

Critical Pedagogy and Architectural Education

C. GREIG CRYSLER
Binghamton University
State University of New York

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I suggest that if we are to engage in a serious reappraisal of architectural education, then our first task should be to examine how institutional and curricular practices combine to construct what we commonly accept to be the identity of an architect. The entropy of architectural schools—characterized by the ritualized, monastic abandonment of the outside world in the early years of training—can be seen as an act of force designed to ensure the production of a uniform and cohesive professional identity.

By gradually severing the connections between personal and the professional worlds, architectural education constructs a model of cultural assimilation that assigns everything that differs from the corpus of knowledge and practices embodied in the figure of the architect to a marginalized “private” realm. Students entering architectural schools learn that they must subordinate their “other” identities to the task of becoming a professional. Bombarded with complex tasks, working under highly pressurized conditions, the student is constituted as the target of a one-directional transmission of skills and information.

Yet, while architectural education continues to be based around the production of a unified, stable, and seemingly timeless professional subjectivity, the cultural character of North American society has changed dramatically over the last 15 years. The percentage of women, African Americans, and first generation immigrants from the third world in higher education has increased steadily since the late 1970s, and the trend is expected to continue. In Canada, group identities are now recognized and protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Elsewhere in the university there have been broad-based critiques of predominantly white, male, Eurocentric, heterosexual curricula.

Despite these demographic, legal, and epistemological shifts, architectural education has remained remarkably resistant to “outside” influence. History and theory programs continue to define architecture through a corpus of Christian religious monuments, public buildings, and palatial private homes whose architects inevitably belong to a select, a gradually breaking apart.

The profession, slow to perceive this “disaggregation”, has recently begun to suggest ways in which it can be halted. Some suggest that architects should demand more fees for their services, apparently hoping to restore some measure of continuity between the signification of expertise and its financial value. Others argue that architects should try to think of themselves as “translators” and managers of technical social expertise from outside disciplines. Still others suggest a “back to basics” approach. The Prince of Wales’ call for architects to be trained in the traditions of classical humanism is perhaps the clearest example of this latter tendency.

In the argument which follows, I suggest that as educators we must step back from proposing a new global strategy for the profession to shore up its authority. Instead, the disaggregation of the field should be viewed positively - not as an end in itself - but as a part of the breaking up of hegemonic systems of knowledge and the identities they construct. Instead of “top-down” reforms, we need a selective jamming of the curricular and institutional machinery of architectural education. We should aim to produce moments of crisis and open-ended possibility, in which contested histories and a competing range of situated political issues become integral to the critical transformation of the field. This is the first step in creating a more democratic learning environment and profession.

I begin with an analysis of the model of training that currently dominates architectural education, and then evaluate an alternative set of practices informed by theories of critical pedagogy, or education for a critical consciousness. I view critical pedagogy—with some reservations—as a possible means to begin “opening up” architectural education.

Critical pedagogy attempts to show the logic of specific power relations and struggles in the educational process. Students and teachers examine how knowledge is constituted, by whom, for whom, and for what purpose.¹ Curricular and institutional practices are considered together as an instance of cultural politics that “contains not only the logic of legitimation and domination, but also the possibility for transformative and empowering forms of pedagogy...”² The

school becomes a site of political articulation and “a terrain of contestation over whose forms of knowledge, history, visions, and authority will prevail as a legitimate object of learning and analysis...”³ This has profound consequences for architectural education. The humanist notion of subjectivity that underpins professional claims to autonomy gives way in theories of critical pedagogy to a self which is produced in signifying practices, and is therefore not an originator of meaning.⁴

EMPTY VESSELS

Architectural education is lengthy process which, under special institutional conditions, creates exchange values and makes them the property of individuals. Before professional services are sold, “homogenized years of schooling and standardized credentials provide a ‘universal equivalent’ into which exchange values can be translated and by which they can be measured.”⁵ A monopoly of instruction and credentialing is the structural condition for the creation of professional exchange value.

Because it is organized around imparting a standard set of skills that defines what it means to be an architect, architectural education is strongly biased towards what has been called the “transmission model” of pedagogy. This form of schooling sees students as a unitary body removed from ideological and material forces, and thus “the same underneath it all” — blank screens ready to receive unmediated transmissions of skills and information.⁶ The student is constituted as the target or object of knowledge without the interference of gender, race, class, or sexual orientation. The conception of an undifferentiated mass is central to architectural education, because its primary goal is to produce a standardized product - a professional architect armed with a particular corpus of marketable skills.⁷

When competence is linked to the relative amount of knowledge received, it follows that those with the least knowledge are also those least able to participate in the public sphere of architectural discourse. This creates an educational community stratified according to the amount of knowledge accumulated. First year students, for example, are relatively isolated from those in upper years, because of their comparative “emptiness” as vessels of knowledge. One of the goals of first-year training (with its emphasis on making kites, “shelters”, and experiments with primary form) is to return the student to a state of intellectual infancy, in an attempt to produce in the budding architect what Kazys Varnelis has called an “innocent eye.”⁸ Discourse between different strata of students is therefore likely to assume a paternalistic parent/child pattern, where the prestige flowing from accumulated experience functions as the ultimate sign of maturity:

“...prestige filters down from the “great men” in a field to those who study or work under them, through ideological mechanisms; the formation of cults and the vicarious enjoyment of the great men’s prestige by

underlings are characteristic of the training situation, but they also extend to the field of work. They ensure the new professional’s willing and even happy acceptance of the hierarchical order of his profession and of the elite-defined knowledge that underlies it...”⁹

Faculty occupy powerful positions in relation to students, because as “full vessels” they embody and control access to what students require to become “full” themselves. But faculty are divided internally, often according to the bipolar distinction of architecture as a technocratic profession or an art — between faculty who are “nuts and bolts” types and who insist that school should transmit practical/technical skills, and those who argue that the school’s primary function is to provide training in different aesthetic ideologies. Larson claims this opposition is founded in the contradictory status of a discipline which secures its institutional claims to autonomy by calling itself an art, but is at the same time dependent upon the construction of built exemplars, and hence practice, in order continue formulating fresh propositions.¹⁰ On one side of the discipline is the ideological construction of autonomy. On the other is practical dependence on the “heteronomous” activities of building needed to keep the profession alive by demonstrating its social usefulness.

In much the same way the school constitutes students as empty vessels, it is itself caught between competing external forces, ranging from the demands of the profession and the market to the internal bureaucracy of the university and the state educational apparatus. This “in-between-ness” grows out of the contradictory position of architectural education, both within the university and outside it. Its primary purpose is to produce graduates with marketable skills. But at the same time, by locating schools in universities, training is effectively removed from the marketplace.¹¹ The actual connection to the market is surrounded by the complex mediation of the university system, producing resistance to market ideology, and at the same time requiring constant intervention by the profession to prevent undue slippage. The contradiction has resulted in the production of a whole class of bureaucratic supervisors who specialize in overseeing the production of producers.

RATES OF RETURN

Not surprisingly, the transmission model has also been referred to as the “banking model” of education, underlining the fundamentally consumerist, objectifying logic of the system.¹² One of the most pronounced effects of the transmission model is to convert knowledge from a social product grounded in relations of power to the benign status of information and skills; like money it is aestheticized and “exchanged.”

Decisions about which faculty member to identify with in architectural schools becomes crucial, because in doing so the student is also deciding upon the type of cultural capital he or she will accumulate.¹³ Faculty are regarded as “re-

sources”, from which students receive “interest payments” in return for the time “invested” in their projects. This relation also operates in reverse: talented students are interpellated into the tutor’s system of cultural capital. While a novice architect may add luster to his credentials through association with a famous teacher, that teacher’s reputation is legitimated through the production of students the profession later deems masterful.

Indeed, the reputation of the school is linked to the perceived value of its human “assets”, both in terms of faculty and students. Thus the schools engage in vigorous competition to attract quality students by heralding the excellence of the faculty, and two forms of symbolic capital become intertwined. Significantly, hiring decisions now combine an older model of industrial product control with an adherence to the “precession of the model”. As Sande Cohen notes, increasingly “the claim to knowledge....is more important than its actual possession. New faculty are hired as ‘players’ whose texts enable the administrative sector to thicken its image/exchange identity, the increase of value imputed directly to the academic institution itself...”¹⁴

AFFECTIVE VALUE: BUREAUCRACIES OF DISLOCATED KNOWLEDGE

The canon is a discursive instrument of transmission “situated historically within a specific institution of reproduction: the school.”¹⁵ Thus the canon does not only represent a core set of ideologies. It is also an institutional process through which knowledge and instruction is bureaucratized. As John Guillory notes, the canon assumes the form of a legacy which is inexhaustible because it appears to reproduce itself; it is “wealth never consumed by consumption; it is used and reused generation after generation...the educational apparatus regulates access to this inherited treasure and individual works are taken up (preserved, disseminated, taught) as ‘important works.’”¹⁶

Critics have noted that the canon plays a central role in reducing knowledge to discrete, exchangeable, components. Gayatri Spivak describes the operation of canon production in the academy as the central means of objectification, where the *socius* is decoded and deterritorialized only to be recoded and revalued as “affective value”, in this case as the texts that best suit the functional ends of the canon: “... ‘What is worth... studying, teaching, talking about’ appears as ‘What can best be parceled out into a fourteen or ten-week format’”¹⁷

Unlike liberal arts programs, architectural schools allow students only a very limited role in designing their studies. Almost all courses, particularly in the early years, are “required” or “core” courses. Thus the canon is present not only in the specification of materials within courses, but in the specification how time is spent within the curriculum as a whole. Time management as a pedagogic principle is central to the entire training regime. Each student is given a bank account — four weeks for this, two weeks for that.

Time/money must be efficiently managed; if it is squandered, “failure” will result.

The time demands of the architecture school are an important part of its folklore.¹⁸ The student is required to perform many different functions within an escalating pattern of obligations and requirements. Within this internal economy of constant deadlines and panic, the credit weighting officially designated to each element of the curriculum becomes crucial in determining how much attention it will receive from the student. Only through the increased refinement of skills and competence within a given set of criteria can more time be obtained. Thus an ability to excel is contingent upon one’s ability to produce the time to do so. The production of time and talent are therefore directly linked.

The studio program, which generally carries two to three times the credit weight of “service” units like architectural history is the top priority; the other subject areas fall in descending order of importance according to their relative credit weighting. This tends to structure the curriculum in a satellite formation where clusters of specialized knowledge hover around the centrality of the studio regime. Although the clusters (professional practice, structures, history and theory) tend towards the transmission model, they are also clearly demarcated as peripheral to the centrality of the design studio.

Thus two systems of temporality are at work in the architectural school. First, there is the unmoving, stagnant temporality of the canon, changing so slowly it seems outside time itself. As Pierre Bourdieu notes, bureaucratic mediation ensures this slowness, but the pace of change is also kept to a minimum by the “timeless” status attributed to received wisdom, and the aura of respectful gravity that surrounds it: “...the healthy slowness which people like to feel is in itself a guarantee of reliability....is really the most authentic proof of obsequium, unconditional respect for the fundamental principles of the established order...”¹⁹

Second, there is the frantic pace of knowledge consumption. Here the emphasis is on getting things done, on establishing what is required and meeting those conditions as quickly and efficiently as possible. There is scarcely time to conform to the basic pattern, let alone question its presuppositions. A contradictory image is produced, simultaneously productive and atavistic. The architectural school is a hive of activity where students are busy completing an array of projects, essays, and assignments. Buzz-saws blare in the model workshop, there is the constant smell of fresh paint in the air. This is matched by a singular lack of innovation and change in curriculum content and institutional structure. The two processes are mutually constitutive: the busier the students and faculty, the greater the potential for stasis.

The underlying logic of exchange insists that knowledge be differentiated and categorized, that its value be made specific, and hence autonomous. Once knowledge is reduced to the acquisition of skills, learning involves the hierarchical passage through different skill areas - each specialized and

contained from the next. Thus the transmission model produces a double bind; a subjectivity whose agency resides in the passive reception of the wisdom of elders, and which takes specialization rather than interaction between forms of knowledge as the norm.²⁰ The architecture school has often been compared to a “boot camp.” Although the militaristic metaphor may overstate the regimented style of training students undergo, the training is military inasmuch as success becomes equivalent with ascent through a hierarchy that remains unchallenged, precisely because the hierarchy is the challenge.

THE THIRD SPACE

What form should political action take in order to contest, and possibly overturn the practices and discourses outlined above? As educators, we should begin by thinking of theory as an “instrument”²¹ (rather than a system) that would show the specific logic of power relations and the struggles around them: “...political action would be carried out step-by-step on the basis of reflection on given situations.”²² Democracy in this formulation is defined as a “site” of struggle rather than an abstract set of concepts guaranteed by law or administrative procedure; it is produced rather than received in social practice. Both students and teachers are redefined as subjects who question, define and shape their relation to the political sphere and society. The form political change might take cannot be finalized in advance. As Laclau and Mouffe have suggested

“...the reference to a transcendent guarantor disappears, and with it the substantial unity of society. As a consequence a split occurs between the instances of power, knowledge and the law, and their foundations are no longer assured. The possibility is thus opened up for an unending process of questioning: no law can be fixed whose dictates are not subject to contest, or whose foundations are not called into question; in sum, no representation of a center of a society: unity is no longer able to erase social divisions...”²³

Laclau and Mouffe argue for a mode of political action which does not dissolve into pure difference, in which various positions become completely incommensurable and hence uncommunicative with each other. Nor does it succumb to the master narrative of complete, unified identity supplied by Utopian political goals conceived at a high level of abstraction. Henry Giroux, in his book *Living Dangerously*. Multiculturalism and the Politics of Difference joins Laclau and Mouffe’s notion of radical democracy with Homi Bhabha’s idea of a “third space,” where deconstructive critical vulnerability and radical democratic politics exist side by side, with one set of practices constantly challenging the other, and hence preventing slippage into the unity of either extreme.²⁴

For Bhabha, the third space “displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new

political initiatives which are inadequately conceived through conventional wisdom.”²⁵ It is just this “third space” that theories of critical pedagogy attempt to constitute. Education for a critical consciousness encourages students to voice their difference from normative values and histories in order to better understand the relations of power that construct their social subjectivity:

“By illuminating the productive effects of power, it becomes possible for teachers as intellectuals to develop forms of practice which take seriously how subjectivities are constructed within particular ‘regimes of truth’...as transformative intellectuals, educators can serve to uncover and excavate those forms of historical and subjugated knowledges that point to experiences of suffering, conflict and collective struggle...”²⁶

Critical pedagogy requires a “reformulation of the knowledge-as-accumulated-capital model and focuses instead on the link between historical configurations of social forms and the way they work subjectively.”²⁷ Democracy and citizenship are thus linked to the notion of “voice.” Formerly suppressed groups are empowered by “bringing them into voice” so that their histories can be told. The fight for a democratic society consists in reforming the institutions of public life to allow different voices to be heard and to participate in a non-hierarchical fashion in the ongoing construction of society.²⁸

In the face of the deterritorialization of knowledge that stands at the center of canon production, critical pedagogy insists that the speaker locate his position in relation to the knowledge constructed. Critical pedagogy encourages students to confront their experiences within different systems of subjection on a personal level, through everyday and “vernacular” forms of speech that are often at odds with the “objective” unsituated language considered to be sign of rational judgement in the academy.²⁹

While such discourses create an opening for students to speak where one did not exist before, this opening carries its own problems with it. The visibility of subjugated knowledge is linked to the authorization of marginal experiences. As Chandra Talpade Mohanty notes, a focus on the centrality of experience tends to lead to exclusions - it often silences those who are seen to be part of “ruling class” groups, leading to what she has called the “more marginal than thou” attitude, where “white students are constructed as marginal observers and students of color as the real knowers.”³⁰

Mohanty argues that this “coagulation” can lead to the reduction of a complexly situated politics of knowledge to a question of sensitivity and respect. The result is a pedagogy of “cordial relations”³¹ where experience is defined in terms of the individual as a representative of an autonomous cultural group. The historical interconnections and conflicts between groups are erased. Each group becomes a fragment in an aestheticized social “mosaic” and is considered as valuable and worthy as the next. The “depoliticization and

dehistoricization” of culture which inevitably follows makes the implicit management of race in the name of co-operation and harmony possible. Yet, “because this pluralism does not address the systematic way in which power is constructed and lived, its serves to reinforce racism, rather than challenge oppression.”³²

Thus a pedagogy of cordial relations is intimately linked to the project of connoisseurship, of “cultural appreciation” abstracted from concrete historical struggle. The canonical structure of the university, with its tendency to divide ethnicity into discrete areas of specialization, reinforces the division between groups, and reduces the possibility to see the way in which culture is relational. Pluralism obeys the process of deterritorialization and differentiation that is essential to making knowledge an exchangeable commodity.

Critical pedagogy can also collapse into comfortable half-measures — for example, bringing historical struggle into the classroom, but only on the basis of ethical and moral conditions conceived in advance by the teacher. This is another version of the pedagogy of cordial relations, where the “critical pedagogue” is constituted as someone who helps students to “speak” but does so only on the (homogenizing) terms he or she deems appropriate. As Elizabeth Ellsworth has noted, in this formulation critical pedagogy becomes synonymous with consciousness therapy administered to the “voiceless”.³³ Constituting the student as “voiceless” and the teacher as speech-enabler returns the teacher to the position of rational transcendence that critical pedagogy claims to undermine.

In contrast, Ellsworth stresses that both voice and silence are not the property of individuals, but produced in a relational, shared fashion that is tied to specific contexts. Silence is often a position that is safely returned to when strategizing for visibility.³⁴ To deny the political importance of silence is therefore as oppressive as denying the right to speak. Moreover, the conception of the student as “possessing” an “authentic” but suppressed voice, is itself deeply problematic since “it is impossible to speak from all voices at once, or from any one, without the traces of others being present and interruptive...”³⁵ Ellsworth’s alternative to the generic “cordial pedagogue” is a teacher who abandons the superior position of the knowing political subject/leader, and with it hidden presuppositions that are informed by abstract, unsituated (and hence unattainable) political goals. Instead, the teacher and students engage in an encounter with oppressive formations and power relations in a way that acknowledges their mutual implication in them.

Critical pedagogy must also be theorized in relation to its broader institutional context. The university is a corporate institution, one that has arguably become more so over the last two decades. The growing authority of the “multicultural canon” should not be understood as solely the work of minorities who have forced “marginal” discourses onto the agenda. Another force, far less progressive politically, needs “information about the other.” John Guillory claims that just as industrial capital is being shifted to the third world, a process of intellectual capital flight is at work in the North

American university. He suggests that this shifting of resources has been partly responsible for the new divisions in the academy between “traditional” and “non-traditional” knowledge.³⁶ An emerging class of global technocrats wants to learn about, for example, Asian history and culture, in order to make trade junkets and business transactions more successful. China is now being aggressively explored as a new market for North American architectural services. It is not by sheer coincidence that architectural schools are suddenly engaged in the Orientalist task of compiling canonical courses on the “great works” of “Asian” architecture. Here the multicultural canon, by obeying the depoliticized, encyclopedic logic of the liberal university, takes on a distinctly neo-colonial dimension.

The introduction of the multicultural canon has also exposed the performance-based market competition that is latent, but always present between different forms of knowledge in the university. Thus for example, white tenured professors who teach the traditional canon may oppose critical pedagogy not out of racism or a desire to silence minorities (though this may also be the case), but rather out of fear that increased attention for “marginal” discourses will erode their own professional status and thus threaten their livelihood. This “fear of falling”³⁷ has been exacerbated by the oversupply of academics. As competition for jobs has heightened, resentment over institutional mechanisms which attempt to rectify systemic racial and gender imbalances tend to be viewed by the dominant groups with increasing hostility. As Mark Yount notes, “racism is rationalized in a new form.”³⁸

Thus while discourses of critical pedagogy create the possibility of counter-hegemonic analytic spaces within the university, their success in doing so is linked to an ability to understand the way they are intertwined with the power relations they seek to address. The articulation of a “third space” in architectural education cannot be achieved by an authoritarian reversal or turning upside-down of existing systems. This approach tends to reinforce what it seeks to replace: a new model is constructed out of opposition to (and is therefore dependent upon) the terms and conditions it opposes. Instead, strategic points of disruption may be useful in the first stage of what is surely going to be a long and difficult process.

Oppositional spaces for alternative histories and previously excluded voices to take hold should not, however, be institutionalized or practiced as static places of “community” and unified subjectivity. Instead, these spaces should be theorized as sites of contradiction and conflict. Volatile and disruptive, they should encourage work which constantly challenges not only its own construction, but the homogenizing, incorporative processes of professional education as a whole.

NOTES

This paper is part of a larger research project into architectural education in Canada that was made possible by a grant from the Architecture Section of the Canada Council.

- ¹ Fabienne Worth, "Postmodern Pedagogy in the Multicultural Classroom: For Inappropriate Teachers and Imperfect Spectators" *Cultural Critique* (Fall, 1993) 6.
- ² Henry Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life. Critical Pedagogy in the Modern Age* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989) 165.
- ³ Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. 165.
- ⁴ Worth, "Postmodern Pedagogy" 7.
- ⁵ Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) 211.
- ⁶ Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. 121.
- ⁷ As Magali Larson has noted, "...The hierarchy of excellence and prestige by means of which a profession legitimizes its internal stratification is produced in the university; professional recruits internalize it first, in that context..." *The Rise of Professionalism* 230.
- ⁸ Kazys Varnelis, "The Spectacle of the Innocent Eye. Vision and Cynical Reason and the Discourses of Architecture in Post-war America." *diss.*, Cornell University, 1994, Chapters 1 and 5.
- ⁹ Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism* 230.
- ¹⁰ Magali Sarfatti Larson. *Behind the Postmodern Facade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) 5-6.
- ¹¹ Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism* 212.
- ¹² Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life* 113-133.
- ¹³ Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus* trans. Peter Collier (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984) 91.
- ¹⁴ Sande Cohen, *Academia and the Luster of Capital* (Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press, 1993) 42
- ¹⁵ John Guillory, *Cultural Capital. The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993) 56.
- ¹⁶ Guillory, *Cultural Capital* 56.
- ¹⁷ Gayatri Chakravond unchanging group of Euro-American white males. Studio programs perpetuate the ungendered, "universal" ideals of autonomy, individuality, and mastery. Tenured teaching posts in architectural schools remain primarily the provenance of white males, as do the positions of authority in architectural offices.
- However, changes in the field of architectural practice are beginning to exert new pressures on the apparent stability of architectural training. The social and disciplinary boundaries of architectural education are in question as the profession struggles to define its position in a new and highly competitive post-Fordist marketplace for design services. Architects are now subject to the same unstable labor patterns that have taken hold in other sectors of the economy. More qualifications are needed to obtain employment that is less secure. The long and difficult sacrifices involved in the credentialing process seem increasingly arbitrary and "out of touch." The coherence and autonomy of the field is rty Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993) 62.
- ¹⁸ Dana Cuff, *The Story of Architectural Practice* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991) 122.
- ¹⁹ Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus* 87.
- ²⁰ Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus* 59.
- ²¹ Foucault states that "The role of theory today seems to me to be just this: not to formulate the global systematic theory which holds everything in place, but to analyze the specificity of the aims of power, to locate connections and extensions, to build little by little strategic knowledge..." See Michel Foucault, "Power and Strategies," *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980) 145.
- ²² Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* 145.
- ²³ Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London and New York: Verso, 1992) 186-187.
- ²⁴ Henry Giroux, *Living Dangerously. Multiculturalism and the Politics of Difference* (New York: P. Lang, 1993)
- ²⁵ Homi Bhabha, "The Third Space," *Identity. Community, Culture, Difference.* ed. Jonathan Rutherford. (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990) 208.
- ²⁶ Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*.
- ²⁷ Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s" *Cultural Critique* (Winter 1989-90) 185.
- ²⁸ Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. 28-38
- ²⁹ Mohanty, "On Race and Voice" 207.
- ³⁰ As Mohanty notes "...co-implication refers to the idea that all of us (first and third world) share certain histories as well as certain responsibilities: ideologies of race define both white and black peoples, just as gender ideologies define both women and men. Thus, while experience is an enabling focus in the classroom, unless it is explicitly understood as historical, contingent, and the result of interpretation, it can coagulate into frozen, binary psychologicistic positions..." *Cultural Critique* (Winter 1989-90) 207.
- ³¹ Henry Giroux, *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. 127
- ³² Bhabha, "The Third Space" 208.
- ³³ Elizabeth Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy," *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy* eds. Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore (Routledge, London and New York, 1992) 109-119.
- ³⁴ Elizabeth Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering?" 105
- ³⁵ Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering?" 103-104.
- ³⁶ Guillory, *Cultural Capital* 45.
- ³⁷ Barbara Ehrenreich argues that the "once secure and stodgy professoriate" now divides between the "star professors, at one extreme, who earn near six figures and teach few courses, and at the other extreme, the growing intellectual proletariat of part-time faculty, who commute from campus to campus to earn a living..." *Fear of Falling. The Inner Life of the Middle Classes* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1990) 246.
- ³⁸ Mark Yount suggests that "this circle of attitudes, assumptions, and (mis)perceptions thus serves to justify resentment towards blacks. And that this resentment cannot be 'racist' because it is justified. And since racial prejudice is now justified by this effective rationale, what might once have counted as racism will no longer be so..."
- Mark Yount, "The Normalizing Powers of Affirmative Action," *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions* eds. John Caputo and Mark Yount (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993) 223.