The Evolution of multicultural Education in the United States: A Journey for human Rights & social Justice

Carl A. Grant, University Wisconsin-Madison

Language shapes our world. Perhaps this explains why the arguments at the Intercultural Conference in Verona, Italy in 2006 over whether to use the term Intercultural Education or Multicultural Education to describe education projects dealing with problems and issues of ethnicity, race, language, gender equality, and immigration were ever-present and often acidic. The debates had me wondering why we – as a community of scholars, teachers and activists – had traveled hundreds or even thousand miles to become mired in this debate when people throughout the world are in need of an education about human rights and social justice problems, as well as issues concerned with ethnicity, race, gender inequality, poverty, immigration, and refugee status.

While I appreciate and believe that debate that is grounded in reflection and critique is informative and necessary for meaningful scholarship and fundamental democracy, I also believe that as a community of scholars concerned with social justice and human rights issues IAIE will better serve and support each other and the organization's purpose if we adhere to the IAIE's broadly worded statement that advocates several education concepts to challenge diversity and equity in education:

Since 1984 the International Association for Intercultural Education has brought together professional educators interested in diversity and equity issues in education. This is defined quite broadly, and includes intercultural education, multi-cultural education, anti-racist education, human right education, conflict-resolution, multi-lingualism issues, etc.

That said, the conference debate over language motivated me to write this essay to maker clearer – by telling the history - the evolution of the system of education in the United States that was developed to deal with issues of social justice and human rights. Currently, many in the United States refer to this education as multicultural education. However, as I will explain, during some periods in its history, this system of education has had other names, including intercultural education.

The chapter is organized into two major sections: First, I will discuss the evolution of multicultural education in the United States. Second, I will define, clarify, and discuss the conceptual meaning of multicultural education in the United States.

The Evolution of multicultural Education in the United States

One effective way to examine the historical development and evolution of multicultural education is to view it as a chain of linked actions (e.g., movements, court decisions, legislation, publications, constitutional mandates, code of conduct) that embrace principles of social justice to support the elimination of poverty, racism, classism, religious bigotry, and sexism in the United States.

Multicultural education may be viewed as an instrument to help people in the United States learn about and take action against social justice and human right inequities such as class discrimination; gender categorization and subordination; racism in the areas of criminal justice, the administration of social service, education, and public housing; restrictions on freedom of movement and the right to live in a particular area of one's own country; and world-wide discriminatory treatment of refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants. This non-static, non-neutral, critical, transformative, reconstructive, and evolving chain of linked actions has mooring and contextualizing attributes that extend from the time the territories that would one day become part of the United States were under colonial rule until the present day.

The chain of linked actions though which multicultural education has evolved has a rich history and several biographers (e.g., Banks, 1995, 2004; Gay, 2004; Grant and Ladson-Billings, 1997). These histories – which have been informative in writing this chapter – are similar in reporting the movements, events, and issues that gave rise to multicultural education – including the major actors, journals and publishers willing to publish articles and books about multicultural education, and education associations and organizations that were early advocates for multicultural education. Gay's (2004) observation makes this point well:

All individual and groups [involved in the multicultural movement] are seeking basically the same goals: a more equitable and effective educational system for ethnically and culturally diverse students, and a more democratic society in which there is much greater equality, freedom, and justice in all spheres of life (Gay, p. 39).

The Early Links in the Chain

No single moment of birth can be assigned to multicultural education. The links of the chain (the historical events) are scattered across the United States (and throughout the world), as were those who sought the democratic society that Gay espouses. For instance, it can be argued that multicultural education was born when enslaved African Americans people began to educate themselves about their history in Africa and the United States and how their role and participation in these histories, as well as their racial identity dictated their treatment in U. S. Society (Banks, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Multicultural education also began when members of Native American tribes begin to educate themselves on how to resist, survive, and get along with White European colonizers and other cultural groups, including other Native American tribes. It also begin when Asian Americans, particularly Chinese, communicated with their families in their homelands about life in the United States, and learned to resist, survive, and get along with White Americans, and other people of color. Similarly, multicultural education began for Mexicans in the Southwest (e.g., Arizona, New Mexico, Texas) when they engaged in various interactions (e.g., work, open border) with Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and White Americans. In many respects multicultural education began to evolve in the United States during the

early years of the country when the people who lived here began interacting with people outside of their immediate cultural group.

Besides these informal interactions and actions, Banks (1995) identifies 24 publications (from 1882 to the 1954 United States Supreme Court case, Brown v Board of Education) that promoted the growth of multicultural education. These publications dealing with many serious social justice and human right inequities include George Washington William's (1892) History of the Negro Race in America; W. E. B. Dubois's (1899) The Philadelphia Negro; Manuel Gamio's (1930) Mexican Immigration to the United States; Gunnar Myrdal's (1944) An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy; and Gordon Allport's (1954) The Nature of Prejudice. These publications were a significant influence on making clear the need for ethnic studies and multicultural education.

To Banks' 24 publications, I would cite several others. First, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) which may be described as "part of a wider reordering of the normative order of postwar international relations, designed to create fire walls against barbarism" (Ignatieff, 2001, p. 5). In addition, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights changed the international human rights paradigm from one where only states had rights under international law to one where the rights of individuals were also asserted. Second, a collection of newspaper articles published during World War II in the Pittsburgh Courier. The articles – including editorials, photographs, letters, and drawings – were published weekly from 1942 to 1943 and used a "Double V" to symbolize the need for two victories. One, was a victory at home in the United States that would give African Americans who were risking their lives abroad and contributing to the war effort at home full citizenship rights. The second victory was the one to free the European countries for democracy.

Four Major Links in the Chain: Intercultural Movement, Intergroup Movement, Civil Rights Movement, and Ethnic Study Movement

Four movements were essential to the evolution or multicultural education in the United States: Intercultural Movement, Intergroup Movement, Civil Rights Movement, and Ethnic Studies Movement. The goal of each of these movements was to take action for social justice and human rights.

Intercultural Education Movement

The Intercultural Education Movement and Intergroup Education Movement were early contributors to the development of multicultural education. These movements provided knowledge about issues of ethnicity, immigration, assimilation, social mobility, and prejudice. Many of the ideas learned from the Intercultural and Intergroup movements, such as tolerance and respect for diversity are included in current approaches to multicultural education such as human relations (Sleeter and Grant, 2007). It is also from these movements that advocates for multicultural education learned that the struggle for the acceptance of diversity would faces major challenges both from within and outside of ethnic and racial groups, and that struggle for equity and equality would require hard work and perseverance.

C. Banks (2004) reports that the Intercultural Movement was started in the 1930s and continued into the 1950s. One goal of the Intercultural movement was to make the American Creed and the values ascribed within – such as freedom, justice, and equality – meaningful and real for immigrants while teaching them the importance of giving complete allegiance to their new homeland. Another goal of the movement was to reduce the fears

and misconceptions that Americans of Northern European heritage harbored about members of other white ethnic groups who had begun arriving from Southern European countries.

These goals, were not advocated by accident, but served as a response to the hotly contested questions that were before the people living in the United States in the 1920s: "Who is an American?" and "Who should make up American Society?" The National Origins Quota Act of 1924 was one response to these questions. The Act cut back on immigration except for those people who came from northern and western European nations. These were the ethnic groups that were already the majority in the United States, and that many of their members wanted to maintain the status quo. The Act permitted a yearly quota of over 127,000 immigrants from western and northern Europe entrance into the United States. However, it restricted immigrants from eastern and southern Europe to less than 24,000. The result from the successive waves of immigrant from 1920-1940 changed the social structure of the United States and influenced the policy, practice and more general ways of thinking that we have today.

During the Intercultural Movement, schools, settlement houses, and newspapers published in the immigrants' native language were agents of society that welcomed new arrivals and sought to ease their immigration and facilitate their Americanization. In addition, these agents put in place curriculum and activities in the school and community to celebrate the immigrants' culture and contribution to society in general and the United States in particular.

Intergroup Education Movement

The Intergroup Education Movement got under way in the1940s. The movement came about at the end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War. World War II brought a reorganization of American industry because wartime needs caused a significant migration of workers – many of whom were black – from rural areas to cities. As a result, major changes in people's way of life and the composition of their neighborhoods took place – and these changes contributed to growing racial tensions.

The Intergroup Movement, much more so than Intercultural Movement, directed attention to race and the problem and issues facing various groups of people of color. In addition, with these two movements came an acceleration of debates over social science theories such as assimilation, amalgamation, contact, social, and cultural identity that would influence social and education majority-minority policy and further exacerbated the black-white binary in the United States.

In 1944, serious race riots took place in Detroit. This, Klarin (1989) argues, was the drop that made the cup run over, and more than 400 public organizations were founded in response to these events. One response was research. Research studies were conducted to understand the causes of intergroup tension. Colleges and universities were the sites where research was conducted to provide the scholarships, tools and personnel to reduce prejudice through the study of anthropology, sociology, and psychology (La Belle & Ward, 1996; Taba, et al 1958). Harvard, the University of Chicago, and New York University, for example, established research programs to examine the nature of prejudice. The research provided the knowledge, skills, disposition, and material resources needed to attack prejudice (La Belle & Ward, 1996; Taba, et al 1958). Books such as Gordon W. Allport's The Nature of Prejudice (1954) which greatly influenced social and education theory were published during the Intergroup Movement. Recently, Pettigrew (2004) reflecting on

Allport's The Nature of Prejudice stated: "His formation has guided research on the phenomenon [intergroup contact] for the past half-century" (p. 711). Also Pettigrew claims, "Both multicultural education and intergroup contact advance methods designed to reduce intergroup prejudice, ignorance, and conflict" (p. 770).

In addition, the study of socio-psychological causes of intergroup tensions led to the development of school curriculum for intergroup tolerance education for students. The curriculum focused on four issues related to social life that are significant to the formation of stereotypes and prejudices:

1. differences in the style of family life;
2. differences in the life-styles of the communities;
3. ignorance of American culture; and
4. development of peaceful relations between individuals (Taba et al, 1952).

To go along with this research to foster better knowledge, understanding and attitudes in these life spheres, programs were developed to teach students how to handle conflicts without resorting to violence. Such programs are significant to some approaches to multicultural education.

Another reason for the development of the Intergroup Movement was that after World II returning African American soldiers who had fought to bring freedom and justice to Europeans countries demanded their civil and human rights. Their efforts were a continuation of previous efforts such as discussions begin during the1930s about the mis-education of African American students and the racist ideology used by European Americans in societal institutions – e.g., schools and the media – to shape the values and beliefs of society.

In addition, advocates for the Intergroup Movement, contended the United States was not doing well in the Cold War with the Soviet Union because the USSR argued that the U.S was not living up its democratic ideas and advocacy for human rights. Tushnet explains:

> [T]he ideological rationale for the war against Nazi Germany and the ongoing ideological competition with the Soviet Union made segregation increasingly anomalous. As Marshall put it in a 1954 speech, the desegregation issue had "assumed its most urgent significance' in the world-wide struggle to stop Communist totalitarianism." Whenever the State Department accused Communist regimes of violations of human rights, Marshall said, they responded with great ease, "You tell us about force labor in Russia-what about the lynching of Negroes in Alabama? You tell us about undemocratic elections in Bulgaria-what about the poll tax in Mississippi?" Marshall concluded, "The continued existence of racial discrimination here at home seriously negates and jeopardizes the entire meaning of American foreign policy throughout the world' (p. 188).

Proponents of the Intergroup Movement recommended prejudice reduction programs to combat racial tensions and inform groups about one another. These programs were design to eliminate conflict between groups by reducing stereotypes and prescribing tolerance. Proponents such as Kurt Lewin, Margaret Mead, Frank Boas, Ralph Ellison, and Kenneth Clark advocated intergroup relations and education, in lieu of ethnic groups promoting their own cause. Scott (2004) explains:

> America looked less like a confederation of nations and more like a single nation celebrating its diversity and minimizing cultural differences. In contrast to the interwar years, when ethnic, racial, and religious advocacy groups tended to promote their own causes, in the postwar era it was common for them to join ranks with others advocating equal rights, tolerance, and individual acceptance. Christians and Jews revised the

national narrative by constructing the idea that America had a Judeo-Christian tradition. As European immigrants exchanged their ethnic identities for racial membership, American identity was reconceptualized (p.72).

Still, despite resistance provided by the Intergroup Movement, curriculum and instruction in the United States demonized and exoticized children of color, or at best ignored and/or offered an assimilation position to deal with the migration of African Americans to the North and Mexican Americans to the Southwest to find a better way of life.

Growing out of the Intergroup Movement and the frustration with the debate over assimilation came the concept of cultural pluralism. Cultural pluralism advocated allowing the immigrant to maintain significant aspects their ancestral culture and was put forth by several scholars led by Horace Kallen (C. Banks, 2004; Kallen, 1915). Kallen argued that cultural and ethnic diversity and pride in one's country are compatible with each other; and that cultural and ethnic diversity and a respect for ethnic and racial differences strengthened and enriched American society. However, Kallen was mainly advocating for Northern and Southern European immigrants, not African American, Mexican American, and Native Americans who had different histories and relationships with the United States.

In summary, The Intergroup and Intercultural Movements provide historical insights into the struggles ethnics groups have faced in the United States. Through active efforts toward community cohesion, opportunities to participate in politics (e.g., voting) to help their causes, ability to attend to religious institutions of their own choice without fear and the service and caring ethic of settlement houses ethnic groups were educated about the history and culture of the United States as well as taught he significance and contribution of their history and culture to the making of America.

From the Intercultural Education Movements and the Intergroup Education Movement, including the advocacy for cultural pluralism in the United States, proponents of multicultural education learned that prejudices and hostility even among White ethnics is difficult to eliminate. The prejudices that some Northern Europeans held against Southern Europeans were not given up on the voyage to America, but were brought along, and renewed (Schaefer, 2000). Immigrants who had earned their American citizenship in previous years were not in favor of immigration into the country, especially for those who were not members of their ethnic group. In addition, new arrivals from different countries and migrants from different regions within the United States were fierce competitors for jobs as well as bitter political and social rivals. Kenneth D. Durr (2003) reports on this competition in Behind the Backlash: White Working Politics in Baltimore 1940-1980:

This political transition [in Baltimore] was driven by three broader shifts. First, working-class Baltimore's "new immigrants" of Eastern and Southern European heritage gained political influence that began to rival that exerted by German and Irish ethnics and native-stock whites. Second, Baltimore's black working people, long restricted to unskilled, low-paid work, began to get better jobs—with and without government help. Finally, although many of the southern migrants who worked in Baltimore's war plants returned home as quickly as possible, many more did not. Instead, southern whites stayed to become members of Baltimore's postwar white working class (p. 66).

Multicultural education continued its evolution at a stepped-up pace, as the Intercultural and Intergroup movements waned and as different groups (African Americans, Asian Americans, Latino, Native Americans, and European Americans) began to share the same urban space, thus becoming increasingly concerned at both the personal and institutional level about how race, class, and gender, and language controlled their presence in society.

Civil Rights Movement

The Civil Rights Movement of 1955-1965 consisted of the actions taken by several marginalized groups to gain equality and equity. As such, it plays a major role in the chain of linked actions that are part of the evolution of multicultural education.

The struggle was about more than just civil rights under law; it was also about fundamental issues of freedom, respect, dignity, and economic and social equality. Black Americans initiated the movement because many, especial those who lived in the South, faced severe forms of oppression, including racial segregation and second class citizenship, which was legally sanctioned by Jim Crow laws. The civil rights movement challenged segregation, "the system of laws and web of social customs separating Blacks and Whites that Whites used to control Blacks after slavery was abolished in the 1860s." A pivotal moment in the Civil Right movement occurred in 1955, when Rosa Parks, an African American woman, refused to give up her seat to a White man and move to the back of the bus in Montgomery Alabama.

The achievements of the Civil Rights Movement were significant and include court decisions and legislation that sought to eliminate structural inequality in the United States: the legal victory in the Supreme Court case Brown v. Board of Education (1954) overturned the legal doctrine of "separate but equal" and made segregation illegal; the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned discrimination in employment practices and public accommodations; the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 restored voting rights to any eligible citizen, and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 that banned discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

The significance of the Civil Right Movement was huge, in that every U. S. citizen, north, south, east and west was to be legally judged without reference to skin color. However the Civil Rights Movement did not bring about equality in the social system. Nuanced discrimination in society, for example in the work place and places of leisure, continues to hinder civil liberties and opportunities every day. It is because of the resistance to civil liberties, for example, that multicultural education evolved as an educational instrument.

Finally, whereas multicultural education primarily evolved out of the Civil Rights Movement initiated by African Americans; struggles by other exploited groups to gain equality and equity, were also Civil Right Movements and played a major role in the evolvement of multicultural education. Groups – including women; people with disabilities; the poor; and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals – were inspired by the actions of African Americans and their supporters and increased their efforts to make society equitable for members of their group. As such, these civil rights movements are part of the chain of linked actions of the evolution of multicultural education.

Ethnic Studies Movement

The Ethnic Studies Movement that grew out of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s is a part of the chain of linked actions that contributed to the evolvement of multicultural education. During this movement, African Americans and members of many other groups of color demanded equity and equality in the policies and practices of housing and schooling. In some large urban areas such as Detroit and Milwaukee parents, community members, and teachers demanded that de facto racist education policy and practice such as segregation be eliminate, but in many instance de facto practices were use to keep desegregation in place. A biography of Lloyd Barbee, a Milwaukee lawyer for the

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), reports how school de facto segregation practices work:

> Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) had operated a neighborhood school system. As the Inner Core grew, the effect of this policy was to create a sharply segregated system. Barbee and the NAACP demanded that changes be made, in particular the use of busing to achieve integration. MPS refused to modify the neighborhood school policy, and the NAACP then organized a boycott of Inner Core schools and operated "freedom schools" in their place. MPS responded by creating an "open transfer" [de facto] policy, which made it easier for students to transfer to schools outside their own neighborhoods. Unfortunately, the open transfer policy "proved to be an open invitation to white students to flee from black schools," and segregation grew worse

Ethnic studies advocates argued that education policy and practices that are more inclusive were needed. For instance, they sought the replacement of the primacy of whiteness in textbook content and illustrations and an increased accuracy in reporting the history and culture of African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Latinos. Hillel Black's (1967) The American Schoolbook reports the following:

> The Newark Textbook Council, which selects books for New Jersey's largest public school system, rejected the series even though it thought the books were the best grade-school science text on the market. In a brief letter the Council accused the publisher of using "stereotyped middle class' illustration. The Newark Council also charged that the publisher had failed to include any pictures or test "relating to minority groups." What the Council really meant was that not one illustration in the entire series showed a Negro, child, teacher, or scientist (p.30).

The demands were often resisted, and some publishers printed two sets of the same book: One set for their southern schools and the second set for their northern schools. The resistance, however, also served to rally support (time, resources) for ethnic studies.

At numerous high schools and colleges, ethnic studies courses became apart of the curriculum; at a number of universities, ethnic studies departments and programs were established (Yang, 2000) The institutionalization of these departments and programs influenced the ethnic studies discourse on campuses at the structural and personal level. They challenged white-dominated social and education theory and programs by having an assigned physical space as well as scholars to articulate the purpose and goal of ethnic studies, and students interested in perusing ethnic study knowledge. Evelyn Hu-DeHart (2004) comments are useful and I quote her at length:

> Beginning in 1968 at San Francisco State and University of California campuses such as Berkley and Santa Barbara-then spreading to many campuses across the nation during the course of the next quarter century to the present day-students of color have been demanding greater access to higher education, recruitment of more faculty of color, and the creation of programs that have come to be collectively known as ethnic studies and separately by a variety of names: Black studies (Also Afro Americans Studies, African American Studies, African Studies); Chicana/o, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican Studies (also Latina/o Studies); American Indian (or Native American) Studies; and Asian American Studies. These programs formed the beginning of multicultural curricular reform in higher education.
> For 25 years, despite fits and starts, peaks and valleys, ethnic studies programs and department have survived and proliferated hundreds-fold from their origins in California to all parts of the nation....They have produced a prodigious amount of new

scholarship....[and] The new perspectives are intended not only to increase our knowledge base but in time to transform all scholarship. Their deep and widespread influence is definitely being felt and debated (pp 869-870).

It was during these periods of actions for education equality and equity in all spheres of the high school and university that the multicultural education movement began to emerge. In the 1970s, multicultural education grew out of a chain of linked actions, energized by scholarship and participation of people of color, women, and people with disabilities, and gays and lesbians. It also became a pathfinder for the development and evolution of multiculturalism across and within many (if not most) areas of academic study (e.g., counseling, social work). From that time until the present day, multicultural education has developed and become an idea advocated by an increasing number of researchers and scholars in universities, as well teachers in P-12 schools. It has also become an area of interest (e.g., challenge, intimation, curiosity) for people outside of the academic community.

What is multicultural? Clarifying the conceptual Confusion and Termology

What it is (and can be):

Multicultural Education refers to the ways in which all dimensions and aspects of schooling address the needs and talents of culturally diverse populations to ensure equity and social justice for all. It is both a philosophy and a process. As a philosophical concept, it is rooted in the principles of democracy, social justice, equity, and the affirmation of human diversity. As a process, multicultural education is fluid and continually undergoes modification to meet the needs and demands of an ever-changing society. To this end, it becomes a concerted strategy, and educational project or instrument that employs multiple knowledge(s) of people histories, and demonstrates an awareness of contexts (e.g., social, historical) in an effort to challenge current state policies that discriminate against, or simply ignore people based on their socio-economic status, race, gender, dis/ability, religion and sexual orientation.

As part of its process, multicultural education is a critique of the mono-cultural content and ethos of the current and prevailing Eurocentric system of education in the United States. According to Parekh (2000), Eurocentrism asserts the following two theses, which multicultural education critiques. First modern, that is post-seventeenth century, European civilization represents the highest form of life reached by humankind so far and provides the standards by which to judge all others. Second, it attained its glory unaided by, and owes little if anything to, non-European civilizations. Its formative influences are taken to be three. Its intellectual and political foundations were laid by classical Athens and Rome, both presumed to be European. Its moral and religious foundations were laid by Christianity which, although non-European in origin, was radically reshaped in light of the Greco-Roman heritage and became a progress force only after it had undergone much cultural filtering at European hands. Its third major source was the rise of individualism, secularism, science, technology and so on, all assumed to be unique achievements of modern Europe and based on its pre-modern heritage. The aims of education are to cultivate those capacities, attitudes, values and sentiments that created, currently underpin and are cherished by European civilization, including the capacities for critical and independent

thought, individualism, the scientific and secular spirit, and pride in European civilization and underplays or ignores the achievements and contribution of others (Parekh 2000).

From a multicultural perspective, no one way of viewing the world, no one cultural standard, political doctrine or ideology can represent the full truth and value of human life, therefore multicultural education is essential to school and society. Thus, advocates and proponents of multicultural education such as Atwater & Riley ((1993); Baker (1977, 1983) Banks (1969, 1993,1995, 2004); Bennett, (1995); Cortes, (2004);(Gay, (1978,1979,1995, 1997; Gollnick & Chinn ,1994:; Grant1994; Grant & Sleeter, 1987,1996, 2007 Grant & Gillette , 2006); Harris, (1996); Hunter, (1974); King 1991;Kumashiro (2000);Ladson-Billings (1995); Leistyna (2001); McAllister& Irvine, 2002; Moll & Gonzalez; 1994;Nieto, 1992; Oakes (1996, 2000); Ooka Pang. & Park (1992); Payne, (1983); Rueda, Rodriquez & Prieto, 1981; and Sleeter (1986, 2000) describe the boundaries of multicultural education as inclusive of all policy, practices, and structures of U. S. schools (e.g., curriculum, financing, teacher recruit and hiring, pedagogy and student and grade level organization).

Multicultural education advocates a long comprehensive, non-patriarchal view of the history and contributions of marginalized groups to the traditional curriculum. It challenges and calls into question previous omissions and distortions. It offers a set of related propositions that are used to explain how a phenomenon was arrived historically; for example, concepts of cultural deficit and at-risk are used to define and place students of color and low income students within a paradigm of stratification. Proponents of multicultural education continually challenge the racism and sexism in arguments that contends that achievements have come about because of, for example, "manifest destiny." In addition, proponents of multicultural education seek to "reveal the kinds of structures and process characterized in the events that are studied, as well as what the consequences of the events are likely to be." Finally, proponents of multicultural education seek to illuminate the ways of thinking that influence institutional and personal decision making and make clear the possible consequences that may arise from following them.

Groups under the Multicultural Umbrella

Although, the coming together of the different groups (e.g., race, ethnicity, low socio-economic status, disability, gay and lesbian, religious) and the varied constituencies and interests they represent sometimes create theoretical confusion and ambiguity regarding the meaning of multicultural education, it [the coming together] also brings flexibility, as well as depth and breath to ideas regarding equity and equality; and fosters coalescence around actions for social justice. I can recall writing in 1975: "I think it would be wrong to posit a rigid and inclusive definition of multi-cultural education. I would prefer to describe multicultural education as a concept, because a concept embodies process – movement – and as such its contours are flexible" (p.2).

Although the definition of multicultural was still inchoate during these early years, those who adopted multicultural education as a topic of scholarly investigation and work and/or who used it as a theoretical lens for guiding their scholarship were united in their demand that school policies and practices should be examined from a multicultural perspective and that school policies and practices should prepare students to work actively toward social structural equality, and the promotion of cultural pluralism. For example, James Banks (1979), who analyzed schooling through an ethnic studies and multicultural education lens argues, "Ethnic studies instruction should help students develop the ability to make reflective decisions on issues related to ethnicity and to take personal and public action to help solve the racial and ethnic problems in our society" (p.20).

Concepts and practices for multicultural education in the United States have been significantly aided by educational associations and organizations, which at one time were visibly out front with their support; and through their action influenced their members to take multiculturalism into account in their scholarship and practice. The National Council for Social Studies (1973) published Teaching Ethnic Studies as the 43rd yearbook (edited by James Banks). The Association of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ASCD) established the Multicultural Education Commission that produced a statement on multicultural education which challenged the organization to change it policies and practices to include more diversity at the annual conferences (session and keynote speakers), and in its publications. It also published Multicultural Education: Commitment, Issues and Applications (edited by Carl A. Grant). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's (AACTE) Commission on Multicultural Education (1973) significantly influenced the evolution of multicultural education when it produced one of the most quoted statements during the mid-1970's to early 1980's on multicultural education: "No One Model American." This eight paragraph statement was quoted in part or paraphrased in numerous books and articles and includes the following:

> Multicultural education is education which values cultural pluralism. Multicultural education rejects the view that school should seek to melt away cultural differences or to view that school should seek to melt away cultural differences or the view that school should merely tolerate cultural pluralism... Multicultural education recognizes cultural diversity as a fact of like in American society, and it affirms that this cultural diversity is a valuable resource that should be preserved and extended. It affirms that major education institutions should strive to preserve and enhance cultural pluralism. To endorse cultural pluralism is to endorse the principle that there is no one model American [my emphasis].

The statement was not particularly unique because it, like other writings in the field, endorsed cultural pluralism. However, its title "No one model American..." became a sound bite or slogan that scholars and students could easily understand and repeat in arguments for and on behalf of multicultural education.

Currently, the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) is providing the organizational leadership though its annual conference, which is attended by more than 1500 scholars; two refereed journals (Multicultural Perspective, Praxis); and the publication of eight years of conference papers (1990-1999). In addition, NAME national office provides internship opportunities for young scholars and it serves as a resource for those seeking information about multicultural education.

Who is Who and What is What under the Multicultural Umbrella?

During the early period of the multicultural education movement, most scholars advocating multicultural education were united in their belief that it should promote structural equality and serve as an instrument to examine inequality. There was debate about the inclusion of ascribed characteristics and experiences other than race in the conceptual defining of multicultural education. Some scholars, for example, believed that race alone should be the focus of multicultural education; others contended that the focus should be broadened to include other groups that were and are similarly oppressed: the poor, women, and people with disability were the groups given consideration for inclusion at the time.

To add to confusion over the definition, some multicultural scholars used different terms to discuss concepts and issue of diversity; and while a lack of a clear definition caused confusion both at the theoretical and teaching level, it nevertheless created space for a

critical mass of multicultural scholars to develop and establish themselves as scholars on college campuses that heretofore often excluded scholars of color. Banks (1973) and Garcia (1979), for example wrote about ethnic studies or multiethnic education; H. P. Baptist, Jr., and M. L. Baptist (1979), Rollick and Chin (1983), Grant (1977), and R. Suzuki (1980) used the term multicultural education in their writings and Grant (1978) and Grant & Sleeter (, 1985, 1986); and Sleeter and Grant (1987) begin to used the term education that is multicultural and social Reconstructionist.

During the early of days of multicultural education, resistance was strong. It was difficult to get articles on multicultural education published because of the bias against arguments that spoke of equity and equality and/or movement away from an assimilationist ideology. When articles about multicultural education were submitted for peer review, journal editors would become very restrictive about the arguments made on behalf of multicultural education and very controlling about the terminology they would accept in the article. For example, editors sometimes demanded the use of phrase ethnic studies or the word diversity instead of multicultural education or some other term the author may have considered appropriate for the essay. Because of such actions by journal editors, some scholars of multicultural education felt compelled to lessen or modify the complete meaning and full exposition of their ideas in order not to be denied the opportunity to have articles published about multicultural education in the journal.

Multicultural scholars in the1970s and early 1980s believed it was important to get the "word out" and meet the "published or perish" requirements for tenure than to put their careers and multicultural education in jeopardy. To be sure, they had concern about this position and recognized that they were participating in the perpetuation of conceptual ambiguity about multicultural education. Nevertheless, these scholars kept the multicultural education discourse alive in the academic discourse.

Despite the disagreement among these early scholars of multicultural education with respect to which oppressed groups to include and which terms to use, they were united in espousing a common objective for multicultural education and pointing out where and how it should influence education policy and practice. They believed it should have at its core a curriculum and methods of instruction that would enable students to: (1) learn the history and contributions to society of the diverse groups who comprise the population of the United States; (2) respect the culture and language of diverse groups; (3) develop knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of one's multiple group characteristics and how these characteristics can privilege or marginalize the individual and others; and (4) learn how to bring about social and structural equality and take action toward that end.

Unfortunately, in the mid-1980s, this trend was interrupted. As advocates were beginning to develop consensus about the conceptual framework, multicultural education began a rapid rise in popularity. The rise was, in part, because some educators (not proponents) believed that a sterile version of multicultural education would serve as a way to placate the demands of an increasingly racially, linguistically, and ethnically diverse student population with very little cost to the social, political and economic structure of the majority population. And while this superficial version of multicultural education did not change or at best changed only slightly the status quo in society and schools, it nevertheless did threaten some people. On several university campuses and in the media, scholars and public official began to portray multicultural education as an unwanted intruder and challenge to the Western civilization canon and social theory (See for example Hughes, 1993)

With the increased attention toward multicultural education, educators and others began to ask: What is it? What does it mean? Is there a definition of multicultural education? The

frequency of such queries, along with the conceptual ambiguity surrounding multicultural education in the academic and popular media, strongly implied that a definition was needed. Thus, the confusion in the field and society over the meaning of multicultural and the demand from scholars in the field to provide conceptual clarity has produced a strong rationale to comply and discuss multicultural education's contribution to social and education theory and practice. This confusion led to the creation of several typologies of multicultural education (Gibson, Grant & Sleeter, Nieto, Banks, McCarty). These typologies allow teachers and scholars to locate themselves within a continuum of praxis, while demonstrating the ideals of transformation and social reconstruction.

Multicultural scholars contend that pedagogical paradigms that encourage the inclusion of bits and piece of knowledge are not satisfactory. Instead, they argue for a pedagogical paradigm such as the one Mehan et al (1995) articulate: "a new narrative of U. S. history, one that focuses on the historical moments in which different groups interacted over, even fought over, issues of justice, equality, and civil and political rights" (p 141). To this Gordon (1995) adds:

> "[E]ducation literature in both the academy and popular culture is grounded in the Euro-American "regime of truth" (Foucault). Multicultural education has disrupted that ethnocentric patriarchy paradigm including bringing the history and contribution of marginalized groups to light in society" (p. 184). Gordon goes on to argue, "Challenging the omissions and distortions of this hegemonic regime of truth is thus not merely a matter of infusing more information into a faulty premise, but of reconstituting the conceptual systems that govern models of humanness and modes of being" (p. 184).

Conclusion: so what are the Results of the Evolution of multicultural Education in the United States

Multicultural education has evolved to contributes to the knowledge and understanding about the complexities, dimensions, and influences of race/racism, low socio-economic status, sexism, disability and other areas where marginalizes groups are narrowly defined, misunderstood, and ignored. Multicultural scholarship has evolved to illuminate the complexities, commonalities, and differences of groups and individuals within groups, including offering theories about how the intersection of race, class, gender and other characteristics influences how people are perceived by themselves and others (e.g., Grant & Sleeter, 1986; hooks, 1992; Young & Pang, 1995; Lee, 1997) and how these characteristics influences access and degree of participation within institutional and organization structures (e.g., Barnett, 1991; Grant and Sleeter, 1988; Lee, 1997; Nieto, 1994).

Multicultural education has evolved to a point where its scholars work with scholars from other disciplines to contribute to its growth and development. For example, multicultural scholars and feminist scholars have come together to illustrate how an individual's multiple characteristics (e.g., race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and religion) construct and influence identity, and how identity politics and power intersect to influence the life chances and opportunities of people based on their ascribed characteristics. I can recall when Christine Sleeter and I reported the following discovery in an article in the Review of Educational Research in 1986, which was based on a review of the education literature over ten years in four prominent journals published in the United States (American Educational Research Journal, Harvard Educational Review, Review of Educational Research and Teacher College Record):

> Race, social class and gender tend to be treated as separate in education literature… A failure to consider the integration of race, social class, and gender leads at times to an oversimplification or inaccurate understanding of what occurs in schools, and therefore to inappropriate or simplistic prescriptions for educational equity" (p.197).

A later writing by Sleeter (1992) illustrated the point:

> It is quite possible for an individual to profess one theoretical perspective regarding one axes of inequality. For example, bell hooks (1990) criticizes avant-garde Whites who take a radical position on gender and/or social class, but accept implicitly more conservative beliefs about race; or African American men who view racism from a radical perspective but regard women, including African American women, as their inferiors. In analyzing a person's beliefs about the social structure and inequality, it is important not to assume consistency (pp.13-14)

Multicultural education has evolved to create spaces where race and sexuality – two ideas often difficult to have a meaningful discussion about in public spaces including schools and universities – can be discussed. Similarly multicultural education has led to multifaceted discussions of social class; and it has striven to effect changes so that religion is no longer reduced and contextualized within a narrow discussion of the church and state, or Islam and terrorism.

The evolution of multicultural education has made and continues to make intellectual space where problems and issues of social justice and human rights and cultural and historical identity can be freely discussed; where prevailing theories can be critiqued; and where culture, including religion and all that contributes to its make-up can be discussed and analyzed in connection to the wider political and economic structures of society. In addition, in the spaces that multicultural education has created cultural liberalism may be interrogated, not only to ask questions about why culture is important, but to learn about the function it performs, and why one should have access to one's culture – including enabling students to learn about the ways they are shaped by and related to their culture (Parekh, 2000). Finally, the evolution of multicultural education proves a space and climate in where different cultures can engage in mutually beneficial dialogue; where different artistic, literary, musical, moral, religious and other traditions interrogate, challenge and probe each other, borrow and experiment with each other's ideas, and often come up with wholly new ideas and sensibilities that none would have or perhaps could have generated on their own.

References

Adams, J. (1910). Twenty years at the hull-house. New York: Macmillan.

American Association of University Women (1995). How schools short change girls. New York: Marlow.

Asante, M. K. (1991). The Afrocentric idea in education. Journal of Negro Education, 60,267-276.

Atwater, M., & Riley, J. P. (1993). Multicultural science education: Perspectives, definitions, and research agenda. Science Education, 77(6), 661-668.

Baker. G. C. (1983). Motivating status and schooling plural societies. Comparative Education Review, 27(2), 168-190.

Baker, G. (1977). Multicultural imperatives for curriculum development in teacher education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 11(1), 70-83.

Banks, C. (2004). Intercultural and Intergroup education, 1229-1959: Linking schools and communities. In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (2nd Edition) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 753-769.

Banks, C. (2004). Improving multicultural education: Lessons from the Intergroup Education Movement. New York: Teacher College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In the Handbook of research on multicultural education, New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. Educational Researcher, 22(8), 4-14.

Banks, 1984

Banks, J. A. (1969). A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. Social Education, 954-958.

Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. Review of Educational Research, 71(2), 171-217.

Black, H. (1967). The American Schoolbook. New York: William Morrow.

Bennett, C.I.(1995).Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chinn, P. (1979). Curriculum development for culturally different exceptional children. Teacher Education and Special Education, 2(4), 49-58.

Chong, D. (1991) Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, K & Clark, M (1940). Skin color as a factor in racial identification and preference in Negro children. Journal of Negro Education, 19, 341-358.

Cortes, C. E. (2004). Knowledge construction and popular culture: The media as multicultural Educator. In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (2nd Edition) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 211-227.

Cross, W. E. J. (1985) Black identity: Rediscovering the distinction and affective state of black students. Journal of Counseling Psychology 34, 4, 519-522.

Decker, S. (1969). An empty spoon. New York: Harper & Row.

Dewey J. (1938). Experience & Education. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Dimitriadis, G. & Kamberelis, G. (2006). Theory for education. New York: Routledge.

Durr, K. D. (2003). Behind the backlash: White working class politics in Baltimore, 1940-1980. Raleigh, N. C.: The University of North Carolina Press

Foerster, L. (1982). Moving from ethnic studies to multicultural education. The Urban Review, 14(2), 121-126.

Foster, M.(1997). Black teachers on teaching. New York: The New Press.

Garcia, E.E. (2001) Hispanic education in the United States. Rowman & Littlefield.Lanham, Maryland.

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice. New York: Teacher College Press.

Gay, G. (1997). The relationship between multicultural and democratic education. The Social Studies, 5-11.

Gay, G. (1978). On behalf of children: A curriculum design for multicultural education in the elementary school. Journal of Negro Education, XLVII(3), 324-340.

Gay, G. (1978). Multicultural preparation and teacher effectiveness in desegregated schools. Theory into Practice, 17(2), 149-156.

Gollnick D. M, Chin, P. C. (1994). Multicultural education in a pluralistic society (4th ed.) New York: Merrill/Macmillan.

Gordon, B. (1995). Knowledge construction, competing critical theories, and education. . In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (1stnd Edition). New York: Macmillian,184-199.

Grant,C. A. (Ed.).(1977). Multicultural education: Commitment, issues and applications. Washington, D. C. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Grant , C. A. (1978). Education that is multicultural: Isn't that what we mean? Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 45-48.

Grant, C. A. (1994). Challenging the myths about multicultural education. Multicultural Education Winter, 4-9.

Grant, C. A. & Sleeter, C. E (1985). The literature on multicultural education: review and analysis. Educational Review 37, 2 97-118.

Grant C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Race, class, and gender in education research: An argument of integrative analysis. Review of Educational Research 56(2) 195-211.

Grant C. A. & Sleeter, C.E. (1986). After the School Bell Ring. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Grant C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (1988). Race, class, gender and abandoned dreams. Teachers College Record, 90, (1), 19-40.

Gutek, An Historical Introduction to American Education, p.24. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1991.

Hillard, A. G., III, Payton- Stewart, L., & William, L. O. (1990). Infusion of African and African American content in the school curriculum. Morristown, NJ: Aaron Press.

Hu-DeHart, E. (2004). Ethnic studies in U. S. higher education: History, development, and goals. In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (2nd Edition) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 869-881.

Hughes, R. (1993). Culture of complaint: The fraying of America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, W. A. (Ed.). (1974). Multicultural education through compentency based teacher education. AACTE.

Horace K. (1915). "Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot," Nation 100, 220.

King, J. (1981). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. Journal of Negro Education, 60(2), 133-146.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Teaching and learning through desire, crisis, and difference: Perverted reflections on anti-oppressive education. Radical Teacher, 58(Fall), 6-11.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(30, 465-492.

Lee, S. (1997). Asian American as model-minorities? A look at their academic performance. American Journal of Education, 103, 121-159.

McNair Barnett, Bernice. 1993. "Invisible Southern Black Women Leaders in the Civil Rights Movement: The Triple Constraints of Gender, Race and Class." Gender & Society, 7:2:162-182.

Moll, L. & Gonzalez, N. (1984). Lessons from research with language-minority children. Journal of Literacy Research, 26(4), 439-457.

Moorland, J.K. (1966). A comparison of race awareness in northern and southern children. American Journal Orthopsychiatry, 36, 22-31.

Mungazi, D. (1999). The evolution of educational theory in the United States. Westport, CT: Praeger

Mehan, H., Lintz, A. Okamoto, D., & Wills, J. S. (1995). Ethnographic studies of multicultural education in classrooms and schools. In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (1stnd Edition). New York: Macmillian,129-144.

National Research Council (1994). Learning, Remembering, Believing: Enhancing Human Performance, D. Druckman, and R.A. Bjork, eds. Committee on Techniques for the Enhancement of Human Performance, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school. John D. Bransford, Ann L. Brown, and Rodney R. Cocking, eds. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. National Research Council Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Newman, W. M.(1973). American pluralism: A study of minority group social theory. New York: Harper & Row.

Nieto, S. (2000). Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical context of multicultural education (3rd ed.).New York: Longman.

Oakes, J. (1996). Making the rhetoric real: UCLAUs struggle for teacher education that is multicultural and social reconstructional. Multicultural Education, 4(2), 4-10.

Ooka Pang, V. & Park, C. (1992). Issues centered approaches to multicultural education in the middle grades. The Social Studies, 108-119.

Parekh, B. (2000) Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory"

Parkay, F. (1983). White Teacher, Black School: The Professional Growth of a Ghetto Teacher. New York: Praeger.

Payne, C. R. (1983). Multicultural education: A natural way to teach. Contemporary Education, 54(2), 98-104.

Pettigrew, T. (2004). Intergroup contact: Theory, research, and new perspectives. In Editors James Banks & Cherry Banks, History of Research on Multicultural (2nd Edition) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 770-798.

Vann, R. L. Race unites for drive to secure real democracy. Pittsburg .Courier www.pbs.org/blackpress/news_bios/courier.html [Retrieved 12/16/07].

Plato (R. E. Allen, Translator) Republic. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Porter, J. D. (1971). Black child, white child: The development of racial attitudes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Radke, M.J. & Trager, H. G. (1950). Children's perceptions of the social roles of Negroes and Whites. Journal of Psychology, 29, 3-33.

Ranney, J. R. Looking further than the skin: A history of Wisconsin civil rights law. State Bar of Wisconsin. WisBar.org. [Retrieved, 2-17-08].

Rueda, R., Rodriguez, R. & Prieto, A. G. (1981). Teachers' perceptions of competencies for instructing bilingual/multicultural exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 48(3), 268-270.

Schaeferf, R. T. (2000). Racial and ethnic groups. (8th edition).Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Scott, D.M. ( ). Postwar pluralism, Brown v. Board of Education, and the Origin of Multicultural Education. The Journal of American History.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Sleeter, C. (2000). Creating an empowering multicultural education. Race, Class, and Gender, 7(3), 178-196.

Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Learning Disability: This social construction of a special education category. Exceptional Children: 53(1), 46-54.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. Harvard Educational Review, 57(4), 421-444.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (2007) Making choice for multicultural education. (5th Ed.). Hoboken, NJ.

Spencer, M. B. (1982). Personal and group identity of Black Children: An alternative synthesis. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 106, 59-84.

Taba, H. (1952) Intergroup education in public schools. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education

Tesconi, C. A. (1984). Multicultural education: A valued but problematic ideas. Theory Into Practice, 23(2), 876-92.

Tushnet, Mark V. (1994). Making civil rights law: Thurgood Marshall and the Supreme Court, 1936-1961. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Yang, P. Q. (2000). Ethnic studies: issues and approaches. Albany: NY: State University of New York Press.

Young, R. L. & Pang V. O. (1995). Asian Pacific American students: A rainbow of dreams. Multicultural Education, 3, (2), 4-7.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In WR Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan. ...