CAN EDUCATION CHANGE SOCIETY? EDUCATIONAL REALITIES AND THE TASKS OF THE CRITICAL SCHOLAR/ACTIVIST

Apple W. Michael
Professor, John Bascom Professor School of Education
University of Wisconsin, Madison. U.S.A
Distinguished Professor Rowan University

Abstract

This essay starts with a personal example of some recent international politics surrounding educational reforms. It is an example that illuminates the damaging effects of some of the radically undemocratic policies that are being put in place by conservative governments in all too many countries..

Key words

Critical-Scholar/Activist, Educational Realities, Education, Teachers.

0. Introduction[1]

A few years ago, I spent a semester as a Visiting Professor at a well-known university in Australia. During my time in Melbourne, I was asked to give a lecture to school principals and teachers in which I was to critically reflect on the policies that were being proposed in education and on how we could make schools more responsive to communities there and elsewhere. After I was given the invitation, a number of members of the State Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) came to hear me give a more academic address at the university on the politics and effects of neoliberal agendas in education. Within a few days of that university address, my invitation to speak to school leaders was cancelled. "My services were no longer required." What I had to say was "too controversial."

The context of this decision was the following. The neoliberal government of the state was intent on imposing such policies as performance pay for teachers and principals, increased support for private and religious schools, corporate models of management, anti-union policies, and similar kinds of things. The union of teachers and principals was deeply opposed to these policies, but the government was adamant in having them take effect and was not willing to bargain seriously over them. It had also made it clear that it was not at all pleased to have these issues discussed publicly.

Let us be honest. This is a very difficult time in education. Neoliberal and conservative policies have had major effects on schools, on curricula, on communities, on administrators, on teachers, and on all school staff. As I point out in a number of recent books, under the influence of those with increasing power in education and in all too much of society what is public is supposedly bad and what is private is supposedly good. Budget cuts have been pushed forward; jobs have been cut; attacks on educators at all levels and on their autonomy and their organisations gain more visibility; corporate models of competition, accountability, and measurement have been imposed; continual insecurity has become the norm. The loss of respect for the professionalism of educators is striking. These are truly international tendencies, ones found in an entire range of countries (Apple, 2006, 2010, 2013, See also Ball, 2012, Lipman, 2004, Lipman, 2011).

One of the least publicly talked about effects of all of this—although it is constantly on people's minds—is the possibility of job loss within what has been called "the managerial state" (Clarke and Newman, 1997). This is especially the case for people within the public sector, particularly in areas such as education where state departments of education not only in Australia but elsewhere as well are under severe threat of having their positions eliminated. In this situation people avoid controversy at all costs. Issues that possibly challenge dominant policies, and people well known for doing this, are to be kept out of discussions as much as possible.

I can certainly understand the very real worries that the Department staff might have had about dealing with controversial issues in a time when their own positions and funding were and still are under threat. However, preventing me from speaking to teachers and administrators about the negative effects of neoliberal policies and about alternatives to them is not only a form of censorship, but it shows disrespect to principals and teachers. Don't they have the right to publicly consider the crucial issues that affect their lives and the lives of their students and communities at a time when the policies and pressures being imposed on them are ever more powerful?

What happened over the ensuing month was important, since the government created even more problems than it thought it had solved. There was an immediate sense of outrage on the part of educators and progressive groups. The media publicized the act of censorship and published a number of interviews with me and others condemning the government's actions. The news stories about the decision to cancel my lecture, and more importantly about the issues that it raised concerning the disrespect the government consistently showed to teachers and school administrators—as well as to poor and working class communities—went viral on Facebook, Twitter, and other forms of social media. Actions and movements around the issues emerged and grew.

In response, the Australian Education Union organized an even larger audience for what was called "The Cancelled Lecture: Understanding and Challenging the Attacks on State Education." It was held at exactly the same date and time as the original lecture that had

been cancelled. The Union also broadcast the lecture to many schools within the state whose distance from Melbourne made it impossible for principals and teachers to attend. In a final act of resistance, many principals and teachers who were to have gone to the conference at which I was to originally speak left the government-sponsored conference and instead came to the Union's headquarters to hear me. We collectively engaged in a detailed discussion of the politics of education and how to resist the "reforms" that were being imposed on schools and other areas of social policy.

A number of things are clear in this example of the politics of policy at the ground level. Sometimes the decisions by powerful groups to "manage consent" by presenting only the knowledge that *they* consider to be safe can lead to contradictory results. They can and do create spaces for interruption. And in this case, the organized actions of educational unions and progressive social movements played a large part in countering these decisions. It is clear that very similar things are happening in many other nations as well.

1. Conservative Modernization and the Current Crisis

I have given a rather personal introduction to this essay to remind us that this is a time when education has become even more of a site of struggle. Certainly, this is very true in the United States, England, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Hungary, Argentina, Chile, Brazil, in many parts of Scandinavia, and in so many other nations. It is a time when we must decide how we are to engage with groups involved in dealing with all of this in critically democratic ways. Dominant groups have attempted, often more than a little successfully, to limit criticism, to control access to research that documents the negative effects of their policies, and to deny the possibility of critically democratic alternatives. They have pressed forward with an agenda that is claimed to simply guarantee efficiency, effectiveness, and cost savings. For them, only these kinds of policies can deal with the crisis in education—even when they are simply wrong.

Dominant groups are not totally wrong in grounding their "reforms" in a sense of crisis. Across the political spectrum, it is widely recognized that there is a crisis in education. Nearly everyone agrees that something must be done to make it more responsive and more effective. Of course, a key set of questions is: Responsive to what and to whom? Effective at what? And whose voices will be heard in asking and answering these questions? These are among the most crucial questions one can ask about education today.

But let us again be honest. The educational crisis is real—especially for the poor, working class, and oppressed. Dominant groups have used such "crisis talk" to shift the discussion onto their own terrain.

One of the major reasons for the continuation of dominant discourse and policies is that the very nature of our commonsense about education is constantly being altered. This is largely the result of the power of particular groups who understand that if they can

change the basic ways we think about our society and its institutions—and especially our place in these institutions—these groups can create a set of policies that will profoundly benefit them more than anyone else. Dominant groups have actively engaged in a vast social/pedagogic process, one in which what counts as a good school, good knowledge, good teaching, a good student, and good learning are being radically transformed.

Let me say more about this process. In a large number of countries, a complex alliance and power bloc has been formed that has increasing influence in education and all things social. This power bloc, what I have called *conservative modernization*, often combines four major groups (Apple, 2006). The first and the strongest one includes multiple fractions of capital who are committed to neo-liberal marketized solutions to educational problems. For them, private is necessarily good and public is necessarily bad. Democracy—a key word in how we think about our institutions and our place in them (Foner, 1998)—is reduced to consumption practices. The world becomes a vast supermarket, one in which those with economic and cultural capital are advantaged in nearly every sector of society. Choice in a market replaces more collective and more socially responsive actions. *Thin* democracy replaces *thick* democracy. This demobilizes crucial progressive social movements that have been the driving force behind nearly all of the democratic changes in this society and in our schools.

In education, this position is grounded in the belief that the more we marketize, the more we bring corporate models into education, the more we can hold schools, administrators, and teachers feet to the fire of competition, the better they will be. There actually is very little evidence to support this contention—and a good deal of evidence that it increases inequality (see Apple, 2006, Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, and Schirmer, 2018, Lipman, 2004, Lipman, 2011). But neoliberalism continues to act as something like a religion in that it seems to be impervious to empirical evidence, even as the crisis that it has created in the economy and in communities constantly documents its failures in every moment of our collective and individual lives.

The second most powerful group in this alliance is neo-conservatives who want a "return" to higher standards and a "common culture." In the face of diasporic populations who are making many nations a vast and impressive experiment in continual cultural creation, they are committed to a conservative culturally restorative project, pressing for a return to an imposed sense of nation and tradition that is based on a fear of "pollution" from the culture and the body of those whom they consider the "Others." That there is a crucial and partly hidden (at least to some people) dynamic of race at work here is not unimportant to say the least (Lipman, 2011, Gillborn 2008, Leonardo, 2009, Apple, 2006). Neoconservatives assume something that isn't there, a consensus on what should be "official" knowledge. They thereby try to eliminate one of the most significant questions that should be asked in our schools: What and whose knowledge should we teach? In their certainty over what a common culture is supposed to be, they ignore a key element

in this supposed commonness. What is common is that we disagree. Indeed, what needs to be "the common" is the constant democratic and deliberative process of asking the question of what is common (Williams, 1989, Apple, 2000).

A third key element in conservative modernization is composed of authoritarian populist religious conservatives who are deeply worried about secularity and the preservation of their own traditions. They too wish to impose a "common." For them, "the people" must decide. But there are anointed people and those who are not. Only when a particular reading of very conservative Christianity—or in some other countries, this is represented by repressive forms of Judaism, Hinduism, and Islam—is put back in its rightful place as the guiding project of all of our institutions and interactions will we be able to once again claim that this is "God's country." In the process, they inaccurately construct themselves as the "new oppressed," as people whose identities and cultures are ignored by or attacked in schools and the media. It is not an accident, for example, that one of the fastest growing educational movements in the United States right now is home schooling (Apple & Buras, 2006, Apple, 2006). Two to three million children have been taken out of public and private or even religious schools, most often for conservative ideological and religious reasons, and are being schooled at home. While the home schooling movement is varied, these decisions are often driven by conservative attacks on public schools and once again by fear of the "Other."

Finally, a crucial part of this ideological umbrella is a particular fraction of the professional and managerial new middle class who have occupied positions within the State. This group is made up of people who are committed to the ideology and techniques of accountability, measurement, and the "new managerialism," to what has been called "audit culture" (Apple, 2006, Leys, 2003, Clarke and Newman, 1997). They too are true believers, ones who believe that in installing such procedures and rules they are "helping." For them, more evidence on schools', teachers', and students' performance—usually simply based on the limited data generated by test-scores—will solve our problems, even though once again there is just as much evidence that this too can create as many problems as it supposedly solves (Apple, 2006, Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, and Schirmer, 2018, Valenzuela, 2005, Gillborn and Youdell, 2000. Demonstrating that one is "acting correctly" according to externally imposed criteria is the norm. "Perform or die" almost seems to be their religion.

While there are clear tensions and conflicts within this alliance, in general its overall aims are in providing the educational conditions believed necessary both for increasing international competitiveness, profit, and discipline and for returning us to a romanticized past of the "ideal" home, family, and school.

This new alliance has integrated education into a wider set of ideological commitments. The objectives in education are the same as those which guide its economic and social welfare goals. They include the dramatic expansion of that eloquent fiction, the free

market; the drastic reduction of government responsibility for social needs; the reinforcement of intensely competitive structures of mobility both inside and outside the school; the lowering of people's expectations for economic security; the "disciplining" of culture and the body; and the popularization of what is clearly a form of Social Darwinist thinking.

The seemingly contradictory discourse of competition, markets, and choice on the one hand and accountability, performance objectives, standards, national testing, and national curriculum on the other has created a situation in which it is hard to hear anything else. Even though these seem to embody different tendencies, as I demonstrate elsewhere they actually oddly reinforce each other and help cement conservative educational positions into our daily lives (Apple, 2006).

I have given this brief description of this new hegemonic bloc because I want to situate all of my most recent work in the context of current realities. As in the past, education is deeply connected to social movements, contradictions, conflicts, antagonisms, and complicated alliances. Understanding dominance and interrupting its various forms is a crucial part of our work—and it certainly has provided the motivation of all of my own analyses from such early books as *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979, 2019) and *Education and Power* (2012) to more recent books like *Educating the "Right" Way* (2006), *Democratic Schools* (Apple and Beane, 2007), *Can Education Change Society?* (2013), and *The Struggle for Democracy in Education*, Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, and Schirmer (2018).

Stressing the social and political in education is not new of course, either in England, the United States, Spain, Greece, Brazil, Turkey, or elsewhere. Many critical scholars have discussed this at great length internationally. However, under current situations, not only is this fact easy for some of us to forget, but while the act of criticism is important it is not sufficient. Let me say more about this issue and about what it means personally and collectively. In the process, I want to describe a set of responsibilities in which I think critically democratic scholar/activists and public intellectuals in education need to engage in a time of crisis and of the growing influences of conservative modernization.

2. Questioning the Relationship Between Education and Power

As readers of this essay may already know, over the past four decades I and others have been dealing with a number of "simple" questions. I personally have been deeply concerned about the relationship between culture and power, about the relationship among the economic, political, and cultural spheres (see Apple and Weis, 1983), about the multiple and contradictory dynamics of power and social movements that make education such a site of conflict and struggle, and about what all this means for educational work. Thus, rather than simply asking whether students have mastered a

particular subject matter and have done well on our all too common tests, we should ask a different set of questions: Whose knowledge is this? How did it become "official"? What is the relationship between this knowledge and how it is organized and taught and who has cultural, social, and economic capital in this society? Who benefits from these definitions of legitimate knowledge and who does not? What can we do as critical educators and activists to change existing educational and social inequalities and to create curricula and teaching that are more socially just? (see, for example, (Apple, 2019, 2014, 2013, 2012, 2006, 1999, 1996, Apple and Beane 2007, Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, and Schirmer, 2018). These are crucial questions. And as I showed in the distressing example of what happened in Australia, the Right has been very effective in placing strong limits on making public more critically democratic answers to these questions.

3. The Tasks of the Critical Scholar/Activist

Given what I have said about the current situation, I want now to speak to possibilities and to what we might do to interrupt dominance. For many people, including many colleagues in the critical pedagogy *traditions* (the plural is crucial here), their original impulses toward critical theoretical, political, and practical work in education have been fueled by a passion for social justice, economic equality, human rights, sustainable environments, a broad range of critical aesthetic literacies, an education that is worthy of its name—in short a better world. Yet, as I have shown this is increasingly difficult to maintain in the situation in which so many of us find ourselves. Ideologically and politically much has changed. The early years of the 21st century have brought us unfettered capitalism which fuels market tyrannies and massive inequalities on a truly global scale (Davis, 2006). "Democracy" is resurgent at the same time, but as I and others have also shown in a large number of analyses, it all too often becomes a thin veil for the interests of the globally and locally powerful and for disenfranchisement, mendacity, and national and international violence (Burawoy, 2005, p. 260, Apple 2010, Apple, Au, and Gandin, 2009). The rhetoric of freedom and equality may have intensified, but there is unassailable evidence that there is ever deepening exploitation, domination, and inequality and that earlier gains in education, economic security, civil rights, and more are either being washed away or are under severe threat. The religion of the market (and as I said earlier it does function like a religion, since it does not seem to be amenable to empirical critiques) is coupled with very different visions of what the state can and should do.

At the same time, in the social field of power called the academy—with its own hierarchies and disciplinary (and disciplining) techniques, the pursuit of academic credentials, bureaucratic regimes and national and international rankings, performance criteria, indeed the entire panoply of normalizing pressures surrounding institutions and careers—all of this seeks to ensure that we all think and act "correctly." Yet, the original impulse is never quite entirely vanquished (Burawoy, 2005). The spirit that animates critical work can never be totally subjected to rationalizing logics and processes. Try as the

powerful might, it will not be extinguished—and it certainly remains alive in a good deal of the important work done in universities and institutes here. People here and elsewhere have constantly struggled to act as the ethical and political consciences of nations.

What can we learn from our colleagues here and in other places about our role as public intellectuals, or as I call them in *Can Education Change Society?*, "critical scholar/activists," in this period of time? Perhaps this is best stated by the critical sociologist Michael Burawoy when he calls for "organic public sociology." In his words, but partly echoing Antonio Gramsci as well, in this view the critical sociologist:

> ...works in close connection with a visible, thick, active, local, and often counter-public. [She or he works] with a labor movement, neighborhood association, communities of faith, immigrant rights groups, human rights organizations. Between the public sociologist and a public is a dialogue, a process of mutual education... The project of such [organic] public sociologies is to make visible the invisible, to make the private public, to validate these organic connections as part of our sociological life. (Burawoy, 2005, p. 265)

This act of becoming (and this is a *project*, for one is *never* finished, *always* becoming) a critical scholar/activist is a complex one. Let me say more about this here. My points here are tentative and certainly not exhaustive. But they are meant to begin a dialogue over just what it is that "we" should do.

In general, there are nine tasks in which critical analysis (and the critical analyst) in education must engage (Apple, 2013, Apple, 2010). And they have guided my work for my entire career.

1. It must "bear witness to negativity."[2] That is, one of its primary functions is to illuminate the ways in which educational policy and practice are connected to the relations of exploitation and domination—and to struggles against such relations—in the larger society.[3]
2. In engaging in such critical analyses, it also must point to contradictions and to *spaces of possible action*. Thus, its aim is to critically examine current realities with a conceptual/political framework that emphasizes the spaces in which more progressive and counter-hegemonic actions can, or do, go on. This is an absolutely crucial step, since otherwise our research can simply lead to cynicism or despair. Cynicism and despair can only assist those who wish to remain in power.
3. At times, this also requires a broadening of what counts as "research." Here I mean acting as critical "secretaries" to those groups of people, communities, and social movements who are now engaged in challenging existing relations of unequal power or in what elsewhere has been called "nonreformist reforms," a term that has a long history in critical sociology and critical educational studies (Apple, 2012). This is exactly

the task that was taken on in the thick descriptions of critically democratic school practices in *Democratic Schools* (Apple and Beane, 2007) and in the critically supportive descriptions of the transformative reforms such as the Citizen School and participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil (see Gandin & Apple, 2012, Apple et al., 2003, Apple, 2013, Wright, 2010).[4] The same is true for CREA, the interdisciplinary research center at the University of Barcelona that is a model of how to build a research agenda and then create policies and programs that empower those who are economically and culturally marginalized in our societies (Flecha, 2011, Gatt, Ojaja & Soler, 2011, Alexiu & Sorde, 2011, Aubert, 2011, Christou & Puivert, 2011, Flecha, 2009) and for The Centre for Equality Studies at University College, Dublin. It too has been at the center of research and action that stresses not only poverty and inequality, but movements towards equality (Baker, Lynch, Cantillon & Walsh, 2004, Lynch, Baker & Lyons, 2009). Thus, we must document *gains* not only losses.

4. When Gramsci (1971) argued that one of the tasks of a truly counter-hegemonic education and committed cultural workers was not to throw out "elite knowledge" but to reconstruct its form and content so that it served genuinely progressive social needs, he provided a key to another role "organic" and "public" intellectuals might play. Thus, we should not be engaged in a process of what might be called "intellectual suicide." That is, there are serious intellectual (and pedagogic) skills in dealing with the histories and debates surrounding the epistemological, political, and educational issues involved in justifying what counts as important knowledge and what counts as an effective and socially just education. These are not simple and inconsequential issues and the practical and intellectual/political skills of dealing with them have been well developed. However, they can atrophy if they are not used. We can give back these skills by employing them to assist communities in thinking about this, learning from them, and engaging in the mutually pedagogic dialogues that enable decisions to be made in terms of both the short-term and long-term interests of dispossessed peoples (see Apple, Au & Gandin, 2009, Burawoy, 2005, Freire, 1970, Borg & Mayo 2007).

5. In the process, critical work has the task of keeping traditions of radical and progressive work alive. In the face of organized attacks on the "collective memories" of difference and critical social movements, attacks that make it increasingly difficult to retain academic and social legitimacy for multiple critical approaches that have proven so valuable in countering dominant narratives and relations, it is absolutely crucial that these traditions be kept alive, renewed, and when necessary criticized for their conceptual, empirical, historical, and political silences or limitations. This involves being cautious of reductionism and essentialism and asks us to pay attention to what Fraser has called both the politics of redistribution and the politics of recognition (Fraser, 1997, see also Apple, 2013 and Anyon, et al. 2009). This includes not only keeping theoretical, empirical, historical, and political traditions—and the educational

policies and practices generated out of them—alive; but, very importantly, it involves extending and (supportively) criticizing them. And it also involves keeping alive the dreams, utopian visions, and "non-reformist reforms" that are so much a part of these radical traditions (Apple, Au & Gandin, 2009, Apple, Ball & Gandin, 2010, Apple, 2012, Jacoby, 2005, Teitelbaum, 1993).

6. Keeping such traditions alive and also supportively criticizing them when they are not adequate to deal with current realities cannot be done unless we ask "For whom are we keeping them alive?" and "How and in what form are they to be made available?" All of the things I have mentioned above in this taxonomy of tasks require the relearning or development and use of varied or new skills of working at many levels with multiple groups. Thus, journalistic and media skills, academic and popular skills, and the ability to speak to very different audiences are increasingly crucial (Apple, 2006, Boler, 2008). This requires us to learn how to speak different registers and to say important things in ways that do not require that the audience or reader do all of the work. The Right has been very good at doing this. We too must relearn these skills.
7. Critical educators must also *act* in concert with the progressive social movements their work supports or in movements against the rightist assumptions and policies they critically analyze. This is another reason that scholarship in critical education implies becoming an "organic" or "public" intellectual. One must participate in and give one's expertise to movements to transform both a politics of redistribution and a politics of recognition. It also implies learning from these social movements (Anyon, 2005, Anyon 2014, Apple, Gandin, Liu, Meshulam, and Schirmer, 2018). This means that the role of the "unattached intelligentsia" (Mannheim, 1936), someone who "lives on the balcony" (Bakhtin, 1968), is not an appropriate model. As Bourdieu (2003, p. 11) reminds us, for example, our intellectual efforts are crucial, but they "cannot stand aside, neutral and indifferent, from the struggles in which the future of the world is at stake."
8. Building on the points made in the previous paragraph, the critical scholar/activist has another role to play. She or he needs to act as a deeply committed mentor, as someone who demonstrates through her or his life what it means to be *both* an excellent researcher and a committed member of a society that is scarred by persistent inequalities. She or he needs to show how one can blend these two roles together in ways that may be tense, but still embody the dual commitments to exceptional and socially committed research and participating in movements whose aim is interrupting dominance. It should be obvious that this must be fully integrated into one's teaching as well.
9. Finally, participation also means using the privilege one has as a scholar/activist. That is, each of us needs to make use of one's privilege to open the spaces at universities and elsewhere for those who are not there, for those who do not now have a voice in that space and in the "professional" sites to which, being in a privileged position, you

have access. This can be seen, for example, in the history of the "activist-in-residence" program at the University of Wisconsin Havens Center for Social Justice, where committed activists in various areas (the environment, indigenous and immigrant rights, housing, labor, racial disparities, the arts, education, and so on) were brought in to teach and to connect our academic work with organized action against dominant relations. Or it can be seen in a number of Women's Studies programs and Indigenous, Aboriginal, and First Nation Studies programs that historically have involved activists in these communities as active participants in the governance and educational programs of these areas at universities.

4. Conclusion

These nine tasks I have discussed above are demanding; and though we may try, no one person can engage equally well in all of them simultaneously. What we can do is honestly continue our attempt to deal with the complex intellectual, personal, political, and practical tensions and activities that respond to the demands of this role. And this requires a searching critical examination of one's own structural location, one's own overt and tacit political commitments, and one's own embodied actions once this recognition in all its complexities and contradictions is taken as seriously as it deserves.

Yet, if we look around the world, there are individuals, researchers, institutes, coalitions, unions, and social movements that have played and continue to play such a large part in the continuing struggle in Greece and elsewhere to build an education that is truly critically democratic in nations and "nations to be." Can we do less?

Let us be honest, however. As my introductory example on the attempts to silence me and others demonstrates, dominant groups will not stand idly by when we individually and collectively act to speak back. But as that example also shows, they cannot totally control the terrain on which such acts occur. Nor can they totally control its outcome. Spaces for counter-hegemonic work are constantly being created at the very same moment as dominant groups seek to close other spaces. Recognizing and filling these spaces is as crucial as it has ever been. Indeed, some of the very best examples of doing this can be already be found in Greece and other nations in this region.

As I demonstrate in much more detail in *Can Education Change Society?*, in so many nations of the world there is a very long tradition of radically interrogating educational institutions, of asking who benefits from their dominant forms of curricula, teaching, and evaluation, of arguing about what they might do differently, of asking searching questions of what would have to change in order for this to happen—and in providing crucial answers to how this can and does happen (Apple 2013). This tradition is what has worked through me and so many others throughout the history of critical education. Indeed, Greece has been at the center of many of these movements.

If we think of *thick* democracy as a vast river, it increasingly seems to me that our task is to keep the river flowing, to remove the blockages that impede it, and to participate in expanding the river to be more inclusive so that it flows for everyone. Building a more inclusive "we," struggles over the knowledge that is seen as legitimate, acting against the retrogressive policies that are so disrespectful to teachers and communities, and building and defending programs of socially powerful critically reflective teacher education that enable our students to critically engage in challenging dominant ideological "reforms" and in building serious alternatives to them, all of these have crucial roles to play. In doing this, we can keep alive the multiple traditions—and can create new ones—that enable us to envision and engage with movements that become significant parts of the flow of that river that dominant groups can never fully stop.

Σημειώσεις

1. A longer version of the arguments in this chapter appears in Apple (2013).
2. I am aware that the idea of "bearing witness" has religious connotations, ones that are powerful in many parts of the West, but may be seen as a form of religious imperialism in other religious traditions. I still prefer to use it because of its powerful resonances with ethical discourses. But I welcome suggestions from, say, Muslim, Jewish, and other critical educators and researchers for alternative concepts that can call forth similar responses. I want to thank Amy Stambach for this point.
3. Here, exploitation and domination are technical not rhetorical terms. The first refers to economic relations, the structures of inequality, the control of labor, and the distribution of resources in a society. The latter refers to the processes of representation and respect and to the ways in which people have identities imposed on them. These are analytic categories, of course, and are ideal types. Most oppressive conditions are partly a combination of the two. These map on to what Fraser (1997) calls the politics of redistribution and the politics of recognition.
4. Luis Armando Gandin's close connections to and analyses of the critically democratic policies and practices in education in Porto Alegre provide outstanding examples of such efforts. See also Wright (2010).

References

Alexiu, T. M. & Sorde, T. (2011) How to turn difficulties Into opportunities: Drawing from diversity to promote social cohesion, *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21: 49-62.

Anyon, J. (2014) *Radical possibilities*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Anyon, J., et al. (2009) *Theory and educational research*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1996) *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. W. (1999) *Power, meaning, and identity*. New York: Peter Lang.

Apple, M. W. (2006) *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (Ed.) (2010) *Global crises, social justice, and education*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2012) *Education and power*, revised Routledge Classic edition. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2013) *Can education change society?* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2014) *Official knowledge*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M.W. (2019) *Ideology and curriculum*, 4th ed. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. & Weis, L. (Eds.) (1983) *Ideology and practice in schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Apple, M. W., et al. (2003) *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. and Buras, K. L. (Eds.) (2006) *The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power, and educational struggles*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. & Beane, J. A. (Eds.) (2007) *Democratic schools: Lessons in powerful education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Apple, M. W., Au, W. & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.) (2009) *The Routledge international handbook of critical education*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W., Ball, S. & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.) (2010) *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W., Gandin, L. A., Liu, S., Meshulam, A. & Schirmer, E. (2018) New York: Routledge.

Aubert, A. (2011) Moving beyond social inclusion through dialogue, *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21: 63-75.

Baker, J., Lynch, K., Cantillon, S. & Walsh, S. (2004) *Equality: From theory to action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1968) *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Ball, S. (2012) *Global education, inc*. New York: Routledge.

Boler, M. (Ed.) (2008) *Digital media and democracy: Tactics in hard times*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Borg, C. & Mayo, P. (2007) *Public intellectuals: Radical democracy and social movements*. New York: Peter Lang.

Bourdieu, P. (2003) *Firing back: Against the tyranny of the market 2*. New York: New Press.

Burawoy, M. (2005) For public sociology, *British Journal of Sociology* 56, 259-294.

Christou, M. & Puigvert, L. (2011) The role of "other women" in current educational transformations, *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21: 77-90.

Clarke, J. & Newman, J. (1997) *The managerial state*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Davis, M. (2006) *Planet of slums*. New York: Verso.

Flecha, R. (2009) The educative city and critical education. In Apple, M. W., Au. W. & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education*. (pp. 327-340). New York: Routledge.

Flecha, R. (2011) The dialogic sociology of education, *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21: 7-20.

Foner, E. (1998) *The story of American freedom*. New York: Norton.

Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus*. New York: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Gandin, L. A. & Apple, M. W. (2012) Can critical democracy last: Porto Alegre and the struggle over 'thick' democracy in education. *Journal of Education Policy* 27: 621-639.

Gatt, S., Ojala, M. & Soler, M. (2011) Promoting social inclusion counting with everyone: learning communities and INCLUDE-ED, *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 21: 33-47.

Gillborn, D. (2008) *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy*. New York: Routledge.

Gillborn, D. & Youdell, D. (2000) *Rationing education*. New York: Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Jacoby, R. (2005) *Picture imperfect: Utopian thought for an anti-utopian age*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Leonardo, Z. (2009) *Race, whiteness, and education*. New York: Routledge.

Leys, C. (2003) *Market-driven politics*. New York: Verso.

Lipman, P. (2004) *High stakes education*. New York: Routledge.

Lipman, P. (2011) *The new political economy of education*. New York: Routledge.

Lynch, K., Baker, J. & Lyons, M. (2009) *Affective equality: Love, care, and injustice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mannheim, K. (1936) *Ideology and utopia*. New York: Harvest Books.

Valenzuela, A. (ed.) (2005) *Leaving children behind*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Williams, R. (1989) *Resources of hope*. New York: Verso.

Wright, E. O. (1985) *Classes*. New York: Verso.

Wright, E. O. (2010) *Envisioning real utopias*. New York: Verso.