the struggles that impinge upon social consciousness at a given point in time, making experience, and the consciousness of the experience, a salient process of understanding and meaning-making by the individuals attempting to understand the conditions of their lives.

Poet T. S. Elliot said that “we have the experience but we missed the meaning, an approach to the experience restores the meaning.” Elliot’s dictum tells us that the notion of identity built on a given experience is as elusive as the notion of consciousness of identity, and this consciousness cannot be separated from processes of oppression, discrimination and exclusion which constitute people’s lives.

Key Democratic Issues for a Democratic Multicultural Citizenship in Latin America

Let us take as a premise of the analysis that the suffrage movement at the turn of the century, the movement of Civil Rights in the U.S. in the sixties and the statute of affirmative action, as well as the amendment for freedom of speech, helped the renewal of citizenship in the USA, enhancing American democracy. “Affirmative action began with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited discrimination on the basis of race and sex and which was later augmented by a number of executive orders that regulate federal contracts and set goals and timetables for hiring minorities.” (Feinberg 1996: 363). As Walter Feinberg rightly points out (1996: 378), affirmative action “...uses group membership to identify and correct past acts of discrimination against individuals, acts that have resulted in inadequate educational, economic, and social positioning.” It is not risky then to assume that the movement of suffrage, the movement of civil rights, the movement of freedom of speech and indeed affirmative action have contributed to create a better, level playing field, understanding diversity as a central component of citizenship in the United States and, indeed, that similar struggles in Latin America have helped to enhance the domains of theoretical and political discourse on citizenship and democracy.

Attacks on affirmative action and cultural diversity, particularly in the realm of higher education, may undermine the foundations of citizenship in the United States and elsewhere. Why? First, because affirmative action reminds us of a historical debt that needs to be repaid to specific groups. Second, and moving from the importance of race-based affirmative action to the need to be complemented with a need-based affirmative action, we should be reminded that there cannot be equality of political opportunity without equality of social opportunity.

Economic citizenship cannot be accomplished without bare essentials, as Todd Gitlin has suggested (1998: 254), including “The right to a job, education,

medical care, housing, retraining over the course of life--these are the bare elements of an economic citizenship that ought to be universal." Finally, in the context of US democracy, affirmative action reaffirms the importance of the critique of public policy and the history of a given social formation. Not surprisingly, many people have identified African-Americans as the eminent subject of affirmative action (though they have not, as a group, become the principal beneficiaries of these policies; white women have been).⁵ Cornel West said it so passionately: "One of the reasons why black people are so integral a part of American civilization is because black people have raised a lot of hell. That is very important, especially in a society in which power and pressure decide who receives visibility. By raising hell I mean organization, mobilization, chaos-producing capacity, as in rebellion." (West, 1996: 58) The black struggle in the United States or the indigenous struggles in Latin America, just to mention two key struggles of our time, show that criticism and rebellion emerge as two key factors in the constitution of citizenship for a democracy of content and not merely a democracy of method.

No doubt, the capacity to generate criticism and rebellion against mainstream ideas which may represent the powers that be has long been a central component of any political democratic education for citizenship. In fact, we cannot understand citizenship without understanding the role that education, and particularly higher education, play in the constitution of the democratic pact. Moreover, we cannot understand the democratic pact without considering affirmative action policies and cultural diversity as indissolubly linked.

In Latin America, Paulo Freire has argued that few human encounters are exempt from oppression of one kind or another because by virtue of race, class or gender, people tend to be victims and/or perpetrators of oppression. He stressed that racism, sexism or class exploitation are the most salient forms of dominance and oppression, but he also recognized that oppression exists on the grounds of religious beliefs, political affiliation, national origin, age, size and physical and intellectual handicaps. Starting from a psychology of oppression, influenced by the works of psychotherapists such as Freud, Jung, Adler, Fanon and Fromm, Paulo Freire developed a "Pedagogy of the Oppressed" (1972: 19). He believed that education could improve the human condition, counteracting the effects of a psychology of oppression, and ultimately contributing to what he considered the "ontological vocation of mankind": humanization. In the introduction to his widely-acclaimed

⁵ While, for instance, "black represent over 12 percent of the population in the United States, they comprise only 4.2 percent of doctors, 3.3 percent of the lawyers, 5 percent of the university teachers, 3.7 percent of the engineers ... [however] the percentage of women lawyers and judges increased from a mere 3.8 percent in 1972 to 22.8 percent in 1993 and women faculty members rose from 28 percent in 1972 to 42.5 percent in 1993." (Feinberg 1996: 366-367)

Pedagogy of the Oppressed, he argued that: "From these pages I hope at least the following will endure: my trust in the people, and my faith in men and women and in the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love."

Following Freire, one may argue that the central question of education today is what role, if any, educational institutions and practices should play in the constitution of the social pact that articulates democracy. This brings us to the dilemma of a democratic culture: The construction of a democratic citizen. To put it simply: democracy implies a process of participation where all are considered equal. However, education involves a process whereby the 'immature' are brought to identify with the principles and forms of life of the 'mature' members of society. Thus, the process of construction of the democratic citizen is a process of cultural nurturing but it also involves articulating principles of pedagogic and democratic socialization in individuals who are neither *tabula rasa* in cognitive or ethical terms, nor fully equipped for the exercise of their democratic rights and obligations.

This central problem of education -- how to contribute to the democratic pact -- is compounded by the fact that teachers relate to the demand of a common public school which is increasingly segregated by race and class, in a society with a growing gap between the haves and have-nots, and when gender distinctions continue to be central to school discrimination. In this context, several issues stand out clearly in the minds of policymakers, teachers, researchers and citizens, among them diversity and multiculturalism, which have emerged as central themes in the discussion on public policy.

Citizenship can be predicated in terms of civic virtues or legal status. Civic virtues point to a sense of solidarity that unites individuals around common goals. These goals are, at the very least, how to survive and live together in our contemporary diverse society. These goals, however, can also be accomplished with a more ambitious agenda: how to thrive as a community of communities, as a culture of cultures, drawing from our cultural diversity as a cultural strength and affirmative action, broadly understood, as a useful policy.

Yet, as Todd Gitlin cautions us (1998: 217), "The question is how to cultivate the spirit of solidarity across the lines of difference -- solidarity with 'anyone who suffers.' For surely that spirit cannot be expected to generate spontaneously inside fortified groups, each preoccupied with refining its differences from other groups."

For a framework of solidarity and common ground across cultures, ethnicities, classes and gender, the goals of cultural diversity are central. We need to develop flexible frameworks for solidarity in schools that take seriously the need for democratic reform. Cultural diversity is a major byproduct of the growing process of economic, cultural and political globalization which has no parallel in the history of humankind. Globalization has produced all sorts of implications for the

multicultural, multilingual and multiethnic configurations of local communities in the United States and elsewhere. In terms of the social covenant, not surprisingly, diversity is a key challenge for any institution of higher education in complying with Federal and State statutes for affirmative action, and in facing the growing social and educational demands.

Institutions of higher education are at the center of the storm in terms of diversity and affirmative action, and I must say, in terms of promoting a renewal of citizenship. A commitment to diversity and multiculturalism implies a commitment to diversify the faculty resembling, to the possible extent and given the available resources, the demographic traits of schools and universities in the United States. Diversity also implies the diversification of the student body to enable demands from different intellectual, ethnic, gender and underrepresented groups and constituencies to be appropriately addressed in the classroom. To achieve the goals of diversity and multiculturalism, universities should be able to attract the best and brightest, the most qualified scholars, undergraduates and graduates who can explore in their teaching, research, and outreach the frontiers of knowledge without prejudice but with creativity, with joy, with enthusiasm and dedication, with a sense of utopian hope.

Achieving diversity and developing a multicultural academic environment is not easy. Tensions will always arise between growing social and intellectual demands and diminishing fiscal resources. There will also be tensions among diverse intellectual, ethnic, and social constituencies, and among faculty desires to serve the ideals of equity coupled with the imperatives of equality in the context of the perennial academic quest for excellence and community. There will also be serious criticisms of policies oriented to equity and equality in education, including affirmative action policies. Affirmative action should not be considered a moral absolute, but should be included in a democratic conversation of how affirmative action and cultural diversity enhance citizenship, and what role institutions of higher education should play in this respect.

I believe, that in order to achieve the missions of institutions of higher education, the construction of an academic consensus based on the notion of diversity is essential. This consensus-building, however, should begin with the recognition of the importance of these tensions, it should take into account the precariousness of many of the managerial solutions available, and it should recognize the limitations of the many intellectual paradigms in vogue. These are some of the intellectual challenges of discussing citizenship, cultural diversity, and affirmative action in higher education. This, in turn, brings us to the question of canon versus culture in the construction of a democratic multicultural citizenship.

Education, Culture, and Democratic Multicultural Citizenship: Conclusions

The impossibility of an uncontested canon results from the impossibility of defining a single, integrated, non-problematic, and descriptive social and pedagogical identity in the culture of the West (Morrow and Torres).

"In a sense, this is a game of never-ending mirrors." (Wallerstein).

As the indigenous struggle exemplifies, in this new millennium in Latin America and elsewhere, it is clear that identity formation takes place in many diverse spheres, including education, but that formerly citizenship building has been mostly confined to the educational domain. The questions which certainly go beyond the limits of this address are whether they should both be treated as processes of life-long learning (with potentially divergent conclusions), whether both -- identity and citizenship -- should be treated as different discrete theoretical entities, which may intersect at some point (and hence the need to rethink their contradictions and correspondences), and whether this interaction (between identity and citizenship) can be accomplished at all in the context of late capitalism and the criticism of democratic ungovernability.

Identity is a never-secured effect of a process of enunciation of cultural difference. Taken to the extreme, however, this epistemological premise may seem impractical for pedagogy or political mobilization. Yet, from a progressive perspective, it would be simplistic to think of cultural difference as the difference between dominant and subordinate cultures. The fact is, that critical multiculturalism should also address the ideological cleavages and differences within subordinate cultures, not only as the negotiation between peoples of color and the oppressive networks of power, but also among people of color themselves. Here, the words of critical race theorists resonate with peculiar force: "Unfortunately, the tensions between and among these differences is rarely interrogated, presuming a "unity of difference"-- that is, that all difference is both analogous and equivalent." (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1998: 62)

Membership and experience in a given identity do not guarantee the accurate recollection of the experience -- for instance, using the analytical tools of social sciences and humanities -- and hence the political risks are many, including the fact that in many multiculturalist quarters: "Personal testimony of oppression replaces analysis, and this testimony comes to stand for the experience of the whole group. The fact of belonging to an identity group is taken as authority enough for one's speech; the direct experience of a group or culture -- that is, membership in it -- becomes the only test of true knowledge." (Scott, 1989: 18)

Despite the growing literature on multiculturalism in the United States, less so in the rest of Latin America, only recently has the discussion shifted to address

the connections between multiculturalism and citizenship, exploring the limits and possibilities of multiculturalism in democratic societies. Perhaps it is fair to argue that the multitude of tasks confronting multiculturalism is overwhelming. They include the attempt to develop a sensible, theoretically refined and defensible new meta-theoretical and theoretical territory that would create the foundations for multiculturalism as a paradigm; the attempt to establish its epistemological and logical premises around the notions of experience, narrative, voice, agency and identity; the attempt to pursue empirical research linking culture/power/knowledge with equality/inequality/discrimination; and the need to defend multiculturalism from the conservative right which has demonized multiculturalism as an antipatriotic movement, opposing the need for a canon that can regulate the cultural exchanges from a principle of order. These multifaceted tasks and the concrete political experience of the eighties and nineties in the United States and Latin America, have forced the different proponents of multiculturalism into the defensive, both in theoretical and political terms. This means that they have been so far unable to fully address the need for a theory of multicultural citizenship, a theory which should be instrumental in advancing democratic goals in the context of theories of democracy, despite the fact that they operate within the capitalist framework. Yet, a final dilemma for multiculturalism is the understanding of the connections between diversity and the unity, that is, the question of unity in diversity.

There are certainly many analytical and political alternatives in confronting the dilemma of unity in diversity. First and foremost is the need to explore the degree of hybridization of cultures, and the notion that every social subject is constituted by multiple identities and multiple affiliations. Recognition of the complexities posed by the process of hybridization, and the notion of multiple identities in the social and psychological construction of the pedagogical subject should challenge any attempt to essentialize differences based on race, gender, class, nationality, ethnicity, religion, or sexual preference. Secondly, rather than dealing with differences in ethical and political commitments as primary contradictions, one may see them as secondary contradictions, or as conflicting loyalties in the social construction of identity. This opens up areas of negotiation in the context of progressive alliances based on multiple identities and learning communities. A fundamental premise is the avoidance of any essentialization of cultural struggles, yet it is also important to recognize that there are a number of insights in neoconservative and neoliberal arguments. For instance, from a very different vantage point than neoconservatives, Cornel West and a number of black intellectuals are concerned with the "Cultural breakdown and escalating self-destructive nihilism among the poor and very poor." (West, 1993b: 196) Nihilism certainly offers poor foundations for the advancement of democracy and the attainment of citizenship.

Cornel West has said that people do not live on arguments, although they might be influenced by arguments. Reading Cornel West's *Prophetic Thought in Postmodern Times* helped me recall, once again, why we all conduct educational research, or at least why we should and why we should take seriously the contradictions between education, citizenship and democracy. West argues that there is an undeniable cultural decay in America that frightens him more than anything else: "By unprecedented cultural decay I mean the social breakdown of the nurturing system for children. The inability to transmit meaning, value, purpose, dignity, decency to children." (West, 1993b: 16)

While historically situated, his remarks, I believe, apply to many societies. Facilitating the nurturing and learning of children, youths and adults, is what public education -- jointly with the family and a few other societal institutions -- is supposed to do. That is what educational research should be about: understanding the indissoluble linkages of theory and practice. This is another practical reason why, periodically, we should theoretically revisit, the relationship between state, education, citizenship, democracy and multiculturalism and why we should strive, as Paulo Freire has told us on innumerable occasions, in the search to build a world which is "less ugly, less cruel and less inhumane."

Democracy is a messy system, but it has survived because there is a sphere for debates and a set of rules that people follow even if they do not benefit from them. Schools and universities within democratic communities cannot be less committed to expand the democratic discourse. Without a serious exploration of the intersections between cultural diversity, affirmative action and citizenship, the plural bases of democracy and the democratic discourse *per se* are at risk. Without a technically competent, ethically sound, spiritually engaging and politically feasible theory and practice of democratic multicultural citizenship, the people will perish.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." (Book of Proverbs 29: 18 [A.V.])

References

- Apple, M.W. (1982) *Education and Power*, Boston and London: Routledge.
- (1986) *Teachers and Text: A Political economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*, New York and London: Routledge.
- (1993) *Official Knowledge. Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*, New York and London: Routledge.
- (1997) *Teoría Crítica y Educación*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila Editores.
- Bell, D. (1995) Racial Realism – After We're Gone: Prudent Speculation on America in a Post-Racial Epoch, In R. Delgado (ed.), *Critical Race Theory, The Cutting Edge*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bowles, S. and H. Gintis (1986) *Democracy and Capitalism: The Contradictions of Modern Political Life*, New York: Basic Books.
- Feinberg, W. (1996) Affirmative Action and Beyond: A Case for a Backward-Looking Gender-and-Race-Based Policy, *Teachers College Record* 97(3)
- Fraser, N. (1989) *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Montevideo: Editorial Tierra Nueva.
- García, H.P., et al (1981) *América Latina 80: Democracia y movimiento popular*, Lima: Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo, DESCO.
- Gitlin, T. (1998) In P. Freire (ed.) *Politics and Education*, Los Angeles: Latin American Center.
- Gordon, L. (ed.) (1990) *Women, the State and Welfare*, Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Habermas, J. (1992) Citizenship and National Identity. Some Reflections on the Future of Europe, *Praxis International* 12: 1-19.
- Held, D. (ed.) (1991) *Political Theory Today*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- (1995) Democracy and the New International Order, In D. Archibugi & D. Held (eds.) *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An agenda for a New World Order*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Laclau, E. (1985) New Social Movements and the Plurality of the Social, In D. Slater (ed.) *New Social Movements and the State in Latin America*, Amsterdam: Centrum Voor Studie en Documentatie Vans Latijns Amerika [CEDLA].
- Lanson-Billings and Tate (1998) In P. Freire *Politics and Education*, Los Angeles: Latin American Center.
- Lanson-Billings, G. and W.F. Tate IV (1995) Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education, *Teachers College Record* 97(1): 55-59.
- Lechner, N. (ed.), (1987) *Cultura política y democratización*, Santiago Chile: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, CLASCO, and Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class and other Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1963) *Sociology at the Crossroads*, London: Heineman Educational Books
- (1965) *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century*, London: Hutchinson
- (1981) *The Right to Welfare and other Essays*, London: Heineman Educational Books
- (1983) *Citizenship and Social Class*, In D. Held et al (eds.), *States and Societies*, pp.248-260.
- Oakes, J. (1995) *Keeping Track*, New Haven: Yale University.
- Pateman, C. (1986) Introduction. The Theoretical Subversiveness of Feminism, In C. Pateman and E. Gross (eds.) *Feminist Challenges, Social and Political Theory*, Sydney, London and Boston: Allen & Unwin.

- (1992) Equality, difference, subordination: the politics of motherhood and women's citizenship, In G. Bock and S. James (eds.) *Beyond Equality and Difference*.
- (1996) *Democratization and citizenship in the 1990s: The Legacy of T.H. Marshall*. Vilhelm Aubert Memorial Lecture 1996. Institute for Social Research and Department of Sociology, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Saldívar-Hull, S. (1994) Feminism on the Border: From Gender Politics to Geopolitics, In. H. Calderón and J.D. Saldívar (eds.), *Criticism in the Borderlands. Studies in Chicano Literature, Culture and Ideology*, Durham and London: Duke University.
- (1998) In P. Freire *Politics and Education*, Los Angeles: Latin American Center.
- Malson, J.F. O'Barr, S. Westphal-Uhl and M. Wyers (eds.), *Feminist Theory in Practice and Process*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Solorzano, D.G. and O. Villalpando (1997) Marginality and the Experience of Students of Color in Higher Education, In C.A. Torres and T. Mitchell (eds.), *Sociology of Education: Emerging Perspectives*, New York: SUNY Press
- Torres, C.A. (1998a) *Democracy, Education and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World*, Lahman, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- (1998b) The Political Pedagogy of Paulo Freire, In P. Freire *Politics and Education*, Los Angeles: Latin American Center.
- West, C. (1993a) The New Cultural Politics of Difference, In C. McCarthy and W. Crichtlow (eds.), *Race, Identity and Representation in Education*, New York and London: Routledge.
- (1993b) *Prophetic Thought in Postmodern Times*, Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- (1996) Colloquy: Our next race question. The uneasiness between blacks and Latinos, *Harper's Magazine*, April: 57-58.