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1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS AND DEFINITIONS

The rapidly increasing diversity in America along ethnic, racial, cultural, and social lines has made multicultural education and cultural diversity critical, controversial, and increasingly unavoidable issues in our society and schools. As we advocate, design and implement multicultural education programs that are expected to be more effective for greater numbers of culturally diverse students, thus producing a more inclusive, egalitarian and just society, we need to better understand what multicultural education entails by reconceptualizing the concept.

Although there have been numerous conceptualizations, few have explicitly analyzed the concept from an analytic perspective. In order to make multicultural education more consistent with the goals
that multicultural education ought to achieve, clear some of the misunderstandings surrounding 'multicultural education', and address some of the charges and concerns many current multicultural education programs are vulnerable to, a reconceptualization of the concept is indeed needed. Thus, a philosophical analysis of some of the current practices of multicultural education; an examination of a meaning of 'multicultural education'; and a normative argument for such a reconceptualization is what the study purports to do.

This study intends to provide a better understanding of 'multicultural education' from an analytic philosophical perspective. It reconceptualizes 'multicultural education' and argues for the plausibility and applicability of this conceptualization and demonstrates its possible implementation in teacher education classes and educational foundations courses. It examines the role of philosophy of education as a contribution to the current concern with multicultural education.
The present Chapter intends only to set out the problems as well as various views associated with the concept of multicultural education, the related issues and concepts, and sketch the outline of some of my arguments, which will be explained and argued more fully in the chapters which follow.

For the sake of clarity, some of the major terms that will significantly influence the discussions in the following chapters must first be defined. The following definitions that I propose to use for the study (except 'multicultural education' for which a conceptual analysis will be given in Chapter III) are mainly in line with the definitions used in the literature of multicultural education. They are intended as either reportive or technical in nature, although it is clear that they function as persuasive or programmatic definitions in some of the literature.¹

'Ethnic group' will be used as a classificatory criterion to single out a group of people on the basis of a combination of the following elements: language,
customs, traditions, common beliefs, and race. Most commonly in the United States, ethnic groups are seen as interdependent sub-units of larger cultural or political entities. i.e., the phrase 'ethnic minority group' is often applied to groups which have a minority status in the larger society. In this use of the phrase, white Anglo-Saxon Protestants are not included. 'Ethnic group' is sometimes treated as a synonym with the phrase 'cultural group' because of the overlap of their basic binding elements such as common beliefs and traditional practices. Nonetheless, we can still observe definite differences between these two. A 'cultural group' singles out a common way of living for a group of people mainly based on commonly held beliefs. Since an ethnic group binds together people of similar ways of living, an ethnic group can also be referred to as a cultural group. However, a cultural group is not always an ethnic group. It can consist of members of different ethnic and racial background. For example, when we speak of the culture of the handicapped, the culture of women, the culture of the working class, we don't think of these groups as ethnic groups, but cultural ones, for each of the group may have
people of different ethnicity and race. These groups are cultural groups rather than interest groups because they are bound together by their special ways of living and beliefs. Usually, these groups have developed their own principles, their own languages, and their unique perceptions of the world.

The word 'race' will be used to refer more to the physical aspects of a people. It is a category which categorizes people based on physical factors such as facial bone structure, skin complex, the eye color, the texture of the hair, and the height of a people.

'Minority group' will be used here to refer to those who hold a political, social and economical subordinate status in the society. The word 'minority' designates a power relationship between the dominant and the subordinate in a given society. It does not necessarily refer to the population of one particular culture. As what has been widely asserted and believed in the United States, the dominant cultural group in America has been the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant males who occupy most of
the management positions from the government to local schools.

I intend to argue in the study that the ultimate goal of multicultural education is to combat discriminative attitudes in American schools and society, change the mind of students into a more accepting mindset toward culturally different individuals and bring about a harmonious society; that reconceptualizing 'multicultural education' mainly as imparting critical reasoning skills in schools will serve these goals. A comprehensive conceptual analysis of the concept will serve as a partial basis for the reconceptualization and I will show how this reconceptualization could be used as a basis of dealing with some multicultural concerns in foundations of education courses.

2. THE INEVITABILITY OF MULTICULTURALISM AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

The ongoing public debate on multicultural education together with the reality of American society has made
multicultural education an ever more important issue in American life today. Diversity has been an obvious fact, more so in America than in most other nations. Diverse ethnic composition of its population has been one of the most obvious phenomenon for the society. Indeed, American society was, is and perhaps will always be marked by diversity. Cultural conflicts caused by cultural diversity has been a common problem.

Why then does the issue of cultural difference turn out to be more important now than in the past for the well being of the nation? At least part of the answer seems to lie in the fact that American society is becoming ever more diverse due to immigration, reproduction of ethnic groups and transmission of cultural traits of the ethnic people. As pointed out by Thomas Sobol in the article "Understanding Diversity", America is rapidly becoming more ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse. By the year 2020, one of every three people in the United States will be what we now call a "minority." In New York City one child in four under the age of ten is the offspring of a non-
English speaking immigrant parent. According to the information presented by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the number of the immigrants admitted to the United States from 1980-1991 was on the rise. In 1980, the total number of immigrants admitted to the United States was 530,639, but in 1991, the number rose to 1,827,167.

It must be noted that mere diversity does not itself make what we call multicultural education an imperative. One thing that makes the problem of cultural differences increasingly pressing for America in the 90's is the cruel reality related to cultural differences we experienced in the past and are still experiencing today: conflicts and tensions between/among social groups; discrimination and deprivation of rights of people from cultures, and/or beliefs different from the dominant white culture and value system.

We are not unfamiliar with some historical facts about discrimination of ethnic minority people. African-Americans were treated as slaves that were owned by the
privileged whites as mere objects among their possessions. As a cultural group, African-Americans were not allowed to ride in the same bus with whites, not allowed to enter into public places which were solely for the white. Segregation and racism permeated American society. As illustrated by Carl F. Kaestle:

Except in New England and New York, whites barred blacks from voting, denying the relevance for blacks of one of the major goals of common schooling, participation in political institutions. Opportunities for most jobs and for most higher education were also closed. ... Even where laws suggested that blacks had rights, they were often denied. As John Jay Smith commented to Tocqueville in 1831, "the law with us is nothing if it is not supported by public opinion--the people are imbued with the greatest prejudice against Negroes, and the magistrates don't feel strong enough to enforce the laws favorable to them."

Other minority groups -- the Native Americans, the Hispanics and the Asians, historically all have received discriminatory treatment in the United States. At one time or another, Japanese, Chinese, Mexican Americans,
and Native Americans were forced into segregation. Mexican Americans have had a history of discrimination in education, public housing and employment in the United States. In the 19th century, they were referred to as "lower class" by whites, and were considered likely to steal horses. In 1946, it was reported that twenty Latin American veterans of World War II had been employed by a Gulf Coast refinery, but at a wage of fifteen cents per hour less than that paid Anglo Americans in the same job classification. Educationally, Mexican children have been segregated although there was no official state policy for segregating Mexican school children. There are documentations showing that, up till 1940s, many school districts in the south provided Mexican school children with separate housing facilities, that Latin Americans were prohibited from entering the polls for political election.

Native Americans were considered as "savages" and put into Indian reservations for easy control. In the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1850, Commissioner Lea argued that certain Indian tribes,
had an "insatiable passion for war" and that it was "necessary that they be placed in positions where they can be controlled." The affairs of Native Americans in terms of education were tightly controlled over by the whites. As Spring put it, as a conquered people, Native Americans were forced to give up their ideas on education in the context of federal policies. For example, in the 1830s, several Indian tribes (such as Cherokees and the Choctaws) established their own school systems, which were eventually "dashed in the late 1890s and early twentieth century as the federal government adopted policies designed to destroy the Indian nations in Indian Territory." Asian Americans also were targets of discrimination. Beginning about 1840, the Chinese, the first Asian group to arrive, landed in the United States in large numbers. The discovery of gold in California served as a magnet, drawing the people of southern China and those of the eastern United States together in Sacramento Valley. The demand for cheap labor for the transcontinental railroad in America and the political unrest and overpopulation in
China brought a steady stream of Chinese to the United States. However, the recessions and the completion of the Union Pacific Railroad in 1869 created the fear for job competition among many Americans. Obvious oppression of the Chinese began in the mining districts. A law was passed that taxed the Chinese miners. The Miner's Convention banned all Chinese in 1852. As the largest nonwhite minority in California, "the Chinese were regarded as 'yellow barbarians' and potential political rivals." The recession in 1872 caused the anti-Chinese sentiments which led to the denial of citizenship rights, landownership, and marriage rights. There were reports of unfair treatment of Chinese in the form of taxes, burnings, looting, assaults, and murders.

Prejudice and discrimination against the Chinese created an anti-Asian atmosphere. As a result, Japanese immigrants also experienced intense racism, discrimination and prejudice in the United States. For example, the Alien Land Law passed in 1913 in California forbade aliens to own land. But the law was passed essentially to warn the American public "that Japanese
farmers were going to take over agricultural land." The wartime relocation of Japanese Americans after the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 was also considered most blatant evidence of prejudice and discrimination by many.13

Conflicts and discriminatory practices are not only found along racial lines, there have been documentations indicating antagonism and discriminatory practices toward the Irish, the Italians and the Jews. For example, because of their Catholic religion, the Irish "became outcasts in a Protestant country, objects of positive antipathy among large groups of American workingmen and of cold suspicion on the part of their masters." They were looked down upon for their whiskey drinking and their fighting, and experienced "No Irish need apply" discrimination in employment in the United States. Also because of their Catholic religious beliefs, the Italian immigrants experienced anti-Catholicism sentiment manifested in employment and social organizations in America. Evidence of discrimination against Jews are also found in social, occupational and educational spheres.
They were excluded from social clubs, treated unfairly in employment, and in regard to admissions into higher educational opportunities.\textsuperscript{16}

Despite many different attempts to reduce discriminatory treatment of minority groups, and many social and educational programs (such as Anglo-conformism, ethnic studies) which aimed at the promotion of mutual understanding for people of different cultures, the tension, conflict and hate between/among social groups have been carried into the 90’s. Not only have the problems been carried into a new era, they have become much more complex, and involve more facets. There are not only the major problem of social prejudice in current America society, but also other tensions or problems such as homophobia, sexism and ageism. We not only still witness the racial tension between ethnic and racial groups as recently exposed in Rodney King’s event, the resurgence of Klu Klux Klan which promotes white superiority in current American society and hate crimes occurring in our everyday life, but also sense the strains between gays and straights and hear charges of
sexual harassment. Blatant racism has somewhat gone into everyday racism which is manifested in the form of intimidation, the denial of dignity, and expectation of gratitude.\(^{17}\)

All these conflicts and tensions point out to us the hard-to-swallow fact that our society has been marked by cultural ignorance, hatred, and racial discrimination; that cultural harmony is still a unrealized ideal in American society. The reality sends us a message that the lack of cultural harmony must be addressed immediately. That is, more effort is needed to create a harmonious community in the 90's which is free from cultural discrimination and depreciation of cultural diversity.

Our common human needs and problems lay another claim for the importance of multiculturalism or multicultural education. As Adlai Stevenson put it: "A man bleeds, suffers, despairs not as an American or a Russian or a Chinese, but in his innermost being as a member of a single human race."\(^{18}\) We as humans have a lot of common needs in the present. There are increased
interdependence in the world. For example, the industrial development of many nations have left fewer and fewer resources for the coming human generations. We face new problems of pollution, old dangers posed by floods and earthquakes, and shortage of resources as before. We are all currently puzzled by the not-yet-curable diseases such as AIDS, and cancer. We witness increasing population in the world, and need to learn how to cope with the changing nature of work. We also experience the modern life brought about by new scientific discoveries and high technology. The demand of the world economic market as well as the change in the world politics have also tied people of the world closer more than ever. We have become more and more interdependent of each other in the world brought by the high technologies and developments of electronic machines. We need to process thousands of pieces of information worldwide in a day time brought about by the arrival of fax machines and many other advanced telecommunications. We need to analyze different data collected from all parts of the world, for instance, in a stock market. We live in a society where we get many of our daily necessities from
out of the country. As Robert U. Jameson correctly pointed out "(We) have to wonder about the rubber and quinine from the East Indies, rope from the Philippines, tin from Bolivia, coffee from Brazil..." in the world we live in today. The intertwined economic relationship makes multicultural education more important. Knowing different people and understanding different cultures will enable us to cope with a world with diversity in the most desirable manner.

We are not only more economically interdependent, we are also more and more politically and socially interdependent. Our world experienced in the last decade the most dramatic change in human history. The uniting of the two Germanies, the breaking down of the Soviet Union communist system, the release of Black leader Nelson Mandela in South Africa, the student movement in Tian-An-Men Square along with other democratic movements in eastern European countries have made a statement to the world that our world is moving toward a more "democratic" direction.
Facing these common needs and common problems, it is imperative that humans unite. It appears to me that the lack of unity and harmony stands in our way as we face these common problems. Attention and energy that are consumed by the racial fights and conflicts in American society could have been directed to the solutions of our common problems in our society and in the world. If our attention is not distracted by the racial fights and if we give our full attention to the preservation of our environment and the exploration of the nature, to the ideal of human liberation, it is for certain that we will have a better world.

However, the above mentioned point that our common human needs require unity is not readily grasped. People need to be educated about the fact that people of the world, no matter of what color they are, what culture they have, what language they speak, what religious belief they hold, have a lot in common. To explore human commonality which is our humanness, we must first of all acknowledge that there are differences in our subscribed ways of living. These differences need not lead to
conflict, but can generate wonder if the wisdom of the diverse population is efficiently utilized. It appears that to work on our common needs and problems, we must direct our attention to the prerequisite need to promote cultural understanding and harmony. Since multicultural education can be designed to contribute to cultural harmony in the society, it is indeed necessary.

Generally speaking, to create a peaceful coexistence of the people of different cultures, there are basically two choices left to us. One is to get rid of differences in the hope of getting a culturally homogeneous group. The other is to change people's attitudes about differences and diversity, establishing a value judgement that people of the world ought to be treated justly no matter where they are from, how they look, and what cultures they have.

The first choice is not really tenable for it has not worked to solve the intra-society (the United States) problem and certainly will not solve the global problem. America has used it to try to eliminate differences. The
ideology of assimilation, (which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter II), practiced in America in late nineteenth and early twentieth century was aimed at creating a nation-state in which one culture -- the Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic became the American culture. One of the goals of Anglo-conformity was to rid ethnic groups of their ethnic traits and to force them to acquire Anglo-American values and behaviors. This goal was reflected in the famed educational leader--Cubberley's statement near the turn of the century:

Everywhere these people [immigrants] tend to settle in groups or settlements and to set up their own national manners, customs, and observances. Our task is to break up their groups and settlements, to assimilate or amalgamate these people as part of the American race, and to implant in their children, as far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law, order, and popular government, and to awaken in them reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth.
Although assimilation may have "worked" for some groups of the nation during the massive immigration time, the ideology, which targeted mainly the immigrants from central, southern and eastern Europe in essence promotes the abandoning of one's life style, tradition and values, depreciation of diversity in American society in favor of the dominant white culture.

Similarly, the ideology of amalgamation or the melting-pot ideology which promotes a synthesis of American social groups (see detailed discussion in Chapter II) tried to drastically reduce or destroy cultural diversity. It was argued by the advocates of this ideology that all cultures were to be blended so that a novel and superior culture would emerge. Again, the target of the ideology was to rid cultural characteristics of ethnic groups in the society.

It should be noted that although assimilation and amalgamation both targeted immigrants from central, southern and eastern Europe, they emerged as a call for the elimination of all cultural differences which
included the cultural differences of colored people in America. American colored groups were not considered targets of assimilation and amalgamation because of their low social status. Nonetheless, they were still expected to conform to the ideologies proposed and eliminate their own cultural traits. It turned out that these ideologies did not work well for the colored people because these two ideologies are inadequate and misleading.

For assimilation, it appeared that the downplay of cultural diversity, the promotion of one dominant culture produced social, economic as well as psychological burden on members of the subcultures. Ethnic people tend to feel inferior and shameful which often lead to self-rejection, and low self-esteem. For example, Thomas L. McKenney who served as superintendent of Indian trade from 1816 to 1822 and superintendent of Indian affairs from 1824 to 1830 indicated assimilation of the Native Americans which is manifested by deculturalization and Americanization caused moral despair for the Indians. This sense of inferiority to whites caused Indians to give up any attempts to become "civilized". It was also documented
by Spring that from 1830s to Civil War, "under the control of the state of Oklahoma, deculturalization programs resulted in a dramatic decline in literacy among the next generation of Indians." The efforts to incorporate the adult immigrant into the life of Americanization, starting around 1918 also were not successful. Drachsler described the failure of the Americanization attempt in his *Democracy and Assimilation*:

More pathetic figures cannot be found than the host of pioneer Americanization workers during this period (whether they be brave teachers of English and civics in an uninviting evening school or self-forgetting settlement workers in foreign neighborhoods, bringing the knowledge of America's tongue, of America's past glory, of America's hopes, to the newcomers) watching with a bitter heart how their words fell upon deaf ears; how classrooms grew empty and social halls deserted; how the foreigner in an inexplicable way preferred to huddle close to his own and be content to live in his ancient shell of tradition...
As with the melting pot ideology, either ethnic cultures were seldom drawn into the amalgam or they usually stuck to the bottom of the melting-pot. This is because for a melting pot to work, it requires the immigrant groups to have the ability to influence the host group. Without this capacity on the part of the immigrant groups, the melting pot can not be made. America has been run very much White Anglo-Saxon Protestant way. The host group has so many resources to maintain its dominance over the immigrant groups that the capacity of the immigrant to influence the host group is to a large degree shattered. Although there were ethnic groups which committed themselves to this ideology, the influence of their cultures on the American culture is very trivial. It never affects the mainstream culture in nature.

Another reason why the melting-pot in essence did not take shape is because how to blend or how to create a mixture, to a large extent, remained vague. Should melting-pot aim at genetic mixture which may eventually eliminate physical differences, or at cultural blending
which bears a further difficult question of how?

The change in American society as characterized with better living conditions and enlightened consciousness of the mass, plus the limitations of assimilation and amalgamation, attracted increasing amount of attention to another ideology, cultural pluralism, in American society. Cultural pluralism, instead of trying to eliminate cultural differences as practiced in assimilation and amalgamation, embraces a heterogenous American society. By promoting the rights of the immigrants to keep their distinct culture, this ideology points to the direction of a society where people of different cultures can enjoy equal human rights and privileges. This is the second choice left for a united America.

Multicultural education, sharing many of the ideals of cultural pluralism, was developed during the 1960s. It is linked with the civil rights movement and the ethnic revitalization movements (which will be discussed in detail in Chapter II). These movements resulted from a
mixture of social, economical, and political factors such as the oppressive situation for ethnic minority people in America and the awakening of their consciousness for human rights and their rising expectations for a better life. From the beginning, 'multicultural education' has had controversies regarding every dimension of the concept.

3. RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There has emerged a body of literature concerning the meaning of multicultural education; its aim, and its implementing methods. In exploring this literature, one encounters a variety of definitions, showing that the concept 'multicultural education' is still a matter of wide disagreement. One influential definition is that given by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education:

...preparation for the social, political, and economic realities individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have
both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and an ongoing assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society. (NCATE, 1979)

Although a variety of definitions of 'multicultural education' will be provided in Chapter II, it should be sufficient for the present purpose to point out that 'multicultural education' has also been defined as (1) the education of recently arrived immigrants, as (2) curriculum reform, as (3) support for cultural and community venture, as (4) the promotion of ethnic histories, as (5) the prevention or reduction of racism, and as (6) the encouragement of minority language instruction.

In addition to disagreement about definitions, content, and purpose, there is also disagreement as to
whether multicultural education is valuable. This value disagreement, I think, often times comes from the conceptual disagreement. There are some conceptualizations of 'multicultural education' that would lead, or might lead, to some instructional programs which could be justly criticized. As a result, there are educational theorists and concerned people who still wonder whether multicultural education is a positive concept that should be valued in a society. There are arguments which point to some multicultural education programs as anti-democratic and divisive. Some argued that particular multicultural education programs promote group freedom but limit individual liberty. Others pointed out that multicultural education paid too much attention to differences which widens the existing gap between or among different social groups.  

Some people oppose multicultural education because they view that the promotion of cultural differences should necessarily include the welcoming attitude of differences in opinion, which should include the opinions of the opponents of multicultural education. For the
advocates of multicultural education to downplay and reject their opponents' criticisms of multicultural education, they have contradicted themselves by violating the principle of celebrating diversity they promote. They argue that rejecting their opponents' different ideas, these multiculturalists do not want to celebrate differences. For example, Linda Chavez, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research claimed that the real aim of the promoters of cultural diversity is to exclude certain people and to foreclose debate after being protested by a group of Hispanic students and community activists to be the commencement speaker at the University of Northern Colorado for her criticisms of affirmative action and bilingual education.26

Other people express concerns on the possible by-product of multicultural education. They worry that the promotion of multicultural education would lead to cultural relativism, the belief that all values, beliefs, and attitudes of other people should be accepted and respected.27
All these arguments and opinions have undoubtedly enriched the scope and the texture of the discussion on multicultural education. They provide diverse dimensions for people to think about whether multicultural education is desirable or not. However, what seems to be lacking in the literature about multicultural education is an analytic approach to 'multicultural education' and an analysis of the arguments about it as well as a philosophical evaluation of the views and opinions concerning the issue. Although there are many books and articles written about multicultural education, very few have addressed the issue from an analytic perspective. It is the importance and the lack of an analytic analysis of 'multicultural education' that served as the rationale for the current study.

The major focus of the analysis will be on taking 'multicultural education' as an education about helping people make a value judgement, as an education about the raising of the cultural and social consciousness of the American students, and as an education that imparts logical skills of critical thinking and develops
dispositions. In the absence of this analysis and reconceptualization, the suggestions on how to implement a multicultural program too often stay at a superficial level. For instance, many would take multicultural education as the celebration of ethnic holidays, eating ethnic food on an ethnic day, and reading a book about an ethnic hero. These activities tend to view multicultural education as a separate event. As soon as the day is over, multicultural education will disappear. Unless there is a clear reconceptualization, much of multicultural education is likely to trivialize and fail to deal with an important educational matter.

Furthermore, among the large body of the literature on how to implement multicultural education, almost no author has attempted to assort to the advantageous resources of international students and scholars on American campuses. That is, how to engage these people in the movement of multicultural education in American society, how to use their authentic cultural knowledge to help raise students' cultural consciousness is largely ignored. As an international student myself from the
People's Republic of China and having stayed in the United States for almost eight years, I feel that I have been not only interested in cultural issues in America, but have been eager to participate in promoting mutual cultural understanding through sharing my cultural experiences and knowledge with American students. Being a member of the Chinese culture, I feel I have a lot to offer to the understanding of the Chinese. The knowledge I have about my culture may be more authentic and up-to-date than what is written in the textbook. The valuable resource of international students in America can also provide opportunities for American students to experience dealing with people from other cultures and apply their cultural knowledge and skills in a more authentic situation.

In addition to what the international student can offer, the international student his or herself can also gain greatly from such an involvement. An international student may have the cultural knowledge from his or her own culture, but he or she may well overlook or misunderstood some of the aspects and nature of the
problems of multicultural education in American society and schools. Therefore, their involvement could add to themselves cultural knowledge and competence in functioning well in a new culture. As multicultural education is clearly taking on the global perspective, I feel this rich resource for cultural awareness should not be ignored. These dimensions are the impetus of the current study.

4. ARGUMENT AND PLAN OF THE STUDY

In this study, I will argue that multicultural education is best understood as a schooling movement that should aim at changing the attitudes of the student toward a more justified position on cultural differences by increasing cultural knowledge, cultivating critical thinking skills and developing dispositions to act upon their reasoned decisions. In this reconceptualization of 'multicultural education', the cultivation of critical thinking skills will aim at enabling students to reason with themselves whether it is wrong to mistreat people from other cultures because they are different from "us".
Students will be taught and given the opportunity to practice logical skills which will likely to get the student into the habit of desiring to be consistent. The cultivating of critical thinking skills will also emphasize the importance of being consistent, and praise consistent behavior which will let the student be proud to be consistent with the self, thus, forming the disposition to act upon the reasoned decision. Although multicultural programs such as ethnic week, culture awareness as currently practiced in many public schools can help students understand different cultural practices, thus, in a way boost ethnic pride and reduce discrimination and prejudice, they are simply inadequate. Multicultural education should be understood as an education which nurtures the skills and tendencies for the making of moral value judgements in relation to cultural issues, i.e. the changing of the mind as well as the attitude of the people who are indifferent to or who guard against cultural diversity, and the raising of their consciousness about the good multicultural education can do to everyone and the society through their own moral reasoning, and the producing of a
favorable attitude to cultural diversity and multicultural education. Without viewing multicultural education as helping people to make a moral value judgement in regard to cultural diversity, multicultural education can hardly fulfill what is expected of it and will fail to produce an attitude that celebrates cultural diversity and the essence of being human.

The arguments of the study are anchored on the value judgment/assumption that cultural harmony is a desirable state of affairs. The major arguments are outlined as follows:

**Argument #1 (preliminary argument):**

Premise #1: If there is a lack of cultural harmony, then that lack should be remedied.

Premise #2: If there are cultural ignorance, hatred, racial fights and discrimination, then there is a lack of cultural harmony.

Premise #3: There are cultural ignorance, hatred, racial fights and discrimination in American society as indicated on pages
Conclusion #1: There is a lack of cultural harmony.
Conclusion #2: The lack of cultural harmony should be remedied.

**Argument #2 (central argument):**

Premise #1: If multicultural education is understood as entailing critical thinking, then cultural ignorance is likely to be diminished.

Premise #2: If cultural ignorance is diminished, then chances of cultural harmony are improved.

Premise #3: Multicultural education is here understood and should be understood as entailing critical thinking.

Conclusion #1: Cultural ignorance is likely to be diminished.

Conclusion #2: Chances of cultural harmony are improved.

The central argument that multicultural education should be understood as entailing critical thinking will be developed in a conceptual analysis and
reconceptualization of the concept in Chapter III.

In order to have a better grasp of what multicultural education ought to be, we need to have an overview of the historical development of multicultural education. Thus, we will look at the origin of multicultural education movement, and some of the major different claims on multicultural education along its growth. This will be accomplished by examining the existing different interpretations of 'multicultural education'. After a critical evaluation of the major available literature on multicultural education, a philosophical and ethical analysis of 'multicultural education' will be presented. Arguments that the concept 'multicultural education' ought to include cultivating critical thinking skills or rationality on cultural issues as well as develop dispositions will be made. Plainly put, my claim that multicultural education is best understood as the making of a value judgement statement resides partially in the meaning of the concept and partially in its being a programmatic definition. Based on my analysis of the concept, I will attend to the
application/practice aspect, demonstrating that certain basic skills commonly taught in introductory courses of philosophy of education can be used to cultivate critical skills in multicultural education courses for teacher education students. Skills such as how to clarify and how to justify are explained with examples.

Specifically, these arguments will be arranged in the following chapters. In Chapter II of the study, multicultural education will be looked at from a historical perspective. Questions such as how multicultural education was developed, why it created such an intense interest in America, and why it also created a heated debate will be reviewed. Different interpretations of multicultural education will be presented and critically analyzed.

In Chapter III, a philosophical analysis, a reconceptualization of 'multicultural education' and a normative argument for such a reconceptualization will be presented. I will employ the method of analytic philosophy to approach the analysis. The concept will
first be clarified from the ordinary and technical language perspectives. Then, an examination of treating 'multicultural education' as a programmatic definition and a justification of why 'multicultural education' should be understood in the way I proposed will be offered. In this part, different constituents of the concept will be carefully scrutinized. Analysis will be given to what is culture, what is multiculturalism, and what is education. In this way, the meaning of 'multicultural education' would be made clearer and easier for people to draw upon. It is this analysis that will serve as a base for putting forward the arguments that multicultural education is about the making of a better person as well as helping students with their skills to make rational judgements with regard to cultural differences.

In Chapter IV, some of the opponents' major positions against multicultural education will be presented and critically evaluated. The relationships between my conceptualization of 'multicultural education' and democracy, my conceptualization of 'multicultural
education' and cultural pluralism will be scrutinized. I will also refute the claim that multicultural education divides people of the United States with my conceptualization of the concept. In this chapter, I intend to show that there is no inherent conflict between multicultural education and the valued ideals of democracy and individuality, and that multicultural education as reconceptualized promotes those valued ideals. Multicultural education is about raising the ability of our students to deal with cultural issues more rationally and efficiently.

In chapter V, suggestions on how to implement some philosophical tools in raising critical thinking skills in multicultural education classes will be found. My contention is that the operation of any multicultural education programs in American educational systems must involve the teaching of reasoning skills whenever necessary. I will demonstrate how the teaching of the reasoning skills in multicultural education will contribute to the elimination of prejudices and discrimination. Suggestions are aimed at enabling teacher
education students and students in educational foundation courses to build multicultural competency in their future profession. I will also bring to this study here some suggestions about how to make use of international student resources in multicultural education programs from my particular perspective of being an international student.

In Chapter VI, a short summary and conclusion of the study will be presented. In this chapter, I will suggest further research that can be done to make the conceptualization of 'multicultural education' more appealing, and more applicable.

It is the historical development that I shall turn to now.
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CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

1. INTRODUCTION

An accurate grasp of the development and meaning of the historical stages of multicultural education despite its relatively short history is essential to any attempt to explicate its essence and assess its present position. Often times the interested person tends to wonder how multicultural education has become such a heatedly-debated issue. Especially when bombarded with so many different interpretations of multicultural education, one tends to feel lost if there is a lack of the knowledge of its historical development. It is apparent that the only way to clear thinking is to bring some order to the field. Tracing back to its origin, sorting out the different historical background for the different claims of multicultural education and analyzing different interpretations will help us, to a great extent, understand and assess the issue better. This chapter is
designed to accomplish these objectives.

The chapter includes two sections: (1) the origin of multicultural education in the United States; and (2) different interpretations of multicultural education. The first section summarizes the historical development of multicultural education in the United States. In it, the ideologies of assimilation, amalgamation and cultural pluralism are examined, and the development of ethnic revitalization movement and multicultural education concept is traced. The second section presents different conceptualizations, different goals and programs of multicultural education and their different assumptions as nurtured by different social stages in American society. It also provides the reader with an analysis of the different interpretations, their strengths and limitations.
2. THE ORIGIN OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

A historical review of the American society in the 19th and 20th century concerning its treatment of immigrants and ethnic groups reveals that multicultural education, when taken as a movement in American schools, is connected to and influenced by several historical ideologies concerning the appropriate treatment of ethnically different groups. Among these are such ideologies as assimilation, amalgamation (or melting pot), ethnic revitalization and cultural pluralism in the United States. According to James Banks, a well-known and influential multicultural education advocate, multicultural education is directly tied to what is called the ethnic revitalization movement of the 1960's and 1970's in the United States.\(^1\) The understanding of the rise of the ethnic revitalization movement necessitates some review of the American history.
Assimilation

During the first half of the 20th century, assimilation became the prevailing ideology mainly concerning the problems of vast immigration from central, southern and eastern Europe to the United States. American society beginning in 1840s experienced large-scale immigration of the famine-fleeing Irish, the Germans, and later the Scandinavians, the emancipation of the Negro slaves and the problems created by post-Civil War reconstruction, the placing of the conquered Indian with his/her broken culture on government reservations, the arrival of the Oriental attracted by the discovery of gold in California and other opportunities in the West, and finally, the tide of immigration in the late 19th and early 20th centuries from the peasantries of the southern and eastern Europe--the Italians, Jews, and Slavs of the so-called "new immigration" fleeing the persecutions and industrial dislocations of the day. Assimilation emerged out of this social context and was endowed with the expectations of building a united America. The elimination of differences of the "new" immigrants from Southern, Central and Eastern Europe in terms of culture
was viewed as essential for a unitary whole of the country.

Assimilation, for the purpose of the present study, is understood as the process by which subordinate cultural groups adopt the dominant culture as what is manifested in Anglo-conformity theory. As Gordon pointed out "The 'Anglo-conformity' theory demanded the complete renunciation of the immigrant's ancestral culture in favor of the behavior and values of the Anglo-Saxon core group." The central assumption of Anglo-conformity is "the desirability of maintaining English institutions (as modified by the American Revolution), the English language, and English-oriented cultural patterns as dominant and standard in American life." Hence, the assimilationist ideology upheld that immigrants to the United States should fit into the social and economic conditions that were dominated by cultural forms that were primarily white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant (WASP).

As for the colored minority groups such as Afro-Americans, Native-Americans and Mexican-Americans,
prejudice and discrimination have largely retarded their assimilation process. According to Gordon, Afro-Americans were not seriously considered as assimilable elements in American society because of their predominantly slave status and severe discrimination and prejudice in American society.⁵ And this was also true for the Oriental and Native and Mexican Americans. Nonetheless, these people were still expected to conform to the Anglo traditions and culture in order to obtain minimal social mobility.⁶

The underlying assumptions of the assimilationist are that the life-styles, values and daily practices of the new immigrants are, first, inferior to the WASP culture and, second, are dysfunctional in the new land.⁷ What was envisaged by the assimilationist at the same time was that the abandoning of one’s ethnic tradition and the integration into a homogeneous culture would enable the newcomers to get in line with others of the nation for the equal share of the social rewards.⁸ The assimilationist believes that the best way to promote the goals of American society and to develop commitments to
the ideals of American democracy is to promote the full socialization of all individuals and groups into the common culture. They believe that curriculum materials and teaching styles should reflect the common culture which is characterized by WASP culture in America. The curriculum should help the child to develop a commitment to the common culture and the skills to participate in social action designed to make the practices in this nation more consistent with the professed ideologies. The school should develop within youths a 'critical acceptance' of the goals, assumptions, and possibilities of this nation. Thus in schools, only Anglo-Saxon values and attitudes were taught. To be human, accepted and valued was to cherish the attitudes, values and behaviors of the dominant majority. History books were peopled by dominant majority. The teaching method did not take different learning styles into consideration.

Assimilation as noted by various writers such as Banks, and Gollnick and Chinn has only been partially successful in America. It is successful in the sense that most ethnic people either voluntarily or nonvoluntarily
chose to become assimilated because they face the only choice of either assimilation and possible inclusion in the mainstream or nonassimilation and exclusion from the promised full participation of all aspects of the society of assimilation.\textsuperscript{11} American experience proved that assimilation worked reasonably well for white ethnic groups (mainly immigrants from Northern and Western Europe), but not so well for non-white ethnic groups (such as Afro-Americans, Asian-Americans and Mexican-Americans.)\textsuperscript{12} The explanation for this comes from the fact that the immigrants from the northern and western Europe physically and culturally approximate the most to the dominant group on the American soil.

As for the colored ethnic groups, no matter how willing they are to become assimilated, they face the uncorrectable physical barrier to become fully assimilated. People can change their clothes, attitudes and other ways of existence, but they cannot change their skin color and their physical outlooks. A story told by a librarian whom I met during my research of the study could be illuminating. She told me that a close friend of
hers is an American-born Japanese. Because of her Oriental appearance, she has been frequently asked how come she speaks English so well. It seems that for those who do not resemble the Caucasian physically, full membership in the dominant cultural group is very hard to come by. These non-white ethnic people will be viewed by many as foreigners. I take it that this is why Gordon, after carefully studied the problem of assimilation, claimed that behavioral assimilation (the absorption of the cultural behavior patterns of the "host" society) is possible for the colored people, but structural assimilation (the large-scale entrance of the immigrants and their descendants into the social cliques, clubs, organizations, institutional activities, and general civic life of the receiving society) is either not meant for them or, at least, not a short term matter. Consequently, the colored people who have tried to conform to Anglo-Saxon behavior patterns but are denied full entry into the social, political, and economic systems may experience the psychological hardship that cannot be taken lightly. In some cases, these colored people are despised, and rejected by their original
ethnic group as disloyal to their ethnic cultural identity. According to Gibson in a study on the Valleyside Indians--Punjabi Sikhs, "Punjabi parents constantly admonish their young that they will dishonor themselves, their families, and their community if they adopt the values and behaviors of majority peers....Many Punjabi teenagers themselves criticized those who socialized at school with white classmates. They would say, 'He’s Anglo, or he thinks he’s white. He’s not one of us.'" Although there could be different reasons to account for this, this example shows that there exists at least the likelihood for those who try to become assimilated to experience rejection from their own cultural group members. Not being accepted by their ethnic group, these people are not welcomed neither as a legitimate member in the "host" culture. Hence, they tend to feel isolated, inarticulate, and politically impotent, alienated, and frustrated at not being accepted by either their own ethnic group or by the mainstream culture.

Theoretically, assimilation makes some highly questionable assumptions in regard to teaching and
learning. Trying to do away with all the cultural differences, the assimilationist assumes that children of all cultures would benefit equally well from the same teaching style, and that the teaching materials reflective largely of Anglo-Saxon culture would enhance learning for children across cultures. However, recent research results indicate the same teaching style will not necessarily benefit students from different cultural backgrounds. To the extent that cultures differ, students differ in the way they approach learning, too. For example, Cohen found that the learning style for Afro-American children and youth is relational, as opposed to the analytical style rewarded in schools. This suggests that the analytical style in which the teacher lectures and the student listens will not in the maximum degree benefit Afro-American students who learn better when the learning environment encourages group work and cooperation. According to Hilliard, Afro-American people in general tend not to be "word" dependent. They tend to be very proficient in nonverbal communications.
Recent studies on the learning styles of Native American and Alaskan Native youth have also established that these children learn best through careful observation, for example, the behavior and expressions of parents, teachers, and other adults, changing weather conditions, the terrain, and wildlife. This established the importance of visualization in their learning.¹⁸

Not only there are cultural differences in learning, there exist many individual different learning styles. A survey of the students in one class may reveal that some work well in groups; others prefer to work alone. Some need absolute quiet in order to concentrate; others do well with music or noise. Some work efficiently in the morning; while others work best at night. Some can sit for hours and learn, others learn well only kinesthetically. Some grasp oral instructions quickly; others need to see the instructions in writing. Some require a warm personal rapport with the teacher, whereas others do not. Some prefer a formal learning environment; others prefer a relaxed atmosphere. With all the differences in learning style, the assimilationist
assumption in regard to teaching will not work to attain maximum educational achievement for the majority of the ethnic minority student population. As multicultural education is expected to reach students of diversity, this assimilationist assumption should be changed.

Amalgamation

As a competing ideology with assimilation, amalgamation drew a considerable amount of attention in America in the first half of the 20th century. However, as Gordon noted that the idea of amalgamation commonly known as the melting pot theory actually started in the eighteenth century.¹⁹ The idea of a synthesized America can be traced back to eighteenth-century French-born writer and agriculturalist, J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur in his Letters from an American Farmer,²⁰ Ralph Waldo Emerson in his Journal of 1854,²¹ and a historian--Frederick Jackson Turner in his paper The Significance of the Frontier in American History presented in 1893 (in which he talked about his ideas of a composite America).²² It was early in this century, the ideal of the melting pot was captured by an English-Jewish writer
Israel Zangwill in his drama, *The Melting Pot*. The play that was opened in New York City in 1908 was a tremendous success. It depicted the great ambition of the play's protagonist, a composer, David Quizano in creating an American symphony that would personify his deep conviction that his adopted land was a nation in which all ethnic differences would be fused and from this a new person, superior to all, would emerge.  

The ideology of the melting pot appeared to be psychologically pleasing to the immigrant population because it advocated a new, unique American culture to which all cultural groups would contribute. "Americanization" is no longer the embracing of Anglo-conformism but the fusing of many nationalities and cultures into a new, composite American people. The curricular effort of this ideology suggests a type of schooling aimed at eliminating cultural diversity by bringing about a unified or amalgamated citizenry. The focus is laid on the study of intergroup and cultural interaction designed to break down barriers between cultural groups.
To the extent that American culture has more or less been influenced by ethnic cultures in terms of areas such as language and food, it may be argued that the melting pot has worked only to a certain degree in America. However, this cultural influence is too trivial for us to claim that melting pot ideology has worked on the national level. The mechanism that runs America has been still WASP culture.

The failure to turn this noble idea of amalgamation into reality is due to certain inherent problems of the ideology. First, it has to be noted that humans and human culture do not melt like iron. There are many complicated aspects that have made the melting pot ideal a unfulfilled prophecy. For example, the consideration of what counts as the "best" element of each individual group to be melted is a difficult one. The nature of the amalgamation (biological? cultural? or both?) is never entirely clear. As Pratte pointed out that in order to obtain a culturally mixed situation, immigrants of different ethnicity must "enter the cliques, clubs, and other primary groups and institutions of the core or
dominant society and, in addition, to place their own mark on these social structures. If this was to be achieved, prejudice and discrimination must be absent—a hardly likely prospect."24 Second, the melting pot ideology was not considered to apply in any great numbers to the Afro-American, the Native American, Asian Americans and the Hispanic minorities.25 According to Gollnick and Chinn, "Until 1967, these people were prevented by miscegenation laws in many states from intermarrying with persons of European descent. They were not expected to melt."26 It seems that the pot was not meant to be colorful at all.

Cultural Pluralism

Refusing, or not being permitted, to assimilate or amalgamated into the dominant American culture, many ethnic minority groups and immigrants formed and maintained their own ethnic communities and enclaves. Among these communities are Little Italy, Chinatown, and Harlem. These communities provided oases of familiarity for the immigrants in a strange land, and band these people together to cope with a strange and often hostile
environment. As early as 1915, there were criticisms on Anglo-conformism and melting pot ideologies. Horace Kallen, a democratic philosopher, published two articles under the title "Democracy versus the Melting-Pot" in The Nation early in 1915. In the articles, Kallen vehemently rejected Anglo-conformity and the melting-pot theories. He argued that a political democracy must be a cultural democracy and argued for the right of the thousands of the Southern, Eastern, and Central European immigrant groups for the maintenance of their cultural heritage and culture.27 About two decades later, he used the phrase 'cultural pluralism' for the first time to describe his position. It was not until after the second World War did the concept 'cultural pluralism' work its way into the vocabulary and mind of social theorists.28 The credence of Kallen's view was given after the civil rights movements in the 1960's and 1970's.29

'Cultural pluralism' nowadays is used to refer mainly to the mutual appreciation and respect between two or more ethnic groups.30 A more careful examination of the concept is found in Pratte's Pluralism in Education
and Green's Education and Pluralism. Pratte suggests that 'cultural pluralism' first of all describes the coexistence of many political, racial, religious, ethnic and age groups living together in a way that allows the social system to function and maintain itself. Second, it positively evaluates such kind of coexistence. It carries a value position which is summarized by Green:

...[Cultural pluralism] involves a belief in freedom of association. Secondly, it contains the belief that there is no single way of life which can without question claim to be best; thirdly, it implies the belief that a humane society must afford room for many competing ways of life. And, finally, the ideal of pluralism implies that it is good to have such ways of life in competition and in contact and that the differences between them will not be endangered but enhanced by the contact between them.

Underlying the ideology of cultural pluralism are a number of assumptions. The pluralist assumes that America is made up of many ethnic groups which may compete with one another for political, economic and social benefit. Therefore, it is extremely important for ethnic people to
develop a commitment to his or her ethnic group, especially if that ethnic group is oppressed by more powerful ethnic groups in American society. Energies and skills of each member of an ethnic group are needed to help in that group's liberation struggle. Each individual member of an ethnic group has a moral obligation to join the liberation struggle. Thus, the pluralist stresses the rights of the ethnic group over the rights of the individual. In the area of teaching and learning, pluralists such as James Banks, Christine Bennett, Pamela Tiedt assumes that ethnic minorities have unique learning styles and that the school curriculum and teaching strategies should be revised so that they are more consistent with the cognitive and life-styles of ethnic group students. To realize this pluralistic ideal, the pluralist urges the use of materials and teaching styles that are culture specific. The goal is to make students learn about the role of his or her own ethnic groups and raise the status of their ethnic groups in the society.

The problem with the cultural pluralist ideology, according to Banks, is that this theory exaggerates the
extent of cultural pluralism in America, it calls too much attention to cultural differences and not enough to similarities.\textsuperscript{34} The theory fails to give adequate attention to the fact that behavioral cultural assimilation has taken place in America.\textsuperscript{35} People in America no matter of what ethnicity, to a certain degree, do participate in the universalistic culture. They value the ideals in the American Creed, they speak American English, they live on the soil that is characterized with mineral and soil wealth, elaborate technology, and a wealth of manufactured goods. People of America are regulated by clocks and calendars instead of by the sea and by the sun. Time is used to organize most of the daily activities. The denial of this fact would mean failure to prepare the ethnic youth to cope adequately with the real world. Cultural pluralism in its strong form\textsuperscript{36} also has the tendency to uphold group interests at the price of individual freedom and rights.
Ethnic Revitalization Movement and Multicultural Education

With the on-going discrimination against colored ethnic groups in America and their rising expectations for more freedom and a better life, came the civil rights movement in the United States in the 1960s. The civil rights movement which mainly aimed at eliminating racial discrimination of Afro-American people in public accommodations, housing, employment, and education gave rise to ethnic revitalization movement. As characterized by Banks, the ethnic revitalization movement in America was initiated by Afro-Americans "because of their historic and profound discrimination in this nation and their rising expectations caused by social and political events in the 1950s and 1960s." This movement impacted and aroused the consciousness of other ethnic groups in America. Shortly, Mexican Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans and Asian Americans as well as some white ethnic groups such as Italian, Poles, and other Slavic-Americans joined in. 37
The ethnic revitalization movement was characterized by their anger, rage and dissatisfaction about institutional discrimination and racism, the denial of equal opportunity to attain an education, to vote, to participate in the political process because of their physical and cultural characteristics. This oppressing reality for the ethnic minority did not turn out to match the democratic ideals on which the nation is founded. Similar to the calls made by the cultural pluralist for the rights of the "new" immigrants from southern, central and eastern Europe, American ethnic minority groups demanded that social institutions be more responsive to their needs and hopes and dreams. As explained by James Banks, the ethnic revitalization movement in the Afro-American experience arose out of the context of institutionalized racism as well as the rising expectations created by the nation's attempts to mitigate some of its most blatant forms of institutionalized racism and discrimination; proceeded into a stage in which ethnic groups form their new identities, legitimize their histories and cultures through debates about racism; developed into a matured phase in which racism
was recognized as a major factor of ethnic problems and symbolic concessions were made (such as black studies programs, the hiring of ethnics in highly visible positions, etc.); and came to the final stage when the call of ethnic groups for recognition is echoed by other minority and groups that perceive themselves as oppressed and discriminated.

It appears to me that the ethnic revitalization movement is a logical historical extension of the attempt of the pluralists to legitimate "new" immigrants' culture in the early twentieth century. Lies in the heart of the theories of assimilation, amalgamation, cultural pluralism and ethnic revitalization movements is the issue of how to morally deal with cultural differences.

The term 'multicultural education' was coined when educational institutions responded to the demands of the ethnic minority people. The demands were made first by black people, but later other ethnic minority groups such as Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans and Native Americans together with other social groups such as
women, the handicapped, people of the aged joined in to demand that educational institutions reform their curricula to reflect their groups' experiences, histories, cultures, and perspectives. Nowadays, there are more minority groups (homosexuals, people who are HIV positive) joined the demand for equality and social acceptance.

In short, the concept of multicultural education we now have in our society is derived out of a series historical theories and events. The large-scale immigration created the problem of how to deal with differences brought by the large number of new comers, who, for the most part, looked different, lived, and worshipped differently in the United States. The first attempt (theory) to tackle the problem was through assimilation in which the "old" immigrants (Anglo-Saxon Protestants) tried to eliminate the differences that are brought in by the "new" immigrants and make the "new" ones one of them by making them adopt and cherish the WASP culture. In the meantime there came a new theory--amalgamation or the melting-pot ideology in America.
Theoretically, this theory also tried to get rid of differences and create a homogeneous America not through upholding one dominant culture, but through a mingling of the existing cultures. Thus, the problem evolved from how to Anglicize to that of how to mix the cultures. In early 20th century, a competing theory known as cultural pluralism emerged. Instead of arguing for the elimination of differences, cultural pluralism argued that America would be enriched if ethnic cultures were preserved, and celebrated. The major problem became how to make people value ethnic cultures. Thus, we witness the implementation of ethnic study programs to raise the self-concept for the ethnic minority in schools. The impact of cultural pluralism was felt by the Blacks, native Americans, Hispanic minorities, and other ethnic groups in America in the 1960s and 1970s. Their consciousness for equal treatment was thus aroused. I believe that the civil rights movements and the ethnic revitalization movements are ample testimony. The call for equal treatment of minority people presupposes that 1) ethnic minority are not treated as well as members of the dominant group in America and 2) the unequal
treatment of the ethnic minority people is a result of their cultural and physical differences. And 3) this unequal treatment is morally wrong. Therefore, the call is a call to the society to face differences in the most moral manner. Multicultural education emerged as a program in the educational sphere to respond to these calls. It is a response from schools to accommodate the requests to include minority's case in American education by meeting the demands, needs, and aspirations of all these different minority groups.

3. DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Multicultural education is subject to many interpretations since it is used as an inclusive concept to cover many perspectives. Along its growth, different people have attached different meanings to the concept due to the fact that different persons have a different aspect of the general problem in mind. In addition to the definition given by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education given in Chapter I, here are some more definitions. James Banks defines
'multicultural education' as (1) an idea of equal educational opportunity, (2) an educational reform movement that will change the school and other educational institutions to ensure the equal educational opportunity for every child, and (3) an ongoing process that should be permeated in all study subjects. Multicultural education is not just a course to be studied for one hour in a day, or several hours in a week, but a theme that is reflected in every subject matter throughout a child's education. According to Bennett, "multicultural education should be viewed as an approach to teaching and learning that is based upon democratic values and beliefs, and seeks to foster cultural pluralism within culturally diverse societies and an interdependent world." Geneva Gay defines 'multicultural education' as "the policies, programs and practices employed in schools to celebrate cultural diversity." Nieto in 1992 proposed to take 'multicultural education' as a comprehensive school reform in which racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society are challenged and rejected. Multicultural education should further the democratic
ideal of social justice.\textsuperscript{43} According to AACTE Commission, multicultural education should teach students to value cultural pluralism. It should work toward the cultural enrichment of all the students, and help students to recognize that cultural diversity is a fact of life in American society, and that cultural diversity is a valuable resource that should be reserved and extended. Therefore, multicultural education is the preservation and enhancement of cultural pluralism.\textsuperscript{44} From Citizenship, Multicultural, and Human Relations Education prepared by Ohio Department of Education in 1985, multicultural education "is to enable and encourage students to understand and respect individual and cultural differences and similarities." It should help students understand and appreciate the world as a multiracial, multilingual, multicultural, and multinational phenomenon.\textsuperscript{45} From this limited selection of the interpretations of 'multicultural education', 'multicultural education' is used to mean many different things: bilingual education; education against racism, sexism, ageism; education about discrimination; education of immigrants and ethnic people and global education.
According to Banks, multicultural education is frequently used synonymously with ethnic studies and used to describe multiethnic education. For the purpose of clarity, I intend to group these interpretations into the following three distinct but overlapping categories: (1) multicultural education as the education of the culturally different students; (2) multicultural education as a process and a curriculum approach; and (3) multicultural education as a school movement for equal educational opportunity. The following paragraphs will present these different interpretations and spell out their underlying assumptions. Each interpretation will then be critically assessed in the last section of this chapter.

A. Multicultural Education as the Education of the Culturally Different Students

In the early 1960’s, due to the gap between Afro-American students and white students in their achievement test scores, there emerged a number of hypotheses. One of them was called "deficit theory" (also referred to as
cultural deprivation theory). The "deficit theory" emerged in the 1960's as an attempt to explain why disadvantaged students tend to experience high rates of failure in school. This theory suggests that, linguistically, children from lower socioeconomic homes are verbally deprived due to home culture and economic disadvantage. Because of the lack of the verbal stimulation in their homes, they enter school without the linguistic resources needed for success. Therefore, it claims that children from disadvantaged populations are intellectually disadvantaged as a result of inferior linguistic development.

Culturally, this theory purports that there is a cultural deficiency for poor minority working class and Black students. It was claimed that children of this category face tremendous educational disadvantages in the sense that their home culture is beyond the scope of the school culture, and that they had to be properly "culturized" in order to succeed. That the problem was with the children and not with the schooling institutions.
Based on the cultural deprivation theory, a national commitment was made to compensate for the lack of an appropriate stimulating environment by the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. As a result, compensatory programs such as Head Start and Title I came into being. Proponents of the program believed that these programs could compensate for the inadequacies of the total environment for the disadvantaged children. Although, these programs carried good intentions of the organizers and were claimed as being capable of "developing greater social competence in economically disadvantaged children" and offering these children an access to equal opportunities to life, in reality, the impact of the programs have had on raising student achievement is still being debated. In a report to the Congress prepared by the Office of Human Development in May 1975, it was reported that "...the educational gains made by Head Start participants progressively declined after the children left the program and were virtually lost by the end of third grade." This result is echoed by later research. In a study done by Stephen P. Mullin and Anita A. Summers in
1983, they concluded that compensatory education has accomplished the following: 1) participants have some slight edge over nonparticipants, 2) effects are not sustained, and that 3) more dollars are not cost-effective. There are also reports that indicated that the majority graduates of Head Start programs still are inferior to the middle class classmates in achievement tests.

The deficit model faces some theoretical limitations. According to Charles A. Valentine, theoretically it is impossible to demonstrate the validity of the deficit theory. This is because the necessary separation of biological and socio-cultural factors is methodologically and/or scientifically impossible in a society where there is ethnic plurality and structural discrimination. In order to show that the source of the problem for the ethnic minority student is his or her home culture, research must offer strong evidence to point solely to the student's native culture as the major factor. However, according to this opinion, this is not accomplishable because the structural
discrimination and the plurality of ethnicity in America made it impossible for researchers to verify whether it was the family environment or the social discrimination that created the poor academic performances of the ethnic minority student.55

As far as I can see it, the deficit model is based on an erroneous assumption which projects a hierarchy of cultures in American society. Assuming that there was a deficit in the native culture of the ethnic minority child, the model implied that there is a superiority and inferiority relationship in the social structure of the United States. It placed the dominant white culture at the top and those of other minority cultures, for example, the black culture, Native American culture, Hispanic culture, Asian culture as well as working class culture at the bottom. Requiring ethnic minority students to conform to the school culture which is dominated by the middle-class Anglo-Saxon culture, this theory tells the minority ethnic children that the values and lifestyles they acquired and learned from birth is not valuable, thus undesirable. Students are forced to choose
between their parents, grandparents and other relatives who represent home and school value. For some, this may not be a big problem, but for many other children, it can be predicted to be a painful experience that may bear adverse effects on the children in question. This is because it creates a possible dichotomy between home and school for the student.

To point to the ethnic minority students themselves and their home culture as the explanation for their academic failure is too simplistic to solve the problem. Blaming the victim is politically the most convenient way to go about the problem. First, the victims are immediately visible ones for the problem. They can be easily identified. Second, they are the weakest in the social structure, thus they are most likely to take the blame without resistance. However, blaming the victim does not make the problem of victimization disappear. The problem for the minority ethnic child must be looked at from the larger social context. The social context that "nurtured" the problem cannot be ignored.
As a variation to the deficit theory, there came the cultural difference theory. Cultural difference theory like deficit theory is based on the empirical observations of the school performance of the culturally different students. Again, it was pointed out that these students usually did not perform as well as the mainstream students (students from the white, middle-class American families). They usually lagged behind the national norms. What makes cultural difference theory different is that it did not attribute the academic failure totally to culturally different students themselves. Instead of requiring ethnic minority students to conform to the mainstream culture, abandoning their home culture, this theory looked at the school for certain explanations.

This theory held that ethnic students' failure is the result of the collision of home culture and school culture. The learning handicaps culturally different children face was, to a large extent, due to the cultural and intellectual disparity between the school and the minority ethnic children's home environment. To help them
rise above this situation, multicultural education was called upon as a viable means to decrease the disparity and to increase home/school compatibility. Transitional bilingual education became a hopeful bridge to connect the differences between the home and the school culture for the immigrant child. It is recognized that school should meet the special needs of the ethnic child and help ethnic students identify cultural differences and put these differences in a meaningful context. Schools are urged to build upon the positive cultural traits such as cooperativeness and mutual aid that mark the extended family, the avoidance of the strain accompanying competitiveness and individualism, the enjoyment of music, games, sports and cards, the ability to express anger of the ethnic minority students.51

Although cultural difference theory took a step toward a more democratic schooling environment for ethnic minority students, it is not free from problems. The very notion of difference implies the question, Different from what? From each other? Or from the WASP culture? It is obvious that the differences that are relevant here are
those between the disadvantaged and the white middle-class. Due to the human tendency of viewing whatever is different from "me" in less positive light, the uncovered differences tend to favor the middle class values. We can take a close look at the proposed transitional bilingual education. According to Baca & Cervantes, "The primary goal of bilingual education is ...to teach children concepts, knowledge, and skills in the language that they know best and to reinforce this information through the use of English." As Gollnick and Chinn pointed out, transitional bilingual education which is one of the two approaches to bilingual education emphasizes bilingual education as a means of moving from the culture and language most commonly used for communication in the home to the mainstream of American language and culture. This is in essence an assimilationist approach in which the culturally different student is expected to learn to function in English as soon as possible. The native language serves only as a bridge for the student to get to the "kingdom of English", it is not supposed to be maintained. The native language gradually is phased out as the student becomes more proficient in English.
Therefore, to the extent of the bias favoring the white middle-class culture, the difference theory can be very easily reduced to the deficit theory which targeted the culturally different student for change.

Focusing only on the minority ethnic students, and leaving the students from the dominant white middle-class culture largely outside the programs, multicultural education interpreted in this manner can do very little in correcting prejudice and discrimination which has been argued by many to be part of the major factors in explaining the ethnic minority student's failure the educational theorists attempted to tackle.

B. Multicultural Education as a Process and the Curriculum Approach

Multicultural education when interpreted as a process advocates that a person become multicultural or develop competencies in multiple ways of perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing.  This interpretation is based on the assumption that individuals can develop
multiple competencies to function well in different situations. They need not reject their home culture and native cultural identities to function in a different cultural milieu—for example, the school. Multiculturalism is "the normal human experience." Thus, the focus of multicultural education is on understanding and learning to negotiate cultural diversity among nations as well as within a single nation. Multicultural education as a curriculum approach can "develop knowledge and understanding about cultural differences and the history and contributions of contemporary ethnic groups and nations as well as of various civilizations in the past...This aspect of multicultural education focuses on both minority and non-minority children and youth."

From the minority ethnic students' perspective, multicultural education is thought of as capable of boosting students' pride in their once looked down upon ethnic or home cultural identity. In order for minority ethnic children to be successful in schools and later in society, it is believed that the elevation of the new
identity and the production of a positive self-concept is very important and this elevation could not be accomplished without the attention and recognition of the whole society. As a reflection in schools, this interpretation demanded that schools include in the school curriculum ethnic people's history, ethnic heroes and ethnic contributions to the nation. Multicultural education takes on the form of Black History week, American Indian Day, Asian and Afro-Caribbean feasts and festivals in school curriculum. Different ethnic food is eaten on different ethnic days.

It is believed that the inclusion of the ethnic information and the making known the ethnic events not only had certain desirable effects on the lives of the minority ethnic child, but also on the lives of other school children. From the perspective of the students other than the ethnic and minority student, multicultural education as cultural understanding was deemed as capable of making the unknown familiar. Thus, driving away the fear of the unknown and enhancing mutual understanding. It was also believed that by studying other cultures, a
child would understand the self better. As Brislin put it:

...more knowledge about others different from ourselves helps us to see ourselves as others see us, rather than assuming that others see us as we see ourselves, or depending entirely on a 'self reference criterion'. If we can have more contact with outsiders, we might become more tolerant and able to understand their point of view....we can learn much about ourselves from other people who see us differently than we see ourselves.65

Thus, multicultural education is proposed to place more emphasis on teaching every student to value cultural differences, to understand the meaning of the concept of culture and to accept others' right to be different. Instead of attributing minority ethnic children's failure to their home culture, it recognizes racism as the major cause of the educational problems of non-white ethnic minority school population. As a remedy, attention should be paid to the elimination of personal and institutional racism; celebration of cultural differences and the enhancement of the understanding of the concept of
The key assumptions in this interpretation are that school should be oriented toward the enrichment of all students, that multicultural education programs can provide such enrichment by fostering understanding and acceptance of cultural differences, reducing racism, stereotypes and prejudice and discrimination in the school. Specifically, this interpretation requires that people have a favorable opinion toward cultural diversity. It assumes that ethnic groups have rich and diverse cultures that have values, languages and behavioral styles that are functional for them and valuable for the nation-state. Cultural diversity is a positive force in the development of American society and a valuable resource to be preserved. It is so basic to the life of our nation that it must become an integral part of our educational process at all levels. By focusing on all the students in schools, this interpretation represents a change of attitude toward different cultures. Ethnic culture is no longer something minority ethnic students alone should study and treasure,
it is an invaluable thing to the whole school population. To me, this is a major positive characteristic this interpretation possesses.

However, what is insufficient in this interpretation is its heavy concentration on the promotion of differences which, when handled inappropriately, can cause unintended effects of disunity and problems associated with ethical relativism. First of all, the strong emphasis on differences trivializes the important fact of the commonality of human beings. It in a way subtly invites people to take sides according to their ethnicity, beliefs, and cultural practices. As a matter of fact, proponents of this interpretation have expressed explicitly that "... an important goal of multicultural education should be to help students who are members of particular victimized groups better understand how their fates are tied to those of other powerless groups and the significant benefits that can result from multicultural political coalitions." It seems to categorize and glue people that share similar experiences together are indeed intended by proponents of this interpretation.
In addition, the emphasis on the promotion of differences is likely to convey the message that because people are indeed different, and have different cultural beliefs and life styles, and because we must celebrate these differences, to accept differences then is to accept everything everybody does or believes. Based on this view, cheating, stealing, murdering, and kidnapping—things that ordinary people would reject—are believed not to be morally rejectable. More detail on cultural relativism is discussed in Chapter IV.

C. Multicultural Education as a School Movement for Equal Educational Opportunities

In this interpretation, multicultural education aims at achieving equality of educational opportunity and equity among all identifiable groups of children and youth, particularly ethnic minorities and the economically disadvantaged. Among the leading proponents of this interpretation are James Banks, Carl Grant, and Christine Sleeter. Banks in his numerous books called for installing changing the total school environment as the
central concern of multicultural education. He rejected taking multicultural education as single separate programs, and suggested a holistic approach to multicultural education. He argued:

The field of multicultural education is replete with single-factor paradigms that attempt to explain why lower-class and minority students often achieve poorly in school.... In order to effectively design school programs that will help ethnic minority youths to increase their academic achievement and to help all students to develop ethnic literacy and cross-cultural competency, we must conceptualize the school as a system in which all of its major variables and components are highly interrelated. A holistic paradigm, which conceptualizes the school as an interrelated whole, is needed to guide educational reform.

The holistic paradigm Banks was calling for is the change of every aspect of the school environment, which includes the change of the attitudes and values of school staff toward a democratic, non-racist stance; the power relationships, the verbal interaction between teachers and students; the culture of the school; the curriculum;
extracurricular activities, attitudes toward minority languages, the testing program; and grouping practices. Banks argued that the school should be looked at as a social system in which all of its major variables are closely interrelated. The change of the total school environment necessitates the campaign and commitment to combat racism and other forms of discrimination.

Carl Grant and Christine E. Sleeter also argued, multicultural education is an approach "that attempts to reform the total schooling process for all children, regardless of whether the school is an all-white suburban school or a multiracial urban school." To them, to ensure the implementation of multicultural education programs in schools, school staff should be reeducated whenever necessary. There should be cultural diversity represented in the school staff composition, and the curriculum should reflect the experiences, perspectives and contributions of different cultural groups.

The underlying assumptions of this interpretation are that multicultural education when understood as the
school movement can indeed make a difference in social distribution of rewards in terms of power and goods, and by changing the existing school environment, it can change people's attitude about those who are from different cultures and/or believe in different cultures. They believe that cultural enrichment and endorsement of cultural differences can be made if and only if ethnicity and change about cultural differences are reflected in every corner, every aspect of the school. Changes in certain isolated aspects of the school will not fulfill the task.

Multicultural education in this interpretation bears a more forceful element trying to eradicate personal and institutional prejudice and discrimination and those -isms related with discrimination, and social injustice. It is approached in terms of equal opportunity and equitable distribution of power among members of the different cultural groups. The focus is on the change of the existing oppressive situation of minority people rather than on the mere understanding and promotion of ethnic cultures.
However, this interpretation is still pregnant with problems. For example, it attached great emphasis on the structural change of the school such as the redistribution of power to the under-represented groups; the change of the school staff composition; the culture of the school; the curriculum; etc. without addressing (1) the most needed aspect for change, i.e. the change of the attitude and (2) the implementing method. It appears that the focus is lost in the multiple claims of change. Without a focus for such an immense social project, the claims are likely to remain lip services.

The advocates of this interpretation seem to contend that every aspect of the school has to be changed in order to bring about a democratic non-racist situation. It is at this point that I differ. To me, all the change claims boil down to one issue. That is, the change of the mind. We can change the staff composition by establishing a quota system for the representation of the minority. We can change the curriculum content by adding materials which represent ethnic or minority culture. We can set rules forbidding the use of discriminative language in
the school. However, these changes do not necessarily lead to the celebrating attitude of cultural differences. People can remain hostile toward people of different cultures even when these changes were made.

For one thing, one can passively accept the increased representation of the minority or ethnic groups, see more ethnic teachers in the school staff, more ethnic and minority materials in the school textbooks, and try to avoid violating school rules on the use of discriminative language, but still keep the racist attitude, rejecting the value of other social groups, avoiding to deal with ethnic or minority people, participating in racist organizations whenever chance permits.

For another thing, these changes made without the focus on the enlightenment of one's consciousness would possibly lead to other unwanted results. They can still produce a sense of superior-inferior relationship which is the very thing multicultural education is against. The boosting of the minority or ethnic culture in every
aspect of the school without sufficient rationale will likely impinge on the young minds of the students that certain social groups are worthier of appraising. One recent TV program on CBS revealed an interview with several school-age children. Upon being asked who they think are better, White people or black people? The response from a few white children was the black people. Because they are tall and big.... When the interviewer asked a black girl "Do you like white people?" The answer is a definite "No!" Although the TV program did not link the interview with multicultural education, I can envisage a possible similar outcome if school changes were made without educating the critical thinking skills of our students. Multicultural education is not for the promotion of certain social group or groups, and it should avoid causing anything that is against its principles which include the valuable human ideal of equality.

Also, it can be postulated that without the focus on the change of the mind, we may add an ethnic or minority staff to the school who only believes in his/her own
cultural practice, but has no understanding of other cultures, and no understanding why cultural diversity is a value and a plus. Change in this way can do very little in achieving the goal of multicultural education programs.

All these indicate that the change of the total environment of the school will have to be prioritized with the change of the mind. In other words, the change of the mind must be the basic focus to ensure the true success of other changes in the school. What I am trying to say here is that there is and should be a hierarchy in the change claims of this interpretation. This is because the change in the empirical situations (e.g. staff composition, power relations, curriculums) does not guarantee or necessarily lead to the celebration of justified cultural differences. The change of the total school environment cannot fulfill the purpose of the multiculturalists without a focus on the change of the mind.
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CHAPTER III

THE CONCEPT AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

1. INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter (Chapter II), I have examined, in the literature, several different views of how multicultural education might best be understood. I have argued that each of the interpretations possesses either theoretical or practical limitations. In this chapter, I will provide a somewhat different perspective on what the best understanding of multicultural education is. To accomplish this, I will do a conceptual analysis to explicate what the meaning of 'multicultural education' is, for such an intricate concept, a sentence or so can never suffice. Following this explication of meaning, I will then argue how multicultural education might be best understood in order that its goals can be best achieved.
'Multicultural education' is a complex concept which draws upon several related concepts. Among these related or constituent concepts are 'culture', 'multiculturalism', and 'education'. The conceptual analysis on 'multicultural education', then, to me, may be more effectively done when each of the elements in the concept is made clear. Hence, I intend to approach the conceptual analysis by decomposing the whole into smaller constituents, and giving each component element a philosophical analysis, thus paving the way for the unraveling of the whole concept. Although the meaning of a whole concept may be different from what the analysis of the constituents would suggest, I will argue that being a programmatic definition, the concept of multicultural education indeed reflects the major meanings of its constituent parts. Strictly, this approach is different from the traditional ordinary language analysis. But it is still based on the traditional ordinary language analysis in that it makes explicit the rules by which the terms function.
In the first part of the chapter--Culture and Multiculturalism, different theories on 'culture' will be summarized and 'culture' will be approached in terms of how it is used both in the ordinary language and in the technical literature in order to draw out an explicit picture on what 'culture' entails. The notion of 'multiculturalism' will then be analyzed. In the second part, 'education' will be examined. The third part of the chapter will present a normative argument on what multicultural education should be. It is in this part the programmatic definition of the concept will be explained and evaluated. In treating the smaller parts individually first in the concept of multicultural education, and then evaluating it as a programmatic definition, a clearer picture of what multicultural education is hopefully will emerge.

2. CULTURE AND MULTICULTURALISM

Before the attempt to analyze the concept of culture from a linguistic perspective, i.e. making explicit the rules according to which the term functions in ordinary
language, I think it may be helpful to briefly summarize some of the major cultural theories and the ordinary language use of 'culture' of the academy so that we have a theoretical background for the linguistic analysis that will follow. A thorough critical review of the cultural theories is beyond the scope of the study. The immediate concern of the study here is to use the summary as a theoretical pavement to a better understanding of 'culture'.

'Culture' connotes a complex integrated system of beliefs and behaviors. Due to its complexity, the concept has been approached in many different ways and has often been the center of debate. Contributions to the understanding of 'culture' are found in many disciplines. There are sociological, anthropological, philosophical, political and lexical definitions.

According to Karl Marx, a society is divided into two parts: superstructure (the political and social structure of a given society) and economic base (the productive power and social relations). Culture, being an
aspect of the ‘superstructure’ consists primarily of thoughts, moods, feelings, beliefs, and values, and it is separated from the concretes of social ‘infrastructure’, namely, means of production and social relations. Viewing from this perspective, culture is abstract, and remote from all forms of observable human behaviors. Social scientists and anthropologists look at culture from the perspective that culture is something specific to human being. It is "species-specific". Only human possesses culture. In sociology and anthropology, however, the concept of culture has been approached in many ways. As early as 1891, the well known anthropologist E.B. Taylor summarized culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." Culture is defined differently by an influential cognitive anthropologist, Ward H. Goodenough, as cognitive systems. He wrote:

A society's culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a
manner acceptable to its members. Culture is not a material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behavior, or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the form of things that people have in mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them.3

In this Goodenough's definition, culture is seen as systems of knowledge, beliefs, and values. It is something that exists in the mind of an individual. It is the mental equipment that society members use in orienting, transacting, discussing, defining, categorizing, and interpreting actual social behavior in the society. This view of culture is different from Taylor's in that Goodenough takes culture as something abstract and invisible, whereas Taylor's definition gives us the impression that culture is the total sum of different aspects of life, which includes something as concrete as laws and customs.

In 1952, Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn published over 160 definitions of 'culture' in their
cultural studies. They offered a synthesized culture definition:

culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially attached values.4

This definition although is a synthesized view of culture out of the many collected definitions, it is criticized as including too much and being "too diffuse either to separate analytically the twisted threads of human experience or to interpret the designs into which they are woven."5 Recent conceptualization of culture has been toward a more concise definition of culture.

The new attempts consist the theorists who look at 'culture' from the perspective of phenomenology. In plain terms, they studied 'culture' from the realms of symbolic meaning system. Culture, in this view, is a semiotic
system in which symbols, like language, function to communicate meaning from one mind to another. Phenomenologists such as Peter L. Berger held that the very heart of the world that humans create is socially constructed meaning. When interacting with society, the individual first attaches meaning and interpretations to his or her actions. These meanings then become objectified in the artifacts of culture—ideologies, belief systems, moral codes, institutions, and so on in the social process of concerting with one another, and after that, the meanings are reabsorbed in the individual consciousness as subjectively plausible definitions of reality. Thus, culture in Berger’s language is the totality of man’s products. This way of interpreting the world defines the culture as an all-embracing socially constructed meanings. Without the intended and subjectively meaningful actions of culture, there would be no such thing as culture. Culture emerges out of subjective meanings.

Like Berger, Geertz, a major advocate of symbolic anthropology, thought that culture is a result of
socially constructed meaning. In Geertz's symbolic anthropology, culture is seen as a system of shared symbols and meanings. What Geertz would emphasize is that meanings do not exist in people's head; and symbols and meanings are shared by social actors--between, not in them; they are public, not private. Cultural patterns, he says, are not reified or metaphysical: like rocks and dreams "they are things of this world." To study culture then is to study shared codes of meaning."

The difference between Goodenough's cultural theory and Geertz' can be placed in their theoretical perspectives which differ most significantly with respect to where they locate culture. For Geertz, culture is a system of shared symbols that exists outside the individual. Although each person in the society has his or her own perception of it, culture is independent of individual human minds. Culture is an autonomous system of symbols that the individual is free to deal with as he or she sees fit--to use as a guide, to manipulate to advantage, to attempt to change.
For Goodenough, culture exists in the minds of individual human beings. That does not necessarily mean that individuals participate in the same model of culture. He held that individuals do not share exactly the same model of their culture, just as they do not share in the same model of language. For example, they speak different dialects and idiolects. The different cultural model individuals have, to Goodenough, is explained by the variations in biological heritage, unique personal histories, and different social roles.

Despite the unsettled debates on the concept of culture, it seems that there is something generic in the concept that most theorists on 'culture' agree. As summarized by Talcott Parsons:

...first, that culture is transmitted, it constitutes a heritage or a social tradition; secondly, that it is learned, it is not a manifestation, in particular content, of man's genetic constitution; and third, that it is shared. Culture, that is, is on the one hand the product of, on the other hand a determinant of, systems of human social interaction.
The notion of collectiveness or grouping is a defining characteristic of 'culture'. When a person says: "That is my cultural practice", this person is declaring his or her group identity, the subjective declaration of one's attached ideas, values and behaviors that characterize a group. It is important to note that Parsons' summary of 'culture' seems to point out that culture is not biologically inherited; that group identity should not automatically be identified with national origin or certain physical characteristics. Rather, cultural identity is closely related with common beliefs, values; with similar behavioral patterns reflecting shared values; and with shared group experiences and aspirations.

It is often assumed that racial differences are a signal of cultural differences. The explanation seems to reside in the fact that people living in the same geographical location tend to develop similar physical characteristics as a result of genetic determination and adaptation to the natural conditions such as the climate, the productivity of the land and the food they eat and
the way they prepare their food. To a large extent, human physical development is indeed conditioned by the natural environment humans are in. People living geographically close to each other also tend to influence one another on their ways of living and on their ways of viewing the world. Empirically, it is not difficult to find people from the same culture bearing similar physical outlooks and behavioral patterns, and holding similar beliefs. Proximity is the major explanation. If physical characteristics are to be used as cultural identifier, they are only the superficial up-for-grab criteria for cultural distinction. They cannot serve as key identifiers for cultural groups. What really marks out a group as a cultural group must be shared and learned values, beliefs; similar behavioral patterns and common experiences and fate. A person having family roots in a particular culture can stop his or her own cultural identity by ceasing to share those values that his or her original cultural group practices. An individual consequently can enter into another cultural group by sharing and valuing those ideas and practices and beliefs that the cultural group identifies itself with. Given
that race and culture are independent concepts, it is a mistake to use race categorization as an indicator of a cultural group. Given that culture has to do with learned characteristics, education can render people a degree of choice in terms of what culture or cultural practice can be adopted and what cannot.

Cultures change over time, they are never static. Education will change cultures as well as reflect them. In feudal China, it used to be in the Chinese culture for women to bind their feet because women with small feet were regarded as beautiful. This practice no longer exists in Chinese culture today as a result of education, learning and changing beliefs. Because feet-binding is detrimental to women's health, it is regarded as an undesirable practice for women. Consequently, small feet is no longer part of the concept of beauty in Chinese culture.

'Culture' as used in ordinary language has a "high culture" meaning which is quite distinct from the concept popularized by the anthropologists. This "high culture"
meaning is in essence a metaphorical term in its social, intellectual and artistic sense. The word 'culture' comes from the Latin word 'cultura', meaning cultivating the soil. The early meanings of the word 'culture' center on a process. Cultivation of the mind was analogized with cultivation of the soil. 'Culture' is seen as a process of cultivation and expresses an ideal of human perfection of the mind. When we hear the remark: "This is a cultured man," we would not logically frown upon the person, rather, we would associate adjectives such as civilized, good-mannered, well-educated and other positive values with the person. Put differently, it would be a logical contradiction to say that man is a cultured individual, and at the same time treat this person as undesirable. The matter of the fact is the word 'culture' has the disposition to fall into the camp of positive values. It is used to indicate positive attitudes toward others. This is the evaluative or value usage of the word in the ordinary language which regards culture as a process for human perfection.
Later development on the usage of the word (the academic use) tends to use the word to describe differences in the ways in which men find meaning and value in their lives. This usage is widely reflected in anthropology and sociology as explained before. The usage is technically descriptive or reportive. It describes what different people do and make and think, without regard to any artistic or intellectual merit. The technical reportive/descriptive use of the word lays its emphasis on particular ways of life, material, intellectual, and spiritual of a given society. Another common usage of the word 'culture' refers to a body of actual artistic and intellectual work.

The conceptual analysis of 'culture' shows that there are different uses of the word 'culture'. It can be used to refer to a general state of the mind, the process of intellectual and moral development in a society, and it can be used to describe different ways of life, and general body of arts and intellectual work. In the concept of multicultural education, only the technical reportive/descriptive definitions of 'culture' is being
used, not the high culture meaning in ordinary language.

'Multiculturalism' has the prefix 'multi' added to the notion of culture. 'Multi' is usually used to mean many, bearing the sense of having more than two. According to Tesconi, 'multiculturalism' can be used either as a descriptor or as a prescriptor. According to him, 'multiculturalism', in its descriptive sense, depicts the condition of numerous life styles, values, and belief systems. It is a term used to express the empirical fact that there are many different ways of existence. In its prescriptive sense, 'multiculturalism' carries an ideological connotation urging for the forging of social and educational policy. The evaluative use of the term holds that "any human society is best served by maximizing (or at least maintaining) the distinctiveness of different tastes and values in just about every conceivable realm of human experience--political, religious, social, linguistic, and so on." According to this argument, calling for the preservation of cultural differences in the prescriptive sense of 'multiculturalism' is the affirmation of the welcoming.
attitude toward cultural diversity. Tesconi's intention was to argue that different cultural practices generally are a valuable resource for the American society, therefore, they should be preserved. His argument was advanced toward the attitude and practice that are against cultural diversity. Focusing on promoting the idea that American schools should embrace and teach cultural diversity, he did not associate himself with the question whether all differences are good, or should be accepted. Should multicultural education teach children to accept and value all cultural differences? The answer to this question requires us to understand better the last constituent part of the whole concept, namely, education.

3. EDUCATION

The concept 'education' plays an important role in the concept of multicultural education, and it will help us to get a better grip of 'multicultural education' if we make clear what we mean when we speak of 'education'. It must be noted that there is an extensive literature on
the concept of education. What I intend here is to summarize some of the major works of philosophers: Cornel M. Hamm, R.S. Peters, and John Chambers.

Hamm in his *Philosophical Issues in Education* summarized three uses of 'education'. They are the sociological use, the institutional use and the general enlightenment use. The sociological use of 'education', according to Hamm, refers to the child-rearing practices of a people or society to socialize the child into the extant culture. It raises no questions where the learning takes place, whether the beliefs acquired are true or false, whether the practices and skills learned are morally acceptable from a universalizable standpoint, or whether the end result is a closed mind individual. All that is involved is whether the child is acculturated into the particular culture. Thus, whoever is properly 'acculturated' or 'socialized' is 'educated'.

The institutional use of 'education' refers to a person's development as a result of influences from schools or other formal 'educational institutions'. This
use of 'education' focuses on the place where the learning takes place. 'Education' is often used to mean schools as represented in the question "Where did you get your education?" The question in essence is asking: "where did you go to school?". 'Schooling' and 'education' are treated as synonymous in the institutional use of 'education'.

Although 'education' and 'school' are pragmatically treated as synonyms, they are not logical equivalents. A careful observation of the ordinary language would reveal that people also take 'education' and 'school' as contrasts. The underlying assumption of the frequently heard remark "That kid went to school, but I don't think he is educated" indicates to us that someone can be schooled, but not necessarily educated. Education should be more than being schooled. It seems that 'education' has a more profound and thoughtful sense. And this is what Hamm called the 'General Enlightenment' use.

The general enlightenment use of 'education' refers to a particular kind of human achievement which is
considered to be a most valuable development of mind characterized by knowledge and understanding. This use of education goes beyond schooling and socialization (the first two uses of ‘education’). As Hamm noted: "It (general enlightenment use) is the use that clearly is central to any discussion of education which is not superficial." What is education in the enlightenment sense then? What are its necessary criteria or conditions? The answers to these questions are found in R.S. Peters' analysis of ‘education’. It is to this end that we are turning now.

R.S. Peters argued that education should be those activities that can change the form of a person's life so that his/her conduct, the activities he/she is committed to, and his/her judgements and feelings are thought to be desirable. Peters' analysis of 'education' in the enlightenment sense centers around the following three criteria: (1) intrinsic value or desirability, (2) knowledge and (3) procedural requirement.
According to Peters, education in the general enlightenment sense is value-laden. It must be something worthwhile and desirable. To quote him: "It would be a logical contradiction to say that a man had been educated but that he had in no way changed for the better." To be educated is to become a better person. The value of becoming better is always embedded in the concept of education. Peters argued that education must be of value-of intrinsic value, not mere instrumental value. A distinction between the two values is in order. This distinction is well explained by Chambers in the analysis of 'education' in his The Achievement of Education.

According to chambers, things and activities have values. A desk has value in that it provides people with a place to write, or perhaps a place to set up a computer. A telephone's value depends on its quality and quantity to provide service to human communicative needs. These are instances of instrumental value, for the value depends on their pursuit in people's uses. However, there are things that have value in and of themselves. These are intrinsically valuable things. A case in point is
happiness. The value of happiness does not depend on people's uses of it. To make the point clearer, let's have a look at a dialogue between a child with a curious mind and the father who jogs frequently.

Child:  "Why do you get up so early, Daddy? "]
Father:  "I want to jog." 
Child:  "Jogging? why?"
Father:  "It will keep me in good shape."
Child:  "Why do you want to keep in good shape?"
Father:  "Because I will feel good about myself."
Child:  "But why do you want to feel good about yourself?"
Father:  "Because it makes me happy."
Child:  "Why do you want to be happy?"
Father:  "Because when I am happy, I can do a lot of things."
Child:  "But why do you want to do a lot of things?"
Father:  "Because I will feel good."
Child:  "But why?"
Father:  "........."
The dialogue seems to be trapped in a loop. Everything comes down to the aim of happiness. The question "why happiness?" seems odd from the adult point of view because everybody by nature desires to be happy. There is no why to ask for happiness. The reason is that happiness is an end itself. It is intrinsically valuable. From here, we can say that intrinsically valuable activities are ends-in-themselves. These are the activities people do for their own sake.

As far as education is concerned, Peters argued that education, though they may be or may be used as instrumentally valuable activities, should be those activities that are intrinsically valuable. However, not all intrinsically valuable activities are education. Eating, relaxing may be intrinsically valuable, but they may not be educational. Education must involve knowledge and procedural criteria, too.

To Peters, an educated person is also a knowledgeable person. There could not logically be an educated person who is not knowledgeable. However, having
knowledge is not sufficient for being an educated person. This is because it is logically possible for a person to be knowledgeable but not well educated. For example, a person may know many mathematical formulas. Therefore, he/she can write down different formulas when asked to do so. In this sense, we can describe this person as knowledgeable. However, we cannot describe the person as educated if he/she fails to connect the formulas with real life mathematical problems, or if he/she fails to use the logical skills of mathematics in thinking about other problems. That is, if this person is consistently self-contradictory in dealing with others without realizing it, or perhaps realizing the self-contradiction without recognizing the absurdity of the logical mistake he/she has made, this person cannot be said to be educated. This is because there is a lack of appreciation of mathematical principles and a failure to utilize mathematics. Education to Peters is about the bringing about of a whole person, a person who has knowledge in breadth and depth, not just a particular skill or technique in a certain field, and understanding and appreciation of principles. Having knowledge alone is not
sufficient for someone to be qualified as educated, for the predicates 'educated' and 'knowledgeable' describe two different qualities of a person. Education, Peters argued, should involve the transforming the forms of thought and awareness that can and should spill over into things that go on outside in the world. The knowledge learned must be used in such a way as to make a difference in the individual's general view of the world and in his actions with the world. An educated person cannot just act logically when dealing with mathematics, but ignore the very principles otherwise. An educated person is one who "exhibit(s) some mastery of forms of thought and awareness, which are not harnessed purely to utilitarian or vocational purposes or completely confined to one mode."\textsuperscript{15}

Besides this knowledge criterion for education, Peters argued that there should be a procedural criterion for education. This refers to the manner in which the task (teaching, instructing and attending school, etc.) in education is conducted. The procedure must be consistent with the desirable ends to be achieved. It
must not be coercive, and must not infringe upon the willingness and voluntariness of the learner or achiever. It must be based on moral grounds.

Drawing upon Peters' analysis, Chambers also argued that education should be those intrinsically valuable activities that broaden the cognitive perspective and rationality of people. To put it differently, the intrinsically valuable activity must be able to enlighten the person to view the world in a new, wider perspective. The cognitive perspective refers to the general understanding of the world--the activities of the world and the ways of approaching the world. According to Chambers: "Educational experiences and activities give meaning to features of the world other than themselves. Their meaning is not tied merely to the activity or experience itself. It is general, not specific. It gives comprehension. Education helps people to see the world differently." He further explains: "To count as education, the activities of schools must in fact be such that they broaden children's outlook on life, give perspective to what they do, provide meaning, knowledge,
and real understanding, and encounter with values, and thus help to make children more rational."17

Rationality is best understood with the ability of critical thinking. To be rational, a person should embody degrees of critical ability, i.e. to be able to judge non-arbitrarily, impartially and objectively. Non-arbitrary judgment is one that reflects reasons, standards and criteria that can be publicly debated. A teacher grades a student’s paper based on his/her moods or whims, not on the standards of grading in the academia is an instance of arbitration. Arbitrary judgment involves mere evocative feelings. It is based on mere preferences and personal attitude.

A partial judgement is one that only takes a portion of the evidence into consideration. Contrarily, an impartial judgement must show some deliberation on every possible aspect of an issue. "A rational person seeks as much relevant information as time and circumstance permit, for he knows that it is necessary to obtain as many germane facts as possible, not merely a few of them,
or only those that are comforting to his present views.\textsuperscript{18}

Objectivity requires us to face the facts squarely, and to be on the guard against the attempting human irrationalities: biases, bigotries, prejudices, fond hopes, wishes, dogmatisms, irrelevancies, delusions and unrealities. An educated person must show these three qualities in his/her dealings with the world, because, as Chambers indicated, an educated person is a rational person.

Although 'education' has the sociological and the institutional use, the enlightenment use of 'education' as summarized by Hamm from theories of Peters, Hirst and Chambers is more desirable as we talk about multicultural education. To understand this fully, we must move on to examine the whole concept, multicultural education.
The concept 'multicultural education', while capable of being evaluated on the usages of its individual constituents, is not only a descriptive definition, but also a programmatic definition. Among a number of theorists dealing with definitions, Israel Scheffler has clearly and carefully explained the nature of descriptive and programmatic definitions. According to him, a descriptive definition purports to provide explanatory accounts of meaning. It provides a general accounts of its prior use. A programmatic definition, on the other hand, is one which attempts to arouse feelings of support by incorporating a program or project in the definition. Thus, programmatic definitions raise moral questions such as whether or not the program expressed by the definition ought to be adopted, and call for evaluation of practice which include appraising the soundness of the practices proposed by the program; and for the appraisal of commitments." Scheffler also argued that it is possible to have a definition that is both descriptive and programmatic. Such a definition must
undergo double evaluation, one on its descriptive nature, the other on its programmatic nature.

A close examination would reveal that 'multicultural education' is both a descriptive and programmatic definition. Having 'multiculture' and 'education' intentionally combined together, the newly forged concept 'multicultural education' is programmed not only with the descriptive characteristics and certain uses of its constituting segments, but also the intention of the programmers to bring about a situation or society devoid of prejudice and discrimination in schools and in public places, and a world where people of differences can live peacefully and cooperatively together. This program suggested by the programmatic definition of 'multicultural education' is highly desirable and justifiable in the light of its goals. It aims at bringing about a harmonious society and a peaceful world for everybody through education. To achieve these goals, 'education' used in the concept of multicultural education cannot merely be understood in its sociological and institutional use because creating a harmonious
society devoid of prejudice and discrimination requires people to exercise their judgment about what is right and what is wrong. Merely associating the younger generation into a particular extant culture without enabling them to make intelligent decisions as to whether the beliefs acquired are true or false will not achieve the goals of multicultural education. Merely placing children in multicultural schools does not directly address the question how the problem of prejudice and discrimination will disappear, and how the society will become culturally more harmonious for everybody. The enlightenment sense of 'education' stresses not only the cognitive perspective of the student, but also the improvement of their critical thinking skills and rationality. This emphasis is more likely to make students realize the harm cultural conflicts can do to a society, and the good a harmonious society can bring to everybody. It appears that to achieve the goals of multicultural education as specified before, we must rely on both the descriptive use of 'multicultural education' and the intentions imbued in the programmatic definition of this concept.
Relying on the descriptive uses of 'culture', 'multiculturalism' and 'education', 'multicultural education' can be taken to mean providing a school environment that presents as subject matter different ways of living and different beliefs. This in turn can be exemplified with making available books about cultural groups in school libraries, adding chapters about cultural groups in textbooks, eating ethnic food in schools, etc.. How important are these activities? What significance does making students eat ethnic food have? And what relevance does the inclusion of ethnic and cultural groups in school curriculum possess? To answer these questions, we need a reply to another related question, which is: whether the practices elicited from the descriptive use of 'multicultural education' are sufficient to complete the above mentioned programs in the programmatic definition of 'multicultural education'. The answer seems to be negative. This is because the practices, which have the descriptive use of 'multicultural education' as their foundations, focus only on the cognitive perspective of the student.
The availability of the books about other cultures and the inclusion of ethnic and cultural chapters indicate that the aim is to draw attention to cultural differences. This way, students will have a place to turn to for knowledge about others. It is hoped that curiosity about other people and confusion about what and why other people do things the way they do can be handled more effectively. Also, eating ethnic food shows that people eat many different kinds of food in the world. Students will be able to distinguish, for example, Chinese food from Indian food, Mexican from Japanese after experiencing different food. The aim of the activity is to pass knowledge of different food preferences to the student and make the fact that people have different life styles in the world known to students. Again, the knowledge objective is obvious.

It is certainly hoped and generally agreed that knowledge about others will prevent curiosity and doubts from becoming seeds of alienation and hatred. No matter what psychological grounds this hope rests on, there is one logical aspect that we cannot afford to ignore. That
is, making people more knowledgeable about cultural differences is perhaps a necessary but certainly not a sufficient condition for cultural harmony and appreciation of cultural diversity. Trying to make students value diversity solely by teaching them cultural knowledge err in that they assume the content of morality (whether cultural differences are good) can be discovered by studying what is the case (cultural facts). Strictly speaking, a naturalistic fallacy (or Is-Ought fallacy) is committed.

To quote Straughan, the naturalistic fallacy is an attack "against naturalistic view that the moral domain can be defined purely by reference to facts about man and the world, and that the content of morality can be discovered simply by studying what is the case." In attacking naturalism, many critics held that a moral evaluation of a state of affairs cannot be derived directly from the factual description of that state of affairs. Facts are generally morally neutral. They can have either a positive or a negative value placed upon them. For example, the hypothetical fact that there are
only 100 whales left in the world is subject to both positive and negative evaluations. People who value preserving our natural environment and care about endangered species will deplore the fact. Consequently, the moral conclusion to be drawn upon the fact is that whale-hunting ought to be stopped. Nonetheless, for those who do not like the species in the world, the fact that there are only 100 whales left in the world becomes a good thing.

What this demonstrates is that one cannot naively take it for granted that knowledge about others, about what others do, and why they do it, about the kind of food others eat will make people come to value the ways of existence of others and, thus, respect the cultures others have. Based on Straughan's definition of naturalistic fallacy, trying to teach children that cultural differences are good simply by teaching them cultural facts is committing Is-Ought fallacy. Knowing what other people do does not lead us to believe what they do is desirable. It may be perfectly logical for an individual to depreciate a particular ethnic food while
eating it. It can also be supposed that someone reading the lives of the !Kung of the Kalahari Desert in Africa could murmur to him/herself: "Savage and backward life! I can never appreciate this kind of uncivilization!" The point is, it is possible for people to place a negative value on others' life-styles when they add knowledge about others to their mind. To teach students to value cultural diversity must then go beyond the teaching of cultural facts.

Scheffler in his Conditions of Knowledge argued that "understanding and appreciation cannot, it would seem, readily be said to be exercises of technique or know-how...for there seems to be no such thing as an understanding know-how or an appreciating know-how."21 To me, he was saying that having propositional knowledge: knowing that, and having procedural knowledge: knowing how, does not necessarily produce propensities. This is because "a skill or element of know-how, once acquired, may or may not be exercised, given the relevant opportunities; a person may be said to have a skill or the relevant know-how even though he never (or very
rarely) exercises it after having acquired it, although he has ample opportunity to do so." The range of educational concepts, according to Scheffler's analysis, is larger than that of knowledge. Education as interpreted by Scheffler is not only to pass knowledge, develop understanding and appreciation, but also to embrace the formation of propensities and traits. He clearly set out the formation of dispositions, tendencies and propensities as educational goals.

It appears that multicultural education, if it is to serve the goal of cultural harmony, requires more than knowledge about others. The addition of the knowledge about cultural differences for our students should be accompanied with the raising of the rationality or the improvement of reasoning skills of our students in dealing with cultural differences as well as motivating the student to want to act upon his/her moral reasoning, i.e. Scheffler's notion of dispositions. Students need to be armed with analytical and reasoning skills so that they are able to assess cultural facts in the most objective, impartial and non-arbitrary manner. They also
need to be led to repeatedly practice these skills. If we are sincere in having a situation that offers equal social and educational opportunities for everyone and having a peaceful world, the focus on changing the state of affairs (e.g. adding knowledge about others) is minimal. Multicultural education must focus on striving to make people develop tendencies to act upon their judgments through fostering reasoning skills. They need to be taught that it is for the better for everyone to act upon rational judgments made about cultural differences, and that it is important to treat an individual as a person, not as one who is physically, thus intellectually, different from "us". The goal of multicultural education, properly understood, can be realized only when multicultural education is taken beyond the propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge to formation of dispositions, propensities, and tendencies.

The state of mind of a person is a crucial factor in directing a person's conduct. If a person has a mind that values an object or an activity, this person will not
likely to cause harm to it. Instead, he/she will be more likely to care about the well-being of the object and set a tone in favor of the activity. Our experiences are full of examples of this kind. A person who values doing exercises would do every effort to keep up with it. However, for a person who does not think doing exercise is important, no matter how many exercising facilities are provided for the individual, he/she will not likely to use them seriously.

What the analysis amounts to is the emphasis on the change of the existing prejudicial attitudes or mind in the society. Among the changes called for by multiculturalists, the most important change at present should be the change of the prejudicial and discriminative attitudes toward people who are culturally different. It can be predicted that once the discriminative attitudes are changed into a mind-set that respects human dignity, discriminative actions will be lessened. The change must made in such a way that people are motivated to act upon the result of their rational judgements on cultural differences. ‘Multicultural
education' should be reconceptualized to establish these goals. Schools should be designed to meet these goals.

It should be pointed out that the change of attitude and dispositions cannot be brought about without the enlightenment of the mind, which, in turn, cannot come about without moral value reasoning. Moral value reasoning for the present study is to be understood as not only imparting the reasoning skills to the students, but teaching the student the importance of consistency, providing the student with opportunities to reason with others, and motivating the student to willingly subject themselves to the reasoning principles learned.

Multicultural education, I am arguing, is a moral concern. It is, in a large part, the education about making moral value judgements in relation to cultural differences and teaching students to act upon their decisions. It cannot be conducted in the manner as if we are dealing with a morally neutral or non-moral concept. For one thing, the teaching of the whats, hows, and whys of a particular culture, practically, cannot be treated
in a morally neutral way. To quote Wright and LaBar: "Whether only the material culture is studied, or the underlying beliefs and values of a culture are focused upon, teachers, through verbal or non-verbal means, will indicate how they judge the content (that some practices are desirable or undesirable; or that all practices are equally good). In addition, students also will make judgments." This is because "...(a) person has to assimilate, accommodate and evaluate new information." When confronted with new information, an individual tends to sort it according to certain attitude or judgment about it. e.g. whether the information is useful, reliable, and good to be retained. Since 'multicultural education' itself has a value dimension to it, the teaching of it cannot but incorporate moral value reasoning.

For another thing, for whatever has been done in the program of multicultural education--studying ethnic histories, eating ethnic food, adding more minority in school faculty and staff, there seems to be one similar underlying aim, which is to get students to agree that
cultural differences can enrich American society. i.e., it is desirable to preserve and respect cultural differences. This aim has a moral dimension to it. it tries to reach the value territory of an individual (whether something is morally good or bad, desirable or undesirable) and to bring about a value judgment in favor of cultural differences.

What is often neglected by current practices of multicultural education advocates is that the desired value position that cultural differences are good itself is subject to evaluation. As a matter of fact, whether all differences should be celebrated has often been and ought to be a center of debate. It is usually taken for granted that multicultural education wants people to value and respect every single cultural practice, which may include "exposing unwanted children to the elements and certain death, a custom still widely practiced in some countries in Asia and Africa" and certain cult’s cultural practice of killing innocent humans for sacrifice. This understanding of multicultural education is certainly erroneous because there are cultural
differences such as the above listed that violate the cardinal principle of multicultural education. We must remember that multicultural education arose out of the appreciation for each member of the humanity as a person worthwhile in his or her own right. It is not reasonable to generalize that because multicultural education involves respecting cultural differences that all cultural differences should be valued and appraised without justification. Some differences are morally justifiable, some may not. Differences such as promotion of sexism, killing innocent human being for certain metaphysical belief should not be valued and appraised. The practice of sex discrimination is differential treatment based on the unjustifiable criteria of gender. A woman is as much a person (in the sense of personhood) as a man. Thus, she deserves every right to the things that a man is entitled to. To keep them from the privileges men enjoy in a society and to degrade them by assigning them a lower social status is morally unjust. Killing innocent human being for sacrifice as practiced by certain cults may be based on the reasoning that the sacrifice will bring some goodness to the community or
society; that the goodness is more worthwhile than the innocent human life. However, rational reasoning would reveal that this assumed goodness is empirically unverifiable. So far, no scientific evidence has pointed to the way that killing an innocent human life can bring about the assumed goodness to the world. Thus, the assumption should in no way override the value of a human life. The examples indicate that there are cultural differences that cannot and should not be valued and accepted.

Multicultural education being a moral concern demands that each cultural practice be assessed through reasoning. The generalization without individual's mind involvement will only result in a superficial agreement that cultural differences are good. A person can claim that cultural differences are good out of social pressure, the desire to be part of the popular trend or other situational necessity. This claim is only a way of saying "I don't really care about the issue. Whatever you say, I won't argue." While whether this person will act in accordance with the prescribed treatment for cultural
differences is not clear, it is clear that this person is not likely to actively participate in the campaign of multicultural movement. To make the individual care, teachers must engage him or her in the mind struggle for rational reasons, to make the student see the issue with the "eye" of the mind. Only when the student is motivated, he or she will want to do something for multicultural education. The value position in regard to cultural differences has to be arrived at by students themselves through guided moral reasoning and evaluation of the cultural differences. Objectivity, impartiality and non-arbitrariness are the elements that must be cultivated when we educate about cultural differences.

In order to evaluate cultural practices, relevant facts need be collected, examined and compared. Political, economic, religious and geographical factors must be taken into consideration. Modes and skills of reasoning must be developed for arriving at rational judgments concerning how people of differing backgrounds should be treated. Equally important in the process of evaluation is whether such a practice infringes on
others' rights to make choices.

It must also be pointed out that up to the present stage the call for the celebration of cultural differences in multicultural education mainly is for the achievement of a social end in American society. We celebrate cultural differences because we don't want people of different color, sex, religion, belief, people from lower economic class and people with physical disabilities to be treated differently for their cultural and/or physical differences. The historical consideration for the multicultural education movement has defined the meaning of the concept for America at least for the current stage. That is, enlightening people's consciousness about cultural differences, providing equal opportunities for people of different cultures, respecting individuals as persons and preparing people to function well in a pluralistic society. Understanding multicultural education in this way, we don't need to claim that all differences must be valued in order to value multicultural education. We can uphold the goals of multicultural education by rationally evaluating cultural
differences and similarities. There is no inherent contradiction for us to respect culturally different people without accepting and valuing some of their unjustified practices. Hence, the immediate concern of multicultural education has to be one of developing beliefs and modes of reasoning by which we can make intelligent decisions concerning how the needs, interests, and feelings of people should be construed, and how conflicts of interest should be resolved. Because the point of these modes of reasoning is to guide conduct, multicultural education involves initiation into rational modes of conduct which must be directed toward all people.
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CHAPTER IV

CRITICISMS OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

1. INTRODUCTION

It is imperative to point out that in some varieties of multicultural education conceptualizations, there have been unclarified concepts and unjustified arguments that often lead to confusion, questions, and sometimes rejection of multicultural education. Many have disagreed with the content and aim and goals of multicultural education. Many, including well-intentioned politicians, social and educational theorists have serious doubts about the desirability of the program. Criticisms of multicultural education range from the claim that multicultural education restricts individual opportunity and individual autonomy, and hence it is a threat to the democratic ideal to the claim that multicultural education divides people, thus does more harm than good to the human community.
Critics also pose questions on issues of cultural relativism in association with multicultural education. They argue that cultural relativism suggests that cultures cannot be judged or evaluated from a single or absolute ethical or moral perspective. Evaluations are relative to the background from which they arise. No culture's values, ethics or morals may be judged as inherently superior to another's. They point out that if multicultural education rejects ethnocentrism, and embraces cultural differences as what is being claimed by many multiculturalists, then multicultural education should not encourage students to pass value judgments on another people's cultural practices. This is because people tend to judge others from their own cultural perspective. If the evaluation is based on one's own cultural standards, then ethnocentrism is committed. Following this argument, multicultural education should only teach students to accept and value differences. But can all kinds of cultural practices be valued, celebrated and embraced? If not, how can advocates of multicultural education solve this problem?
The three criticisms of multicultural education in the name that 1) multicultural education infringes on individual autonomy, thus it is against democracy; 2) multicultural education promotes disunity of the nation; and 3) multicultural education indulges cultural practices commonly held as morally undesirable, are serious challenges to the program of multicultural education. For multicultural education to reach its expectations, these challenges must be met. This chapter is devoted to this end. In it, I will critically analyze these major criticisms of multicultural education and argue that these critics are misguided by the confusion surrounding 'multicultural education'. These criticisms can be refuted if we take 'multicultural education' as cultivating critical thinking and developing an attitude that values human essence. That the reconceptualization of 'multicultural education' in the present study will avoid these problems.
2. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

One of the serious criticisms on cultural pluralism is the possible conflict between the call for the maintenance of ethnic enclaves and the valuable democratic ideal of individuality and personal autonomy. To explain this differently, the call for the maintenance of ethnic groups may require members of the same ethnicity to band together and conform to group principles. This way, individuals will be required by the pluralism ideology to give up some of their individual autonomy for group interest. So the argument goes, the conflict between cultural pluralism and the democratic ideal of individuality is thus created. Since multicultural education as conceptualized by many authors as the celebration of ethnicity and cultural differences, the criticism can be levelled against multicultural education, too. The issue here becomes whether multicultural education can be conceptualized and implemented in a way that it enhances individuality or personal autonomy as well as promoting democracy. The answer to the question requires that the issue be put
It has been pointed out succinctly by Charles A. Tesconi\textsuperscript{1} that multicultural education is "heavily imbued with the tenets and assumptions of the ideology of cultural pluralism.... questions and challenges which can be directed at cultural pluralism ideology are also appropriately raised relative to multiculturalism and multicultural education." It has been well established that the ideology of cultural pluralism promotes, celebrates and honors cultural differences\textsuperscript{2}. 'Cultural pluralism' as used by many writers as a technical definition carries with it a value judgment that cultural differences are good. For the benefit of the existing society, these differences should be preserved. Thus, one of the biggest challenges for cultural pluralism, and for multicultural education, is the possible conflict between democracy and the ideal of pluralism. This challenge is explained by Nicholas Appleton and Orlando Patterson.

Nicholas Appleton in his book \textit{Cultural Pluralism in Education: Theoretical Foundations}, argued:
If it is true that a diversity of groups enriches a democratic environment and that groups play a major role in the development and actualization of individuals, there is also the potential for groups to restrict an individual's opportunities and autonomy.³

This line of argument about democracy and cultural pluralism or multicultural education actually can be traced back to Orlando Patterson, who, in numerous articles, criticized cultural pluralism for being in conflict with the democratic ideal. He said: "Ethnicity, and the spurious philosophy of pluralism that rationalizes it, are the new dangers to individuality and personal autonomy."⁴ Patterson's basic argument seems to be that the celebration of the existence of different cultural groups and the call for members of different cultures to line-up with their cultural groups will necessarily suppress individuality or personal freedom, and thus, will hamper the democratic spirit of the country. Since democracy is a central point here, we need to understand it in more detail along Dewey's view of democracy as a way of life.
'Democracy' is often conceptualized as a way of life in the western world. According to John Dewey:

Democracy...means voluntary choice, based on an intelligence that is the outcome of free association and communication with others. It means a way of living together in which mutual and free consultation rule instead of force, and in which cooperation instead of brutal competition is the law of life; a social order in which all the forces that make for friendship, beauty and knowledge are cherished in order that each individual may become what he and he alone, is capable of becoming.5

Democracy understood in the light of Deweyan liberalism has the following elements: 1) it involves voluntary choice on the part of the rational individual to make intelligent decisions as to what kind of identity he/she is willing to live with; 2) it nurtures cooperation and collective action for the facilitation of qualitative individual growth; and 3) it provides a ground for each individual to realize the self to the fullest extent. If we accept Dewey's conceptualization of 'democracy' here, then whether multicultural education
contradicts democracy lies in the question whether the three democratic elements manifest themselves in 'multicultural education' as conceptualized in Chapter III.

'Multicultural education' as conceptualized in Chapter III was argued to be best understood as a school movement to combat prejudice and discrimination levelled against minority individuals by fostering reasoning skills and dispositions of our students. It was argued multicultural education should not only provide cultural knowledge, but also cultural competence including the ability to reason well, the ability to make rational and moral judgements and the tendency to act upon their value decisions. Only when 'multicultural education' is taken and implemented in this manner will the possibility for a culturally harmonious society be increased. It is from this conceptualization that we see a complimentary nature between democracy and multicultural education. First of all, democracy in Dewey's conceptualization has room for individual to realize his or her capabilities. This characterization of democracy is also one that
characterizes multicultural education as conceptualized here. By calling for the elimination of discrimination and prejudice, one big, if not the most serious, hinderance, to the educational, social and economic achievement of ethnic minority people, multicultural education strives to render every student the opportunity to realize his or her potentials.

There is strong evidence that discrimination has prevented the ethnic minority people from getting employment and equal educational opportunity. Without equal educational opportunity and the opportunity to express one’s capability, self-realization remains a lip service. To realize what a person is capable of, there must be a facilitating environment. An environment that is free from discrimination and prejudice, a place where people are not humiliated or putdown for their cultural marks and a place that facilitates everybody’s learning. Multicultural education understood as enhancing reasoning skills and changing the mind and attitude of the student will bring about this environment. The focus on cultivating reasoning skills in multicultural education
enables the student to see more clearly which opinion is justified, which statement is false, which generalization is unwarranted. As a result, the student will less likely to be influenced by biases, and more likely not to form prejudices. The focus on changing the discriminatory attitude and mind through both cultivating reasoning skills and forming dispositions in multicultural education is likely to produce an individual who not only stays away from discrimination and prejudice, but actively participate in the multicultural education campaign against them. Using critical thinking skills, the student is more likely to understand that not all diversity will be celebrated, that diversity which does restrict autonomy will be rejected in multicultural education.

Second, one part of what multicultural education does is to inform students with cultural knowledge which is a potential resource for the provision of alternative frames of references, value structures, and life styles in which an individual may choose his or her identity. Multicultural education, as conceptualized in Chapter
III, involves dealing with cultivating critical thinking skills and enabling students to use these skills in deciding for themselves which lifestyle fits them better, and which not; whether having cultural diversity is desirable or not; why or why not. Through the practice of reasoning, evaluating, and weighing relevant facts, it is hoped that students will arrive at a new plateau with their reasoning skills sharpened, their consciousness enlightened. According to Dewey, a democratic system would encourage people to make intelligent decisions for themselves and for the community in which they live. Multicultural education understood as including cultivating critical thinking skills would attempt to teach the student a process to assess different sorts of information and avoid logical fallacies. If successful, this teaching would contribute a means for students to make intelligent decisions.

Third, it can be envisioned that teaching different cultural frames of existence, fostering rationality, and developing an attitude and a mind-set that celebrate human essence would be likely to enrich the quality of
cooperation and collective actions. Pratte argued that a multicultural society is a "cooperative venture for mutual advantage. Everyone profits from a plurality of groups expressing different values and interests." He explained this mutual advantage with Thomas F. Green's idea. Thomas F. Green explained:

The view is that any society is richer if it will allow a thousand flowers to blossom. The assumption is that no man's culture or way of life is so rich that it may not be further enriched by contact with other points of view. ... Diversity is further valued because it provides any society with a richer pool of leadership from which to draw in times of crisis.

Although Green's view of promoting diversity fails to take into consideration cultural differences that are not morally justifiable, he has explained clearly how diversity can be utilized to benefit everyone in a society. Multicultural education as conceptualized in Chapter III encourages people to respect every human as a person who has emotions and points of view, who can learn, and who is capable of rationality. It encourages
students to get in touch with people of different cultures. This way, it is assumed, people are likely to become more capable of understanding each other, more tolerant of differences. Since one of the three primary emphases of democracy as Dewey singled out is to bring about a cooperative environment which fosters individual growth, it can be claimed that multicultural education embraces democracy in this perspective, too.

What this analysis amounts to is the fact that the Deweyan notion of 'democracy' is manifested in its full strength in the reconceptualized concept of multicultural education. The claim that I am here making is that multicultural education (and cultural pluralism) and democracy need not be in conflict. They are, given the reconceptualization of 'multicultural education', complementary concepts.

To extend this argument, let us look further at the claim that multicultural education may limit individual autonomy and hamper the democratic spirit. To further examine this claim, let us begin by putting the issue
within the American social context.

The social context we encounter in the United States, especially for people not from the dominant white-middle class, has not been and is not free from discrimination. It seems that: America is a racist society. Racially and culturally motivated hate crimes are common. Discriminatory practices can be seen everywhere from employment to renting a house. Racial slurs can be heard from people who make decisions for justice in the legal system to children playing on the street. Blatant and subtle discrimination and unequal treatment can be detected everywhere. In order to obtain a better living situation for themselves, the oppressed may well decide they must take actions against social and institutional discrimination. The question these groups face is one of how this is to be done, of what actions promise to ameliorate the situation.

John Rawls in *A Theory of Justice* discussed extensively social associations and distributive justice. He described a society as a cooperative venture for
mutual advantage; and argued that a cooperative venture is typically marked by a conflict as well as by an identity of interests. Rawls said:

There is an identity of interests since social cooperation makes possible a better life for all than any would have if each were to live solely by his own efforts. There is a conflict of interests since persons are not indifferent as to how the greater benefits produced by their collaboration are distributed, for in order to pursue their ends they each prefer a larger to a lesser share.

One thing that is acknowledged here is that cooperation between or among people of similar interests will bring mutual advantage. Experiences have shown us that individual power alone is too limited. To challenge the social system, individual efforts are likely to accomplish very little. In order to assert power to influence the social system, people of similar interests must unite. Together, they can make a difference. The point here is that the formation of interest groups, theoretically speaking, may occur in order to bring about individual liberation. This is because groups play a
major role in the development and actualization of individuals. Viewed in this way, collective action on the part of groups may have a goal of increased individual autonomy, and hence would be consistent with a Deweyan notion of 'democracy'.

The challenge that multicultural education may restrict equal opportunity and individual autonomy, and hence may be a threat to the democratic ideal largely ignores the above argument. It may appeal to many people because it made use of the paradox of freedom inherited in the grouping practice. i.e., in order to protect individual freedom, it is necessary for individuals to form groups. However, group membership necessarily requires individuals to give some of their freedom for the principles of the group, for freedom in the sense of absence of restrictions will lead to anarchy or more oppression. The challenge is then a question of whether the formation of groups will lead to more individual autonomy or less, it is a question of whether the achievement of individual freedom can be attained efficiently in a very oppressive society without the
means of grouping practice. As I argued previously, the promotion of diversity of cultural groups is or at least should be for the very reason of individual autonomy. The attainment of a situation in which everyone in the world enjoys individual freedom necessitates the unity or grouping practice of individuals of similar aspirations, values, disposition and interests. Without united efforts, it will be very difficult to achieve individual autonomy. From this perspective, grouping is necessary in the achievement of individual freedom. Despite its possible limitations on individual autonomy for the short term, group membership eventually yields more power to each individual. The advantages of grouping practice overpowers the disadvantages inherent in the practice for the individual, thus, the conclusion that the cultural pluralism (and multicultural education) is consistent with democratic ideals follows.

3. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION, UNITY OR DIVISION?

Another challenge facing multicultural education is represented by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. In 1992,
Schlesinger published a book *The Disuniting of America*. In it, he claimed that multiculturalism arises as a reaction against Anglo- or Eurocentrism. He accused multiculturalists as "ethnocentric separatists" who are fragmenting the American society into separate ethnic communities. He wrote:

> The cult of ethnicity exaggerates differences, intensifies resentments and antagonisms, drives ever deeper the awful wedges between races and nationalities. The endgame is self-pity and self-ghettoization.11

Schlesinger argued that the teaching of history under the name of multicultural education was carried out for political and therapeutic purposes at the expenses of distorting historical facts. History as a weapon, he claimed, is an abuse of history. He also listed the 'crimes' of bilingual education in multicultural education programs: retarding rather than expediting the movement of Hispanic children into the English-speaking world; promoting segregation more than integration; nourishing self-ghettoization, which nourishes racial
antagonism. Bilingual education shuts doors and dooms people to second-class citizenship in American society. In all, he is arguing that multicultural education is dividing people into different segments of the society rather than uniting the nation. Multicultural education advocates antagonism, and degrades the common American identity of American people.

Although there are points in his book that I am sympathetic with, (for example that multicultural education is not solely about teaching ethnic traditions; that as far as teaching history is concerned, historical facts should be represented in the most objective manner; that deliberate omission of historical facts for political reasons such as raising self-esteem should be avoided,) and his criticisms may well be grounded in some of the multicultural education programs, practices and literature, I believe that multicultural education in my conceptualization would certainly avoid the results Schlesinger talked about. But before I turn to show how my conceptualization promotes unity instead of separatism, I must point out one obvious problem with
Schlesinger claimed that multicultural education came as a response to Anglo- or Eurocentrism; that multiculturalists are very often ethnocentric separatists who see little in the Western heritage beyond Western crimes. He wrote as if multicultural education is totally about anti-Western traditions. He claimed that ethnic ideologues have done their best to turn a college generation against Europe and the Western tradition. He spent pages answering the questions he raised himself: "Is the Western tradition a bar to progress and a curse on humanity? Would it really do America and the world good to get rid of the European legacy?" In defence of Western tradition, he said:

One of the oddities of the situation is that the assault on the Western tradition is conducted very largely with analytical weapons forged in the West. What are the names invoked by the coalition of latter-day Marxists, deconstructionists, poststructuralists, radical feminists, Afrocentrists? Marx, Nietzsche, Gramsci, Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Sartre, de
Beauvoir, Habermas, the Frankfurt "critical theory" school--Europeans all. The "unmasking," "demythologizing," "decanonizing," "dehegemonizing" blitz against Western culture depends on methods of critical analysis unique to the West--which surely testifies to the internally redemptive potentialities of the Western tradition.13

In addition, Schlesinger argued that it is the "crimes" of the West that have provoked great movements to end slavery, to raise the status of women, to abolish torture, to combat racism, to defend freedom of inquiry and expression, to advance personal liberty and human rights. The argument is: there is something valuable done by Western culture, and we cannot deny all western traditions.

While arguing that we should not go extreme by denying all Western cultures, Schlesinger himself went extreme in claiming that all multicultural education advocates deny all Western cultures. He threw a blanket over all multiculturalists and accuse them as anti-Western zealots. He made a sweeping generalization and
ignored that 'multicultural education' can be and is indeed conceptualized in such a way that it retains the cream of the Western culture as well as promotes the rights of other cultures to exist in American society. For example, multicultural education, conceptualized as cultivating critical thinking skills and the ability to rationally deal with moral issues, as providing students with a ground for practicing logical reasoning skills and facilitating students to form propensities to act on their moral reasoning, promotes the use of analytical and logical skills originated in Western culture as acknowledged by Schlesinger himself. This proves that not all multicultural education advocates deny all from the West.

Another proof lies in the fact that the goals of my conceptualization of 'multicultural education' are consistent with many of the ideals of Western culture. The values cherished in Western culture such as enhancing personal liberty and human rights, combating racism as indicated by Schlesinger are all reflected as major goals in my conceptualization of the concept. In this study, I
have argued repeatedly that multicultural education is for the creation of a harmonious society which is free from discrimination and prejudice, free from cultural conflicts and personal oppression. The achievement of these goals needs an education that makes people realize that having diversity is not a bad thing; that we need to promote the coexistence of different cultures in American society. As a multicultural education advocate myself and having established these goals for multicultural education, I have in no way acted as if all western cultures and values should be eradicated. As a matter of fact, I have shown that multicultural education can be linked with some of the cherished Western values; that not all multicultural education advocates are anti-Western zealots.

As for his challenge that multicultural education divides the nation into ethnic segments, thus promotes separatism, I can at least theoretically demonstrate that my conceptualization of 'multicultural education' will work for the unity of the nation, not separatism.
In my conceptualization, multicultural education is understood as teaching cultural knowledge, promoting reasoning skills, raising cultural consciousness, enlightening the mind about cultural differences, and developing tendencies to act on their moral decisions. If this conceptualization is indeed implemented in multicultural education programs, it can be predicted that we will envisage an elevation of the student’s consciousness toward people of cultural differences. Students will more likely not to form prejudgments about others, for example, by how they look, and how they live. They will have more resources in terms of reasoning skills to draw upon when they confront a cultural issue. The sharpening of their reasoning skills will also open students’ mind, making them more tolerant of others, and more understanding. All these predicted results of my conceptualization of ‘multicultural education’ will contribute to the reduction of discrimination and prejudice, for the student now has a keener sense of what is right and what is wrong. Since discrimination and prejudice are major factors preventing people to get to understand each other, their elimination will only
facilitate mutual understanding and unity.

The facilitation of mutual understanding is very important in promoting unity. This is because mutual understanding expels doubts and confusion, which are barriers for unity. Multicultural education as conceptualized here facilitates mutual understanding by encouraging communication. Conceptualizing 'multicultural education' as imparting cultural knowledge, as cultivating critical thinking skills and providing a ground for reasoning helps students not only to know each other better, but also to communicate with each other in the most rational way. Through more cultural knowledge and communication, it is hoped that the gap caused by ignorance, doubts, and confusion will be narrowed. Mutual understanding will result. The following example may help us understand this. As a member from the Chinese dominant group (the Han nationality), I used to frown at hearing that the Mongolian in China only wash themselves several times a year. This feeling of estrangement disappeared after I learned that the reason for them to do so is necessitated by the lack of water in their living
environment. Except winter, the Mongolians travel year round with their sheep on the highlands. They drink from water in ditches. And there is simply not enough water for them to shower themselves as often as they like. Understanding that many of the life styles are conditioned by the natural, social, economic and political environment people are in, the student will be less likely to be barred away from each other because of differences in their life styles. They will have a more friendly attitude toward each other. It is in this way that multicultural education so conceptualized helps to get people together and achieve unity.

Another criticism Schlesinger made on multicultural supporters is that they inculcate the illusion that membership in one or another ethnic group is the basic American experience. Schlesinger appraised the old assimilation days, condemned the polity that calls for group formation. He argued that "The American Creed envisages a nation composed of individuals making their own choices and accountable to themselves, not a nation based on inviolable ethnic communities. The Constitution
turns on individual rights, not on group rights."¹⁴ His point is American identity is something that multiculturalists are destroying. He defined American identity as the combination of due appreciation of the splendid diversity of the nation with due emphasis on the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy, and human rights.

I agree with Schlesinger about what American identity should be: appreciation of cultural diversity and promotion of individual freedom, political democracy and human rights. To my understanding, this American identity of Schlesinger's should include individual rights and freedom enjoyed by every citizen of the country. If this is to happen, it requires a society that treats everyone equally. What Schlesinger did not adequately address is that there has been oppression and discrimination going on in American society; that the empirical situation of America exhibits too little appreciation of American identity for very individual, especially those who have darker skins, and whose native language is not English. Schlesinger called for
individual freedom, political democracy and human rights, but paid too little attention to the problems that hinder certain groups of people from getting them. The fact is individual freedom and human rights have not stretched to their maximum extent for ethnic minority people in American society. They frequently experience injustice and unequal treatment. Without equal distribution of these fundamental moral goods, unity or American identity is doomed to remain lip services. One of the crucial preconditions for a unifying society, to me, is the honoring of human essence specific to every individual in American society.

Conceptualizing 'multicultural education' as changing the discriminatory attitude of the society toward people from different cultures, as cultivating the ability to make rational judgments, and as inculcating a society that celebrates the right of each culture to coexist in America is for the very reason of promoting American identity. It enhances individual freedom, political democracy and human rights by getting rid of the barrier of discrimination and prejudice. It advocates
cultural diversity through rational reasoning processes. It should be clear that multicultural education conceptualized this way will not only support American identity, but also address the need for America to reduce discrimination and oppression. Through advocating the preservation of ethnic groups and their right to fight against discrimination in America, this conceptualization embraces grouping practice as a necessary step to the unity of the nation.

It is obvious that Schlesinger downplayed the notion of grouping practice. However, his call for American identity and unity in itself is indeed a grouping practice. Isn't he calling for members of the American society to unite together for the common goals of individual freedom and human rights? The mere difference between the grouping practice he advocated as unity and the grouping practice he named as disunity, to me, lies in the fact that the former is a grouping practice on the national level while the latter is one within the nation. i.e., the unity Schlesinger advocated is to get members of the United States into one large group—a nation, and
the unity he labelled as disunity is to get members of an ethnic group together into a smaller ethnic group. To me, these two grouping practices need not to be contradictory. The formation of ethnic groups can facilitate the unity on the national level. This is because the unity on the national level can only come about after each individual in the society can reasonably cooperate with each other, which includes the exclusion of discrimination and prejudice based on the basic human constituents such as skin color, facial appearances and ways of living. In other words, the higher level unity (national unity) for individual freedom can become a realization only when discrimination and prejudice is reduced. Without this reduction of discrimination and prejudice, it is not possible to have this national unity.

It seems that the immediate need for individual freedom and human rights are the removal of the already established, deeply rooted, or hegemonized discriminating attitudes and practices in American society. I think that this removal is best accomplished by lower level grouping
practice called for by multiculturalists and pluralists. This change may not be welcome by everyone in the society, because it may mean the removal of some of the privileges enjoyed by the ruling class.

It is the case that American society has progressed in terms of cultural awareness and eliminating cultural discrimination. But at least part of the reason for this progress is the struggle of the oppressed by lining up together (and, of course, by better and more enlightened education). This progress is applauded but is far from sufficient for a peaceful and harmonious society. More progress is needed before we can meaningfully talk about national level unity or American identity. To ask the oppressed to give up their means of struggle, i.e. to disassemble their grouping practice, is to disempower the oppressed. We ought not afford to let that happen.

Multicultural education calling people to celebrate cultural differences rationally and to line up together is the very practice to empower the-not-so-powerful for individual liberty and basic human rights. Culturally
different people are encouraged to form sub-groups, to appreciate what is different about one's own group and to resist oppression from the society. Ideally, this experience enables group members to extend the difference appreciation to other culturally different groups in the society. Again, group formation is a necessary step in gaining individual power for ethnic people. Multicultural education, properly understood, can extend individuality and promote individual autonomy in a society that at present continues to restrict people from subordinate groups. In order to assure that each individual has an equal opportunity to express his/her own individuality, the discriminated must seek their share of the opportunity in the society. This is unlikely to succeed with individual power. As a way to make a change, people of similar cause or fate should form cultural groups. This way, their voice is louder, power greater.

The formation of interest groups does of course carry with it side-effects, but on the whole, it can work to increase individual autonomy. It is on these grounds that I hold, in principle, multicultural education, as I
have conceptualized it, is not in conflict with the American democratic ideal. Nor, I think, does this view of multicultural education divide people. It unites them. The unification is accomplished by uniting the people of similar fate together on the sub-group level first, and then proceed into a unity on the national level. Multicultural education as here conceptualized lays down a bridge for people of diversity to get to the unity of the nation. Understood in this way, multicultural education can be implemented in a way that does not cause disunity.

4. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND ETHICAL CULTURAL RELATIVISM

The third serious challenge facing proponents of multicultural education stems from the anthropological doctrine of cultural relativism to ethnic and racial groups in the United States. Cultural relativism arose in anthropology as a view to encourage tolerance toward culturally different groups of people. According to Appleton,
relativism asserts that each culture, or subculture, must be treated on its own terms because of the basic premise that the values, attitudes, and prejudices of each group are determined by that group's own peculiar form of conditioning. Human values, in short, have no absolutes, and those belonging to one group can be taken as no better or worse than those of another.15

Pursuing the argument presented by the cultural relativists, people ought to be tolerant of different cultural practices because values and cultural practices are conditioned by different environment. They argue that since there is no moral common denominator that all people share, it follows that the values of all societies deserve equal respect and non-interference. Thus, ethical cultural relativists seem to be suggesting that the society/culture that values tolerance is no better or worse than the one that does not value tolerance. The society that treats every human being as intrinsically valuable is no better or worse than the one that oppresses certain groups of people.
Ethical cultural relativists also assert that given differences in cultural circumstances and elements, value systems are bound to be different from one culture to another and, according to this doctrine, are not subject to intercultural evaluation. Within relativism, one might objectively describe the moral structure of a cultural group other than one's own, but as soon as one passes judgment on that structure one has acted ethnocentrically, that is, one has used his own cultural reality or cultural standards to judge another.

There are at least two problems with this kind of reasoning. First, the evidence whether there are shared moral values in this world or not is highly debatable. There have been extensive discussions or debates about this issue among anthropologists and philosophers. While the relativists hold that there are no universal moral standards, there have been those who suggest the existence of universal values. They point out that the belief that differences between cultural groups cited by the relativists in cases such as parricide may reflect differences in existential belief--judgments of reality,
rather than moral beliefs—judgments about how things ought to be. Using an example from William Frankena, the cultural practice of putting parents to death at an early age of a particular society may reflect the reasoning that in doing so people are better off in the afterlife if they enter it while still physically vigorous. In other parts of the world, say the United States, putting parents to death is not part of the concept of benevolence. They disagree because they are not convinced that there is afterlife, and most importantly that killing our parents will bring them a happy afterlife. Although there are substantial differences concerning what counts as looking out for others’ interests, both sides obviously agree about the moral principle that looking out for our parents’ interests is desirable. The disagreement is merely on whether the concept of benevolence (i.e. looking after the interests of others) includes the practice of parricide or not, whether there is afterlife or not, whether dispatching our parents at an early age would enable them to live a better afterlife or not. All these questions dwell on the domain of ontology, or the
existence of reality. Suppose if someone someday scientifically proved to this world that there is afterlife and killing our parents at an early age would indeed bring about a better afterlife for them, it can be logically predicted that many of the current nonpractitioners of parricide would consider to start doing it. The analysis suggested that the disagreement is not a moral one, rather, it is a disagreement over reality. It also suggested that there is universal agreement that looking after the best interest of our parents is desirable.

Empirically, it is not hard to find people who firmly believe and are sturdily trying to show that there is a fundamental uniformity of certain common standards of value in societies all over the world. Ralph Linton observed that in all societies parents are morally obliged to care for their children and to train them, while the children are expected to care for their parents when they become old. Hatch summarized Linton's argument in his writing:
In all societies, he (Linton) noted, 'some degree of loyalty and mutual assistance is prescribed' between siblings, although the extent of this support varies widely among cultures. Nearly all peoples who live under conditions which do not allow the accumulation of material goods have patterns whereby food is shared and tools and weapons are freely lent. All societies are set up in such a fashion that individual interests are made subordinate at some point to the needs of the larger whole. And violence is condemned everywhere, although there are cultural differences in its definition.  

White also argued that there are bed-rock realities about human beings and the world around them which provide objective bases for their beliefs and values in such a way that people may not say or claim whatever they will or conduct themselves as they capriciously please. The entitlement of one's own culture to equal respect and to retention remains a cherished value every cultural group possesses.

The problem with the relativist's argument for their position that values are relative in the world resides in
the fact that relativists both stress ethical relativity and insist on some universalistic values, e.g., tolerance. Although they claim that values are relative, their value position that we should be tolerant of other cultures is not itself held to be relative. From the point of logic, they can’t get to tolerance as a general value if they indeed insist on ethical cultural relativism. To put it simply, the relativists are not consistent in their argument.

The second problem with the relativists’ reasoning, like the first problem, is also a philosophical one. That is, the relativists erred in deriving an OUGHT—a value judgment, directly from an IS—an empirical situation. This is what they argue: we ought to be tolerant because different cultures have different situations that give rise to different values. To say that different societies have different situations which give rise to different values is to describe an empirical state of affairs. To say that we should be tolerant of other cultures is a prescription of what ought to be. Logically, it is impossible to derive one from the other. i.e., empirical
cultural relativism (the description that, in different cultures, the same kind of action or thing is judged differently) does not entail ethical cultural relativism (the view that in each of the respective cultures the judgments made by the members of that culture are correct.) Specifically, logic does not permit us to derive a prescription (what ought to be) from a description (what is). To use Hatch's words again, "The fact of moral diversity no more compels our approval of other ways of life than the existence of cancer compels us to value ill-health."\textsuperscript{20}

Soltis and Strike also have argued forcefully that the position that ethics is relative to culture because human beings disagree about moral questions and different societies have different moral points of view involves logical fallacies. They write:

The conclusion does not follow from the premises. It simply does not follow from the fact that two people or two cultures disagree about something that no one is right. Different cultures have different views of science as well. However,
we need not conclude from the fact that some people believe that disease is caused by evil spirits that the germ theory of disease is incorrect or that the truth about medicine is relative to culture. It makes a good deal more sense to conclude that one of the views is incorrect. Likewise, it does not follow from the fact that something is unknown that it is unknowable. If we do not currently know the answer to an ethical question, it does not follow that we may not be able to discover the answer by careful inquiry or that someone else at some later time may not solve the problem. If ethics is an area of inquiry, we should expect that there will be ethical discoveries. Slavery was once morally controversial. Have not human beings discovered it to be wrong?21

The challenge to multicultural education lies in the question: Can multicultural education on the one hand promote diversity, tolerance of others and understanding, while on the other hand rejects ethical cultural relativism, i.e., criticizing or even rejecting elements of a particular culture? In other words, the question is, can multicultural education teach students to become both tolerant of others and critical of others? The answer to the question is positive. To further explain this, we
need to clarify 'tolerance' and 'to be critical'.

It is to my understanding that there are two kinds of tolerance. One is to hold an indifferent attitude toward a person or a behavior. In this sense, tolerance is similar to "I don't care." I will call this tolerance "passive tolerance". The other is to hold a more active and accepting attitude toward others. I will call it "active tolerance". When I talk about teaching students to become more tolerant in multicultural education, I am using 'tolerance' in its active sense.

Thus, teaching students to be tolerant of others is to make the student more accepting of others, treating others as persons (i.e. giving others the right they are entitled to, and taking into consideration of their interest, feelings and emotions) despite the fact that others may have different ideas, life styles, or perhaps have done something not praise-worthy. To teach students to be critical is to provide them with rational reasoning skills, to show them how to be objective, impartial and non-arbitrary in collecting, sorting and weighing
evidence. It is to teach them to become reasonable and persuasive. To be critical does not mean to be impatient and non-tolerant. The criticisms are constructive, not destructive.

If what is entailed in 'tolerance' and 'to be critical' is made clear, it appears that it is not only logically possible, but also practically plausible to be both tolerant and critical. Logically, if active tolerance includes accepting others as a person and to be benevolent, then we are required to act critically about things that we deem can be improved for them. This may include criticisms and denial of certain elements of the individual's culture. After all, it will not be looking after the best interest of others if we withhold our warning when we sense an impending danger for others. It may turn out that our sense of the danger is wrong, but the warning is consistent with benevolence, thus, active tolerance. What this analogy boils down to is that teaching students to be tolerant of others can be accompanied by teaching them to become critical. Practically, I think the combination of tolerance and
criticism is a healthy ingredient in any human relationships. For example, to have a good friendship with a person, there must be the presence of both tolerance and criticism. Tolerance without criticism makes the friendship shallow, for the tolerance tends to be a passive one. Criticism without tolerance destroys the friendship, for friendship thrives on toleration.

If multicultural education is to teach tolerance only, a serious problem will surface. That is, it has the burden to rationalize inaction, complacency and oppression—things that are commonly held as undesirable by ordinary people. If multicultural education is to teach celebrating of cultural differences without critical thinking, then, to quote Appleton again,

it is easy for those who would maintain the status quo to absolve themselves of any responsibility for poverty and inequality to support their actions on the grounds that they are protecting a valuable and legitimate subculture and lifestyle. Thus, one might accept the poverty, poor nutrition, high infant mortality rates, and despair often found on Indian reservations, in Mexican American barrios, or in Black ghettoes as tolerable by-
products of a chosen and valued way of life. Similarly one need not be concerned with equal educational opportunity where formal education is not valued, or with achievement and advancement where competition, future orientation and materialism are not valued.\textsuperscript{22}

The point I want to make here is we can be and perhaps should be both tolerant and critical. Multicultural education can and should celebrate cultural differences while encouraging people to exercise critical thinking skills on cultural differences. Multicultural education as conceptualized here is inconsistent with cultural relativism.

This point can be strengthened by returning to the concept of culture for a while. As characterized in Chapter III, culture will never be static; it will always be in the making. The passage of time in every society will always modify the existing culture to a certain extent. i.e. the contents of a certain culture at one time may be different from those years later. A case in point is, in Chinese culture, 'beauty' used to include
foot-binding which had caused a lot of physical and mental destruction to women. In the modern age, the notion of beauty changed. Women with bound feet are not regarded as beautiful any more. Instead, they are often thought of as backward and uneducated. Now, if we follow the relativistic line of argument, then people are supposed to act like a parrot accepting foot-binding when foot-binding was highly regarded in the Chinese culture, denying the acceptability of it when people in China stopped accepting it in their culture. The blind following suit and the abandoning of the power of the mind is, to say the least, childish, and, the most, irrational. Rational beings should never be asked to stop reasoning, and human judgment can never be reduced to parroting. But these are the very things derived from cultural relativism. Cultural relativism tends to reduce human faculty to idiocy, which is one of the major reasons why it stands on a shaky ground. Since multicultural education is for the purpose of individual growth and it encourages people to exercise their reasoning power, logically, it cannot be mixed together with cultural relativism. This understanding of
multicultural education seems in strict contradiction with the position, which holds that proponents of multicultural education are forced to recognize the unquestionability and validity of each system, derived from the doctrine of cultural relativism. The support for multicultural education does not necessarily call for the support for cultural relativism. Indeed, it is inconsistent with ethical cultural relativism.
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1. INTRODUCTION

It is generally taken for granted by many practitioners of multicultural education that multicultural education is solely about adding knowledge about other people, getting to know different cultures and familiarizing students with the unknown cultural practices. Influenced by ethical cultural relativism, many teachers nowadays would intentionally avoid encounters with values when dealing with cultural issues. At least, they would attempt to take a "value neutral" stance, at most, they would totally avoid teaching students what is desirable, and what is not in multicultural education. Given that some do want to teach values, the lack of procedural knowledge makes them feel helpless when dealing with highly controversial multicultural issues. As argued in Chapter III,
multicultural education can be and is best to be conceptualized as a moral concern. Only when it is understood as an education that helps people make value judgments and rational moral decisions will multicultural education be more likely to achieve its goals of eliminating discrimination and prejudice, and bringing about a harmonious society where each individual is valued as a person.

If multicultural education is developed and planned in such a way that it indeed has a moral dimension to it, then, the value conclusion of whether any or all cultural differences are desirable or undesirable is a judgment to be made by the students themselves, i.e. these judgments should be a result of moral reasoning. Thus, multicultural education programs must aim at raising the rationality of the student about cultural differences by cultivating critical thinking skills, including thinking critically about moral matters. It cannot be overemphasized that the desired value position in multicultural education should not be obtained as a result of dogmatism or indoctrination, or as something to
be swallowed down without chewing, but as a result of moral value reasoning on the part of our students. Thus, the essence of multicultural education is to help students with the skills to form judgments about cultural differences in the most objective, impartial, and non-arbitrary manner. Without the skills, students are apt to form biased conclusions and value positions based on mere preferences due to human irrationalities of all sorts: bigotries, prejudices, wants, wishes, delusions, fond hopes, dogmatisms, irrelevancies, and unrealities. These are the factors that tend to warp and distort human judgments. Students need to be taught that relevant facts need to be collected, examined and compared in order to make sound judgments; different factors must be taken into consideration; modes and skills of reasoning must be developed for arriving at rational judgments concerning how people of different backgrounds should be treated. Equally important in the process of evaluation is the understanding of the fundamental moral principles such as respect for persons and human dignity. Multicultural education, besides imparting all the necessary skills for forming moral judgment, is also to provide each student
better grounds for practicing these skills as well as evaluating one's own culture.

Having been an instructor in foundations of education courses geared for teacher education students, I intend to show, in this chapter, how some elementary skills and techniques commonly taught in introductory philosophy of education classes can be applied productively in teaching multicultural education students. The aim of this chapter is to show how undergraduate foundations or philosophy of education courses might add an important contribution to the cultivation of critical thinking skills of students in multicultural education. It should be noted what is included in this chapter is not the whole of critical thinking or the whole of needed multicultural education. I am simply giving a few selected examples of how some distinctions, skills and techniques commonly farmed in introductory course in philosophy of education could be applied to cultivate critical thinking skills in multicultural education.
2. CULTIVATING CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS IN CLASSROOMS FOR MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Multicultural education as conceptualized in this study must develop in students the ability to think critically about the information with which they are presented and the ability to reason well with that information. Critical thinking, according to Ennis, includes "the correct assessing of statements". Indeed, since words describe our ideas, judgements about cultural issues (e.g. whether a particular difference is good, and why it is good) have to be based on statements made about them. What this establishes is that one of the prerequisites for critical thinking is the use of language, language skills for critical thinking should be developed and honed. Students need to be able to grasp the intended meanings in a statement and decide whether there are ambiguities and/or vagueness involved. They should be helped to develop the skills of identifying different types of statements and to tell whether these statements are used and evaluated properly, i.e., whether empirical statements are empirically supported; whether
value claims or positions are warranted or justified, etc. They also need to be taught skills for reasoning. For example, what arguments are logically plausible, and what are not. The following are several major aspects that can contribute to critical thinking skills that are central to multicultural education as here conceptualized.

*Cultivating clarificatory skills*

(1) Raising questions about meaning

One view of the proper role of philosophy is to clarify, justify and examine assumptions. However the problems of justification for the truth of propositions and problems about assumptions made are dissolved only when the problem of meaning is adequately addressed. In other words, questions of meaning must always be settled before questions of justification and examination of assumptions. As Hamm correctly pointed out, failure to convey meaning is one of the major problems in educational discourse and causes much unnecessary
confusion, lack of progress in educational research and even animosity and distrust. Clarification of meaning is consequently a significant aspect of critical thinking. In order to think critically, one has to understand well what is at issue and the intended meaning of the language-in-use and the arguments of the speaker or writer. A careful observation or some experience in philosophical reasoning will reveal that it is very difficult to discuss anything seriously if the participants have different notions of what is being discussed. For example, the concept 'cultural learning' can mean very different things to people with different understandings. This concept can be understood as getting to know cultural practices of a particular society. It can be understood as the process whereby people gain competencies in dealing with different peoples of the world. It can be understood as the study of the fine arts of a particular society. Or it can be understood as the special skills for the rearing of a particular product or crop or stock for supply, (e.g. the culture of cotton or the culture of bacteria). In order for people to make a judgment on cultural learning, it is important that there
is a mutual understanding of the concept. One way to do this is to teach students to ask clarificatory questions such as "What is cultural learning?" "What do you mean by 'cultural learning'?" "What is included or excluded in the concept of cultural learning?" Raising the questions itself is not a difficult task. However, getting into the habit of raising the clarificatory question in appropriate circumstances will take some skill. It is very tempting for people to make assumptions--assuming that there is a mutual understanding about what is being discussed without good reasons. Unwarranted assumptions can lead people to verbal disputes, disputes about words and about what would be the appropriate meaning of the word to be used in a given context, in which people argue at cross purposes. To correct this temptation, students need to realize how raising questions about meaning can help in preventing people from getting into unnecessary and unproductive arguments.
(2) Being aware of ambiguities and vagueness.

In order to reason well, one must be able to think clearly. Philosophy can help clear thinking by strengthening the student’s ability to detect ambiguities and vagueness. According to Thomas Green, there are conceptual and contextual ambiguities. A conceptual ambiguity is the fact that a word may have more than one meaning. For example, the word ‘culture’ has different meanings. According to Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, ‘culture’ means several different things. To name a few, 1) it means the art of practice of cultivating. 2) it means the act of developing by education. 3) it means the body of customary beliefs, social forms, and materials traits constituting a distinct complex of tradition of a racial, religious, or social group. Conceptual ambiguity usually is not a problem due to the fact that a word usually has multiple meanings and that most of the conceptually ambiguous words will become unambiguous when placed in a certain context. Real problem in thinking arises when conceptually ambiguous terms remain ambiguous even when
placed in context. In this situation, several interpretations of the same word will lead to several different interpretations of the statement, and the writer fails to make clear which meaning is intended in the context. For example, in the statement ‘The form of the multicultural education programs needs to be changed’, the word ‘form’ is both conceptually and contextually ambiguous. ‘Form’ in one way refers to the way or manner of an activity’s operation, and in another, it refers to the information record. When the word is placed in the statement as indicated above, the ambiguity is still retained. i.e. the statement can be understood as calling for change in the way or manner in which multicultural education programs operate; asking for, for example, the addition of cultural experiencing and/or the emphasis on reasoning to the existing multicultural education programs. It can also be interpreted as calling for the change of the format of the information record of the multicultural education programs for administrative purposes. i.e., asking for, for example, the addition of more information entries, or perhaps the provision of more space for each answer, etc. Since the ambiguity
stays with the word when it is put in the statement, the ambiguity is a contextual one.

The statement 'the exceptional children should be given more attention, more help, more love because of their educational needs' is also ambiguous in that we are not sure which group of children the speaker is talking about. This is because an exceptional student can be a severely disabled student, it can also be an especially talented and gifted child. Without clarification and/or qualifications, the ambiguity in the statement may cause difficulties in communication.

Ambiguity can not only interfere with communication, but also lead to certain confusion that gives rise to certain unintended results. For example, the statement "The teachers were ordered to stop the racial fight" is ambiguous in that it can be read as 1) that the principal ordered the teachers to go and stop the racial fight of the students. And 2) that the teachers were engaged in a racial fight themselves and they were ordered to stop it. When people take the second meaning of the statement, the
ambiguity would possibly produce low opinion for the teachers in question. People would wonder if the teachers engage themselves in racially motivated fights, how can they establish role models for their students, how can they teach their children to work for a harmonious society, and teach them to be good. Clearly, the ambiguity, if not clarified, may lead to confusion as well as undesired result to the teachers.

Vagueness, according to Scheffler, involves a certain indeterminacy or ambivalence in deciding the applicability of a word to an object. A term is vague when the boundary of its application is unclear. Let us consider a hypothetical real-life example to make the point clear. Suppose it is time for the Chinese Student and Scholar Society in The Ohio State University to select its chair person again. Besides other qualifications necessary for leadership, the chair must be a Chinese. However, among the candidates, one is half Chinese and half Korean, another is born to a Japanese couple, but has lived all his life in China. Yet another is an American Born Chinese who is devoted to promoting
the welfare of the Chinese students. Faced with the difficulty in deciding who meet the race requirement, or whether they all meet the requirement, we probably will have to say that 'being a Chinese' requirement is a vague one. It is vague because the notion of "Chinese" is vague here. It is obvious, if we had several candidates who were pure Chinese -- born to be Chinese citizens, and lived all their lives in China, there would not have been any problems. It is the borderline cases that are the problem, the grey area that lies between Chinese and non-Chinese. The example shows that a word is used in a vague way when there is doubt or disagreement about whether the word applies to given cases.

Vagueness also occurs when there is imprecision in the use of a word. For example, the statement "middle-aged people can enter the multicultural exhibit free" is vague in that it does not specify clearly what age would be considered middle-age. Does it cover people in their age ranges such as 30's, 40's, or 50's or does it involve a specific age cut-off line? Similarly, the instruction "All boys are required to wear their hair cut and styled
in an appropriately manly way" is also vague because what is 'an appropriately manly way' is not at all clear. There are also words, such as 'democracy' and 'liberal', which have no generally accepted conditions governing their use. Take 'democracy' for example, it can mean different things to different employers of the word. When people in the United States use the word 'democracy', they probably have in mind a government that is of a representative kind, one in which the wishes of the people are expressed by the elected officials. However, Arab sheiks and the Chinese communist government also use 'democracy' to describe their governance. They use the word in a very different sense. They explain for themselves that a democratic government is one that serves the interests of their people. Yet ancient Greeks would use the word to describe direct participation in decision making by all eligible citizens. Therefore, when used without explanation, 'democratic' or 'democracy' may be vague.

We must take note that vagueness is not always undesirable. "A wise communicator will use the extent of
precision required for his purposes." Upon being asked "how much do you make for the job?" a person may avoid giving a specific number by being vague. He may answer: "They pay pretty good." It is a vague answer because what counts a good pay is subject to different interpretation. In order to protect self interest, a businessman may also want to withhold his business information such as the number of business transactions he made in the last season, and the customers he has had. When these questions are addressed to him (maybe by his competitors), he may just as well give a vague answer: "I did quite some business with my old customers." In this way, the businessman both answered the question and avoided giving out his concrete business information.

Vagueness becomes undesirable when the discourse requires precision. It also becomes a problem when it causes confusion. For example, in teaching students that we should work for democratic ideals in multicultural education, the teacher needs to explain what is intended in the phrase 'democratic ideals'. In the ambiguous request that 'unqualified teachers should be replaced in
multicultural education', we must clarify what is meant by 'unqualified'. To understand what is a unqualified teacher in multicultural education, we must establish specific criteria. For example, the absence of professional training in multicultural education; the lack of cultural knowledge, etc. This way, vagueness can be transformed into relative criteria, which may provide standards for action.

We must also note that vagueness is open textured. i.e. it is always producible because "there are borderline objects for any term." A term that is not vague in a certain domain may be vague in another domain. When 'red' is used to describe all red objects, it is not vague. But there are borderline cases in which objects are more or less red. It is the consideration whether 'red' should be applied to these borderline objects that makes the word 'red' vague. This open textured characteristic of vagueness is something that makes the elimination of vagueness difficult. Nonetheless, vagueness is hard to eliminate does not mean that it cannot be eliminated, or at least, mitigated. As
suggested by Ronald Munson, the most direct way of eliminating vagueness is to ask for clarification and try to turn the vagueness into certain specific criteria as shown in the example of requesting for the replacement of unqualified teachers explained above.

In multicultural education, it should be made known to students that multicultural education literature is not devoid of ambiguities and vagueness. Ambiguous and vague statements similar to the above can be found everywhere from multicultural education writings to public debates. Students not only need the capacity to detect them, they also need to be able to avoid them in their own dealings with the world.

(3) identifying different types of statements

Besides raising questions about meaning and being aware of ambiguities and vagueness, there is another important set of language "instrument" that must be taught in cultivating clarificatory skills. Good reasoning and critical thinking necessarily involve the
evaluation of the warrant for various kinds of statements. Therefore, it is important to have the skills to identify different types of statement, and to have the knowledge of their different functions. We will briefly look at four most commonly used statements in multicultural education: empirical, analytic, preference and value statements.

An empirical statement makes a truth claim about things in the world. Its truth or falsity can be determined by empirical investigation including activities such as measuring, listening, collecting data, making comparisons, calculations and analysis, and conducting sensory tests. For example, in an article "Klan loses members to other hate groups" published in The Ohio State University newspaper -- The Ohio State Lantern, it was reported that "Harmon 'Pete' Collins, head of Hamilton's U.S. Knight of the KKK...said blacks were not being punished as severely as whites in racially motivated fights." The statement made a truth claim about the differential treatment of blacks and whites by the legal system in America. Thus, it is an empirical
claim. To ascertain its truth, we need to question whether the statement is supportable by empirical evidence. To find the answer to the question, we must conduct empirical research: collecting relevant data by reading records, talking and listening to relevant people, analyzing and comparing the data, etc.

Empirical investigation also includes sensory tests. For example, we determine the texture of a piece of material by feeling it, we identify colors by looking at them and we tell vinegar from soy bean sauce by smelling them.

Value statements, on the other hand, cannot be verified in the same way as we verify empirical statements. This is because value statements do not describe the nature of events or objects, they evaluate and recommend. According to Thomas Green, a value statement involves judgments. He defines a judgment as a truth claim made with some relevant reasons, grounds, standards and warrants and in the absence of conclusive knowledge. Thus, a judgment is neither a wild guess nor
full knowledge.

It is important that value claims be supported by reasons. Value judgement statements offer reasons that equally-well-informed people can logically debate. They not only describe the emotive state of the speaker, but also prescribe to the public that this feeling is, for example, morally desirable and good. The claim "it is wrong to discriminate people based on skin color" is a value judgment statement or evaluative statement in that it tries to show discrimination based on skin color is wrong on public domain. i.e. it is not morally desirable for anyone to do so. Thus, the reason is logically debatable.

Although preference statements are also sometimes called by ordinary people on the street as value statements, from the point of view of philosophers, preference statements are very different from the value statements explained in previous paragraphs. Preference statements are expressions of feelings that are purely subjective, and beyond the reach of reasonable argument.
They are used to describe the emotive state of the speaker. The statement "I like ethnic food" is an expression of the feelings of the speaker toward ethnic food. It informs us that the speaker has a favorable attitude for ethnic food. It does not tell us anything about ethnic food, nor does it suggest that others should like ethnic food, too. This is because the statement expresses a pure matter of personal preference. From the perspective of logic, the truth of the statement cannot be contradicted by the truth that others don't like ethnic food. There is simply no question here of being correct or incorrect. Since a preference statement is an expression of feelings, it does not make much sense to ask why I like ethnic food. The statement is not about beliefs and knowledge about ethnic food. Thus, it is noncognitive, meaning, it is sheer subjective and not logically debatable.¹¹

Analytic statements mark out a special kind of statement. They provide information based on a set of man-made tools such as language, mathematics and logic. 'A man is a human being' is an analytic statement. It
provides us with information about men based on linguistic definitions. People define 'man' in such a way that a man is necessarily a human being. It would be logically contradictory if we say "a man is not a human being." Similarly, 'two plus two is four' and 'if a is b, and b is c, then a is c' are both analytic statements for they both give us information by following the principles of mathematics and logic. It would be self-contradictory to claim that 'two plus two is not four' and 'if a is b, b is c, then a is not c'.

We also need to observe that analytic statements are empirically empty. This is because knowing that a bachelor is an unmarried man, we don't need to conduct empirical research to find out whether there are any married bachelors in New York. The research is redundant because the question can be answered by the knowledge of the definitions of 'bachelor'. By definition, there cannot be married bachelors. However, this is not to claim that analytic statements are of no use. They are useful in that they facilitate us to explain a concept; they help us to make useful deductions and transform one piece
of empirical knowledge into another.

It must be noted that analytic statements are sometimes disguised as an empirical statement. For example the claim "The motives for the formation of any social groups are for self-interest" appears to be an empirical statement. It tells us something about the formation of the social groups in the world. However, the claim can be retorted by the question "How about those volunteers grouped together for the aid of needy people". If the answer to the question is "Oh, well, the formation of those groups is to allow people to fulfill their own desires. They want to do these things. In this sense, they are really doing things for themselves. And that is acting for self-interest" then, motives are defined as self-interest. It follows if a man or group has a motive, it must logically be 'for the self-interest', because it is what he or she, or the group wants to do. Hence, by definition, the statement "The motives for the formation of any social groups are for self-interest" is true. From the fact that this truth is arrived at with reference to the definition, i.e. it is not empirically derived, the
statement is an analytic statement.

When analytic statements are misused as empirical ones, people are likely to be misled to believe that the speaker is giving them information about the state of affairs of the world, while the speaker may intend only to give linguistic information. Misunderstanding is thus created.

Analytic statements can sometimes be misused as value statements, too. For example, the statement "multicultural education ought to teach students what is right" does not give us new information about multicultural education and what is right. Based on the linguistic rule that 'right' can be replaced by 'what you ought to do', the statement is transformed into "multicultural education ought to teach students what they ought to do." The problem that arises here is when a teacher teaches the student "You ought to do what you ought to do", the student has learned nothing new about what counts as right behavior. When analytic statements are used in a situation where new information about the
state of affairs of the world, about concrete directions and instructions are expected, they fail to facilitate communication. As a matter of fact, they tend to cause confusion and misunderstanding.

In multicultural education, students need to be taught identification skills in order to assess different kinds of claims they come across within multicultural education. The ability to identify different statements not only helps students to clarify, it is a prerequisite for critical thinking and good reasoning.

Cultivating justificatory skills

(1) Teaching how to reason

We must first of all understand what is involved in justification before we can seriously claim that we care about learning the reasoning skills. According to Chambers, people must have clear understanding of the concept at issue in justification. They must also assess assertions that are acceptable or unacceptable, make
arguments for or against; and produce reasons why.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, good reasoning makes it necessary for students to understand whenever an empirical claim is made, relevant evidence should be provided; that a value claim is supported with rules, standards or principles and it is tested through reasoning about the justifiability of the principles and the relevance of the factual claims used to the principle to which we are appealing.

Understanding the logic of an argument is central to any reasoning including value reasoning. We must take notice that there are all sorts of reasoning that students can learn. What I attempt to do here is to explain and clarify some basic forms of deductive arguments and some of their contrasts that are commonly used in multicultural education debates. This clarification and explanation hopefully will help students sharpen their skills for argument analysis and to use them competently in their reasoning.

Basically, an argument is a conclusion supported by its premises. According to Robert Ennis in his \textit{Ordinary
Logic, a deductive argument is a kind of reasoning in which the conclusion is supposed to follow necessarily from what is given (its premises). Here the phrase 'to follow necessarily' means: if you accept what is given, you are therefore automatically committed to accepting the conclusion. This is because the conclusion is included in its premises. So if the premises are truth, the conclusion must also be true. There is simply no escape for the conclusion be false.

One of the most frequently used deductive argument is known as sentence reasoning or conditional argument. Because of its wide application, I will focus on this kind of deductive argument. In sentence reasoning, the basic sentence units are used repeatedly without changing their meanings. They are constructed in such a way that they are joined by 'If' and 'then' in the first premise of the argument. Each sentence unit then stands by itself as a second premise and a conclusion. The basic sentence unit after 'if' is called in logic the antecedent, and the sentence unit following 'then' is called the consequent. The following is an example of a sentence
Premise 1: If today is Wednesday, then our multicultural education class meets.

Premise 2: Today is Wednesday.

Conclusion: Our multicultural education class meets.

In this argument, the sentence 'today is Wednesday' in premise 1 (P1) is the antecedent, and 'our multicultural education class meets' in P1 is the consequent. The fuller understanding of deductive sentence reasoning requires an explanation of four basic forms associated with it. They are called
1) affirming the antecedent; 2) denying the consequent; 3) denying the antecedent; and 4) affirming the consequent. As we go along, I will show that not all of the forms are valid arguments.

The example on the previous page is an example of affirming the antecedent. It contains a conditional statement in the first premise, and the antecedent is affirmed in the second premise. The conclusion is the
consequent. This is a common form of valid deductive argument.

Another valid deductive sentence reasoning is the second form: denying the consequent, an example of which is provided below.

Premise 1: If today is Wednesday, our multicultural education class meets.
Premise 2: Our multicultural education class does not meet today.
Conclusion: Today is not Wednesday.

In this argument form, the first premise indicates that today being Wednesday would make the multicultural education class meet. But if the class does not meet today, then today can not possibly be Wednesday. This is because if today were Wednesday, then class would indeed meet today. By denying its consequent, we are led to deny its antecedent.
The third and the fourth argument forms in the names of denying the antecedent and affirming the consequent are both invalid forms. To clarify how they look like, I will provide an example for each and explain briefly why they contain invalid argument forms.

--Denying antecedent:

Premise 1: If today is Wednesday, our multicultural education class meets.

Premise 2: Today is not Wednesday.

Conclusion: Our multicultural education class does not meet.

In this third form, the antecedent is denied. However, this is an invalid form. This is because "given a conditional statement, the denial of the antecedent does not force us to the denial of the consequent."\textsuperscript{14} i.e. "today is not Wednesday" does not warrant or force us to say (in consistency with premise 1) that the multicultural education class does not meet today. All the major premise (premise 1) indicates is Wednesday is a class meeting time. It does not say that Wednesday is
THE class meeting time of the week. There may be other times of the week that the class must meet.

The following example illustrates a fourth argument form, affirming the consequent.

Premise 1: If today is Wednesday, our multicultural education class meets.

Premise 2: Our multicultural education class meets.

Conclusion: Today is Wednesday.

This argument is invalid for the same reason as explained for the third form. Affirming the consequent does not enable us to conclude the antecedent. Premise 1 did not specify that Wednesday is the only day for class meeting. Therefore, the fact that the class meets does not lead to the conclusion that "Today is Wednesday." The last two examples are invalid forms because their conclusions are not necessitated by their premises.

I have explained one commonly used deductive argument. As a contrast to deductive argument, there is
another argument called inductive argument, about which I will very briefly explain.

An inductive argument offers a conclusion through the support of the premises used. The support, however, does not necessarily lead to the conclusion. To put it differently, its conclusion is not necessarily warranted by its premises. Even when all the premises are true, the conclusion still may be false. Let's have a look at an example.

e.g.: Premise 1: The dish I had in that Chinese restaurant on Monday was spicy.

Premise 2: The dish I had in that Chinese restaurant on Tuesday was spicy, too.

Conclusion: All the dishes in that Chinese restaurant are spicy.

Since, in inductive arguments, the conclusion is not warranted by its premises, the conclusion "All the dishes in that Chinese restaurant are spicy" becomes a hasty generalization. It may turn out to be that those dishes
used by the speaker on the Monday and Tuesday are the only spicy dishes in the restaurant. A better conclusion that can be drawn is: "it is likely that many of the dishes in that Chinese restaurant are spicy" or "If I have a different dish today, it too will likely be spicy."

It is my contention that learning these argument skills not only helps students do argument analysis, but teaches them how to reason well. For example, understanding which argument forms are valid, and which are not, students can employ the valid form in their reasoning. They will know better how to organize a moral argument. Specifically, they will understand that one form of a moral argument is a moral claim (the conclusion) supported by a first premise (a conditional statement) and a second premise (the antecedent of the conditional statement). For instance, from the first premise, "If providing equal educational opportunity to all children is good (X), then we should provide equal educational opportunity to Anita (Y)" and the second premise, "providing equal educational opportunity to all
children is good (X)"., we can conclude, "We should provide equal educational opportunity to Anita. (Y)". In order to support the conclusion Y, it is crucial to get people to agree on both of the premises. First, we have to establish the truth of the If-then relationship of the conditional statement. i.e. we need to get people to agree with the if-then relationship. At this stage, people don't have to affirm the antecedent. They don't have to agree that providing equal educational opportunity to all children is good. All that is needed is the commitment that the consequent would have to be accepted if the antecedent is accepted. Second, we must be very persuasive to make people accept the antecedent in the second premise. In order to arrive at the conclusion Y, we must vigorously affirm X--showing, proving and explaining the desirability of providing equal educational opportunity to all children. Failure to do these will make the conclusion shaky. Let's see how this can be the case.

If I fail to establish the if-then relationship in the first premise, namely, it is NOT the case if X, then
Y, then no matter how successful I have been in getting people to agree on X, the conclusion Y simply does not follow. If the second premise is not affirmed, that is, if I fail to show that providing equal educational opportunity to all children is good, no matter how committed people are to the first premise, the conclusion Y has not been reasonably argued and supported. Obviously, good justification necessitates the understanding and good application of these argument skills.

(2) Avoiding hasty generalizations

Making generalizations seems to be a method commonly used in learning. A generalization is an inference or a conclusion made from specific facts. Having watched the trees in the forest burn on TV in the varies states along the Western Coast, burning the woods in my backyard, and setting my wooden chair on fire, I came to a generalization that wood is combustible. This generalization helps me to deal with my environment more competently. i.e. I would be careful not to place fire
near wooden furniture; I will collect woods to get fire in a situation when other burning materials are not attainable, etc.

While making generalizations is a useful means for classification, it can obscure critical thinking and foster prejudice and stereotypes when the generalization is made with insufficient evidence and a lack of careful observations and thoughtfulness. When generalizations are made in the absence of sufficient facts, they are called hasty generalizations. When they are held as absolute truths to categorize new evidences, stereotypic thinking takes place. According to Christine Bennett, a "stereotype is a mental category based on exaggerated and inaccurate generalizations used to describe all members of a group."¹⁵ Some common stereotypes are blonds are dumb, Chinese-Americans are good at math, fat people are lazy and lack self-discipline, Jews are stingy and mercenary, and out to get all they can for themselves, Blacks are violent and irresponsible, and Whites are racially prejudiced.
Hasty generalizations and stereotypes are harmful to human society. They may lead to inaccurate perceptions and judgments about certain groups of people, thus preventing people from communicating with each other with an open mind. I believe multicultural education conceptualized as cultivating critical thinking and reasoning skills will help mitigate the problem. For example, the students need to be taught that the fact that some Jews are stingy and found to fall into the generalizations does not necessarily mean that all Jews act in similar manner; that some Whites are racially prejudiced is not equal to all Whites are racially prejudiced. They need to be taught that empirical generalizations should always be held as tentative, with new instances seen as a test of the generalization. What makes generalizations a problem is that people often use the generalization to categorize new instances, treating a generalization as absolute truth. Therefore, in multicultural education, teachers should teach the student to avoid making hasty generalizations by providing students with more evidence to test generalizations. This can be done with looking for
counter examples.

Confronted with generalizations such as Jews are stingy and mercenary, Whites are prejudiced, Blacks are violent, one must look for counter examples. One must try to find out whether instances of Jews who are passionate and altruistic can be found, whether examples of Whites fighting for the rights of ethnic minority people can be obtained; whether there are instances of Blacks who are nonviolent and courteous. Looking for counter examples will enable us to recognize, thus avoid hasty generalizations.

One best way to help students find counter examples is to resort to the unique and rich resource of international students in higher educational institutions of the United States. Being an international student from the People's Republic of China for almost eight years, I found myself not only interested in cultural issues, but eager to make some contributions to solve the problems of racial discrimination and prejudice prevalent in America. Bringing with me the most authentic Chinese cultural
knowledge, I feel I can at least help others to understand more about Chinese people and their culture. Having an out-going personality and being a Chinese woman, I can help to eliminate the stereotype about Chinese women for always being timid and shy. The point I am making here is, the use of the rich resource of the international students is especially important in multicultural education. International students carry with them the most authentic, up-to-date cultural traits. Their involvement will provide first hand experience for American students who don't have the opportunity yet to interact with people from other countries. Their involvement will not only bring new perspective about their culture, but also provide the opportunity to practice the tact and sensitivity American students need in dealing with people of other cultures. Through associating with the international students, many of the generalizations about culturally different people can be tested.

If multicultural education has a global dimension which is to promote world peace, the engagement of the
international student will provide opportunities for them to know American people and their unique culture, too. Mutual understanding will be promoted. It is simply a mistake not to explore the rich resource international students can provide for multicultural education.

As a viable method to engage the international student, international student offices can be contacted to attain international student volunteers. Assignments can be made in class for American students to interview the international student, and to invite the international students to class to participate class activities.

Teaching students to avoid poor generalizations is one important aspect in cultivating critical thinking and reasoning skills because it helps people to face facts and issues objectively. It is important in multicultural teaching because it contributes to the elimination of prejudices and stereotypes. It cannot be ignored.
(3) Avoiding Is-Ought (or naturalistic) fallacy

Another common error in reasoning is to draw a value position simply by appealing to a state of affairs. Generally speaking, Is-Ought or naturalistic fallacy is an attack against naturalistic view that the moral domain can be defined purely by reference to facts about man and the world, and that the content of morality can be discovered simply by studying what is the case. In attacking naturalism, many philosophers held that a moral evaluation of a state of affairs cannot be derived directly from the factual description of that state of affairs. Facts should not be mixed up with values.

It must be noted that not all philosophers believe that the fact/value dichotomy is that sharp, and that the naturalistic fallacy is a fallacy. Some philosophers argue that facts bear certain degrees of value because facts are discovered and interpreted by people full of values. Upon hearing the factual report that Johnny beat
Hadrian at school, we would instantly feel that Johnny had done something wrong. At this point, the fact seems to have a moral or value import. But careful analysis would reveal that this is so because the moral consideration whether the fact of beating is wrong or right has already been deliberated and it is generally agreed as a prima facie rule that it is wrong for one to beat another. Since the moral argument for the undesirability of beating is established, the argument is put underneath the fact. In normal circumstances, when we hear facts of beating, we would simultaneously associate our feelings with the established value argument hidden in the fact.

What this tells us is although facts bear certain degrees of value, strictly, facts do not themselves tell us whether they are good or bad. It is people who draw either a positive or a negative conclusion on them. For example, the fact--cultural study draws attention to cultural differences, itself never lends sufficient support for whether cultural study is good or not. Getting attention to cultural differences is a good thing
only for people who value cultural differences. It is a bad thing for people who believe that differences will only divide people, thus producing more conflicts. This example indicates that facts can be evaluated differently by people with different values, the justification of any moral position must go beyond facts. In this case, the justification of cultural study demands that we not only show what cultural study does, but why what it does is good, desirable, and worthwhile.

For similar reasons, it is unacceptable to justify a value position simply by appealing to authority or to prevailing opinion. Nothing can ever become morally right because someone says that it is so or because the majority think it is so.¹⁷ There can be mistakes and/or unjustified opinions from authorities. Majority can believe in something that is morally undefendable or something that is false. Strictly speaking, obedience to an authority and pressure from majority are irrelevant to the business of moral decision-making. Since students must make a lot of value decisions in dealing with multicultural education, they must be taught how to make
justified moral decisions.
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CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been shown that multicultural education, properly understood, should aim at eliminating prejudice and discrimination in American society; and producing a harmonious social environment in which everyone is treated with dignity and respect. The achievement of these goals requires a better understanding of the concept 'multicultural education'. The purpose of the study had been 1) to reconceptualize 'multicultural education' in such a way that the understanding of it maximizes the possibility for the realization of the above mentioned goals; 2) to argue for the plausibility of such a reconceptualization; and 3) to show how some basic skills commonly taught in introductory courses of philosophy of education can make a contribution to the cultivation of critical thinking in multicultural education classes for teacher education students.
Based on the belief that history helps people understand the present better, and that a historical account of multicultural education would provide insights about the entailment of 'multicultural education', Chapter II was developed with a focus on the historical development of multicultural education. In chapter II, it was shown that multicultural education arose as a school movement to respond to the social situations of American society in 1960s. It tried to accommodate the demands for equal treatment and representation of ethnic minority groups in American schools. In this sense, it is a new method or attempt to solve an old problem, the problem of cultural conflicts and racial prejudice and discrimination in American society.

It was argued that the old attempts such as assimilation, amalgamation did not work well to solve the problem due to various social, economic, physical, and theoretical problems. For assimilation, trying to make all members of the ethnic minority groups to adopt the
dominant white Anglo-Saxon culture was not possible in a society where there were severe prejudice and discrimination. The physical appearances of colored immigrants prevented them from being fully assimilated. Abandoning one's home culture also created certain psychological pain for certain ethnic minority individuals. For amalgamation, the ideal of a composite American is theoretically vague and practically difficult to realize.

Chapter II also summarized different interpretations of 'multicultural education' and showed them to be inadequate. It was argued that multicultural education should not be an education just for ethnic minority children as assumed in deficit and cultural difference theories. It must aim at all student population. It was also argued that multicultural education should not solely promote differences, doing so will likely create segregation and disunity; that multicultural education understood as the movement for equal educational opportunity loses its focus in its multiple calls for change in every aspect of the school. It was established
that we need a better conceptualization for 'multicultural education'.

Chapter III contained the reconceptualization of 'multicultural education'. Based on the analysis of the individual component of the concept, and on the intentions of the "programmers" of this programmatic definition, it was argued that to achieve the goals of multicultural education -- social harmony, respect and equal opportunity for everybody, teaching cultural knowledge alone is not sufficient. Multicultural education should be conceptualized as cultivating critical thinking and reasoning skills which includes teaching propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge, providing a multicultural ground for students to practice the skills learned so as to encourage the formation of propensities and tendencies to act on their reasoning. Multicultural education should focus on the enlightenment of students' moral conscience.

Chapter IV presented three major criticisms on multicultural education. They are 1) because
multicultural education promotes group rights, it limits individual autonomy. Thus, it hampers democratic spirit of America. 2) multicultural education promotes cultural differences, thus, it promotes division, not unity. and 3) multicultural education promotes differences, thus, like cultural pluralism, it indulges cultural practices commonly held as morally undesirable. It was acknowledged that these criticisms may be well grounded in some of the multicultural education interpretations, literature and programs. There could indeed be aspects of multicultural education conceptualizations and implementations that led to the problems pointed out by the critics of multicultural education.

It was demonstrated that understanding 'multicultural education' as conceptualized in chapter III will not only increase the possibilities of reaching the goals of multicultural education, but also avoid the criticisms. This is because 1) understanding multicultural education as teaching critical thinking and reasoning skills encourages cooperation, free intelligent decisions-making, and realization of the fullest
potentials of an individual. Since these are necessary elements of 'democracy' according to Dewey, this conceptualization is consistent with the Deweyan democracy. 2) Multicultural education as conceptualized in this study promotes unity in that it encourages communication and cultural understanding. Through reasoning, people will understand for themselves that discrimination is wrong, that everyone is entitled to be treated equally. This will lead to the elimination of prejudice and discrimination which are major barriers of unity. 3) Encouraging critical thinking and reasoning, people will be put into a better position to deal with differences. The cultivation of rational reasoning skills requires the student to assess each cultural practice through the process of collecting, sorting and weighing evidence and arriving at a conclusion. Soon it would be clear to the student that not all cultural differences are desirable, that it will be a hasty or unwarranted generalization for anyone to claim that all cultural differences are good. Students are not forced to accept all cultural differences by this conceptualization. Thus, it was argued that multicultural education is not in
agreement with ethical cultural relativism.

Chapter V demonstrated the implementation aspect of the conceptualization of 'multicultural education'. The purpose was to show how some basic skills common to the introductory courses of philosophy of education can be employed to cultivate critical thinking skills in multicultural education courses for teacher education students. It was believed and demonstrated that learning the skills for clarification and justification will facilitate critical thinking. It was also suggested that multicultural education should make full use of the unexplored rich resource of international students in America. Their participation would bring authentic, up-to-date cultural knowledge and valuable experience for American students.

3. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

What was developed in this study was a theoretical construct with hypotheses and arguments, examples and explanations suggesting that multicultural education
would achieve its goals more efficiently when it is conceptualized as cultivating critical thinking and reasoning skills; as teaching cultural knowledge and forming propensities to act on one's judgments; as educating moral principles such as respect for persons; and as celebrating our humanness, and raising the student's moral conscience.

Although the study had established theoretically the validity and plausibility of this conceptualization, it would make it more persuasive and appealing if the theory is proved by empirical research. For example, we can apply the suggestions in chapter V in a multicultural education program and test the hypothesis that teaching students the clarificatory and justificatory skills would improve their reasoning ability. We can also test the effects of the program based on the conceptualization of the study in terms of whether students are more competent in dealing with cultural differences and cultural issues, whether they have become more sensitive to prejudice and discrimination as a result of the implementation of the skills in chapter V.
Another research that can be done as a follow-up of this study is to see how this conceptualization can be applied to teach young children. Since the central point of the conceptualization is to increase the reasoning abilities and forming tendencies to act on their decisions, can we then incorporate cultivating critical thinking abilities in teaching elementary children? Can we teach them the basic skills such as asking for clarification, and avoiding making hasty generalizations? If the answer is positive, we need the research to show us how. i.e. how can we convert these basic skills in chapter V into simpler games or interesting exercises that will both retain young children’s interest in learning and teach them the skills to clarify and justify. This follow-up research would extend the application of this conceptualization through reaching more people.

Strictly, cultivating critical thinking and reasoning skills, imparting cultural knowledge and forming tendencies to become consistent with oneself by acting upon one’s own decisions are included in the very
aims of education in general. What makes this conceptualization of 'multicultural education' different from general education is the specific focus of multicultural education on the problems of prejudice and discrimination, cultural conflicts and racial fights in American society.

If the aim of general education is to develop in a person strong, academic knowledge, habits of inquiry, critical curiosity about how power, equality, and change operate in society, to prepare individuals to cope with the world better, as well as to create a society that enables every person to enjoy the individual development, and a better place for everyone to live and work, then multicultural education is an inseparable part of general education. This is mainly because multicultural education as conceptualized in the study strives to solve the problem of social injustice in American society. It not only works for the personal development of each individual, but also for the elimination of prejudice and discrimination and the creation of a better social environment for everybody. It seems that the preparation
of people to live in a diverse world cannot result in fruition without helping people to participate, i.e. to question and reason, and to act on the issues in multicultural education. The claim that any defensible general education today would necessarily include multicultural education is thus validated.
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