



Brosio, R. (2004). Marxism, Still the Best Hunter of the Predator, Capitalism: A Review of *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. *Workplace*, 11, 206-214.

RICHARD A. BROSIO

**MARXISM, STILL THE BEST HUNTER OF THE PREDATOR, CAPITALISM:
A REVIEW OF
*MARXISM AGAINST POSTMODERNISM IN EDUCATIONAL THEORY***

edited by Dave Hill, Peter McLaren, Mike Cole, and Glenn Rikowski
Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002

I sent the following to the publisher as an endorsement and "praise" of the manuscript which became the book being reviewed herein: For those who have insisted that Marx's work is still relevant to understand problems and possibilities facing societies and schools during this historical period of recurrent "gales of creative destruction" this book represents reinforcements that arrive just in time. *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory (MAPET)* can serve also as an introduction and catch-up course for those who have become interested recently in the utility of Marxist analyses. This well-argued, succinct, and assertive work may cause "lapsed Marxists" to reconsider their decisions. Moreover, those who are responsible for the current capitalist "gales" will recognize that this book poses serious problems to their power and plans.

2. In many ways and for various reasons this book succeeds, falters, or fails for readers because of how they view capitalism—especially as a system. Many people are aware of and dislike the actions of powerful corporations, national governments, international organizations such as the World Bank, and other forces that further enrich those who already have power, influence, access, and wealth. However, the reasons for what is occurring—as well as what is to be done—are seen in a wide variety of ways. There are some who believe that lack of honesty is a big part of the problem. Some call for "liberal" states to regulate multinational corporations and their allies, while others wish to reinvent capitalism itself so that it can be "used creatively" to build a better society. A newsletter from *The Nation* magazine (December 22, 2003) introduced William Greider's new book, called *The Soul of Capitalism*, as an example of such alleged creativity. More than a few earnest people turn to religion and hope for a replay of driving the money-changers from various temples. Every little bit of recognition that most socioeconomic systems are now grossly unequal and far from being authentically democratic helps those who oppose the present status quo(s).

3. In contrast to the variety presented above, the contributors to the book all recognize that the dominant political economy in the world, "today's capitalism," is the most powerful secular force on earth. They realize that there are multiple oppressions and causalities; however, the authors and I view the capitalist system as helping to determine much of what occurs and does not occur in our lives. Moreover, these

contributors are convinced that in spite of the complexities of cause and effect in our lives, there are ways to claim "warranted assertibility" that some explanations, analyses, readings, theories, hypotheses, and plans for action are better than others. According to most of these contributors, Marx's "historical materialism" is the most warranted idea available. They critically embrace Marxist thought as a living tradition that makes possible the best explanations and understandings of the historical capitalist system and how its constant crises cause "gales of creative destruction" throughout societies and schools. This book offers analyses that are both holistic and specific, just as Marx would have us do. There are disagreements among the authors about the comparative weight and importance among many causes and effects. This is not unusual among Leftists and especially democratic scholars. However, there is overall agreement that the Marxist view of the world is far superior to the ones offered by conservatives, neoconservatives, liberals, neoliberals, and various forms of postmodernist-poststructuralist accounts. *Nota bene*: the book's title emphasizes working *against* postmodernism!

4. The editors' goal is to reclaim the best that Marxist analyses have to offer. Central to this effort is to reclaim the centrality of class struggle as the most important "motor of history" during this phase of the capitalist system—as it has been from the beginning! Discourse is important, of course, as Marx already knew; however, it is how discourse fits into actual, concrete, political class struggle that is most important in overcoming capitalism—a system that is incompatible with and even hostile to bona fide democracy. Those who support capitalism and benefit from it most will find these chapters strange, foreign, and perhaps even a bit "terroristic." Some hostile readers will likely profit from criticizing these authors' work in condemnatory and dismissive ways. There is always a market for those who try to dismiss the respected—even by many non-Marxists—and brilliant modernist dissection of a Frankensteinian system that was neither apparent nor understood before the availability of Marx's *oeuvre*.

5. The précis on the book's back cover includes the assertion that postmodernism has become the orthodoxy in educational theory. This assertion is linked to the writers' views that all too many theorists have refused to consider Marxist analyses in reference to the driving forces behind the changes and similarities we encountered during the last third of the twentieth century. Those who work within postmodernist, poststructuralist, and other post-something forms of inquiry do not look to the crisis of accumulation within the capitalist system and how it has been "solved" by the powers that be as keys to understanding what forces have most determined conditions in societies and schools. The educational theories they embrace are not surprising—nor are they inevitable.¹

6. The contributors to this book claim that the postmodernism they discuss unfairly rejects the political economy's importance. Furthermore, they argue that postmodernists believe that systems such as capitalism cannot be understood holistically. The epistemological positions that present weak subjects and an occluded world make it difficult or impossible to understand where we are in space and time, let alone to make decisions that are based on publicly defensible criteria along a better-worse continuum. The various post(ies) are critiqued for misunderstanding the historical need for grand narratives, their specific attacks on the Enlightenment and Marxism, and for rejecting the belief that we can understand causes and effects (albeit imperfectly) at all! They are presented by some of the book's authors as intellectuals who can play loose and "sexily" within the aisles of today's consumer, financial, imperialist capitalism in ways that pose no real threat to the dominant system. It is refreshing for me to read a book where the writers name names in assertive and even muscular tones. There is more: the Marxist contributors state that feminist theory in the US and elsewhere is profoundly influenced by poststructuralism/modernism. Many of the contributors to *MAPET* recognize that certain valuable ideas have been raised by post-something writers on issues of difference; however, the former are convinced that Marxists have been unfairly criticized for allegedly undervaluing differences among us. The authors make clear that diversity has been and can continue to be recognized within the tradition of Marxist thought, which holds that social class membership is of course characterized by racial, ethnic, gender, sexual, variously-abled, and other human realities. I am convinced that this criticism of postmodernism and the claim that Marxism can provide a

more realistic and effective way to deal with the tensions between the politics of identity and class are among the most important issues in this book.²

7. Most, if not all, of the contributors agree that non-reductionist, critical, dialectical materialism is the most warranted mode of inquiry with which to study the world. They accuse postmodernists of failing to connect and explain convincingly the *necessary* connections between "discursive materiality" and the social relations of production. Some would argue that language/discourse is the only way that we can deal with the material world. However, when one studies Marx's concept of the new materialism, as compared to prior crude versions, it becomes apparent that he never saw stark dichotomies between thought and material "realities." As I have written elsewhere:

Marx's 'new materialism' depends on the soundness and convincingness of the following ideas. He argued that the external world is the materialization of human labor. What he called the 'sensuous world' around us is the product of our labor. The old materialism failed to grasp this fact. Marx explained that the reality we 'apprehend' through our senses and cognition should be viewed as the objectification of human activity. (Brosio 2000, 84)

Marx's dialectical understanding of how action and reaction occur, as well as his insistence that materialism is in fact a term that includes intellect and language, stands in sharp contrast to the failure of postmodernists to realize the integral connections between discourse and the extraction of surplus value.³ Contributors to *MAPET* emphasize the necessity of knowing what Marx actually wrote. Some educational theorists may have come to Marx mostly through reading his critics—ones with axes to grind. Furthermore, these theorists' work suggests a lack of in-depth study of what used to be called intellectual history.

8. When one becomes familiar with Marx and the best Marxist scholarly work, it becomes clear that the emphasis has been on understanding and changing the complex places where we live. For example, the emphasis on dialectical understandings of phenomena, institutions, and processes enable us to penetrate the window dressing and fig leaves that persuade us to believe that capitalism is good for everyone, universal, trans historical, and part of the very nature of things. However, Marx's dialectical approach helps us to understand the contradictions within the system and to recognize some of the places where collective action can attack the predatory system. The emphasis on class politics is logically connected to this line of reasoning. It is as workers and citizens that we can best understand and oppose the capitalist labor contract that gives enormous advantages to the capitalist bosses.⁴ Focusing on the sites of production does not mean a failure to understand that workers are also consumers (although during Marx's life there was less consumption). Again, if one follows the journey of the prosaic commodity that is originally designed for sale value rather than use value per se, one can see the connections among production, exchange, and consumption to be found within Marx's great modernist critique of capitalism.⁵

9. This critique is not just theoretical, but based on concrete evidence amassed during Marx's prodigious scholarly labors. He established much of his philosophical scaffolding as a younger man and the turn to economics (writ large) followed for the rest of his life. It is important to realize that Marx did not continuously remind his readers of his philosophical bases; therefore, all too many of his readers were and are ignorant about them. This was made worse by the late recovery of the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*.⁶ Nevertheless, his union of theory and concrete data provide a powerful mixture that makes it possible to ignite informed collective action. As critical students of history realize, Marxism (in its various forms of action) provides the greatest threat to capitalism.

10. Postmodernist and poststructuralist theorists fail to recognize the capitalist system as the most powerful opponent of authentic democracy. Millions of "reds" were blacklisted, deported, exiled, jailed, and killed (often murdered) by the gendarmerie of the capitalist states. As we know, the so-called Western democracies were not above doing some of the above, although the fascist/nazi political excrescences of

capitalism were guilty of the most infamous actions. Socialist and communist movements did not just fight against capital and the class states but also developed counter-communities and institutions within which millions of workers found respite, education, inspiration, security, and leisure time. It could be argued that the murderous response by capital and its agents against revolutionary socialism and communism partly helped the Nazi state to initiate the holocaust. Some of the first victims of Italian Fascism and Nazism were members and leaders of organized labor, many of whom were committed reds. In Italy and Germany, communists bore the brunt of vicious reaction as compared to other Leftist enemies of the dictatorships. Without making an unfair or invidious comparison, we must acknowledge that "post-threat" exists mostly within academic-intellectual circles. This is not to demean intellectual work of any kind; however, to compare the role of radical socialist and communist intellectuals to those who espouse anti-Marxist, anti-Enlightenment, anti-grand narratives while telling all who will listen/read that we are too weak epistemologically to understand the complexities of this opaque "post-" period is ridiculous at best and irresponsible at worst.

11. Marxists believe that desire can be educated. They agree that political economy is not everything, but argue that discounting it completely reinforces the hold of capitalism. Those agents of capital who still take ideas seriously often regard "identity politics" as a gift that allows "multiculturalism lite" to displace class awareness and politics. The present occupant of the White House is lauded by the mainstream media for being able to say a few words in Spanish, while his brother—the governor of Florida—gets good press for having a Latina wife!

12. All of contributors to *MAPET* agree political economy must be re-emphasized in order to better understand what is occurring in society and schools; however, there are nuanced disagreements about how much emphasis should be put on "cultural" aspects. The authors agree that there are very difficult structural barriers to overcome if we are to have authentic democracy, social justice, respect for diversity—beyond "multiculturalism lite"—and the possibility for us to act more altruistically, if not more "caringly." In spite of the acknowledged barriers importantly represented by capitalism, the contributors agree with Marx: "history is open!"⁷ Unfortunately, the odds are stacked against those of us who oppose capitalism and its attendant injustices. Some of the reasons are: hegemony is backed by enormous, coercive forces that are already in place and functioning; the Left(s) are obviously divided; and politics in the capitalist "democracies" are very much like what Marx called the executive committees of the ruling class. Nonetheless, the unanimous view presented in *MAPET* is that we are living on contestable, if not always contested, terrain. Therefore, those who push the democratic imperative do not have power anywhere equal to the advocates of the capitalist imperative. These incompatible imperatives upon societies and schools can be represented as a severely unbalanced teeter-totter. The heavyweight capitalist representative keeps the lightweight democrat high in the air. The terrain is contestable, but hardly a level playing field.⁸

13. The most ardent defenders of class politics among the contributors, namely the editors and their co-authors, think that all too many postmodernist/structuralist writers are in "collusion" with the capitalist side. The retreat from class analysis and collective struggle allows the predators to roam everywhere. It is heartening to read that regardless of whether certain intellectuals believe in the importance of class, its significance is arguably more important now than it has ever been. In fact, the uneven struggle between labor and capital is characterized by some strengthening of the former as people around the world have come to better understand the causal and determinative power of capitalism on the conditions of our lives. Demonstrations against neoliberalism have occurred in cities around the world. While the protesters are not driven exclusively by class perspectives, many of them are very aware of class and how workers' interests are incompatible with the global masters' project.

14. Rikowski offers a useful way to view Marxism's conception of class and its relationships with our other identities:

Marxist theory affords potentialities for articulating a multitude of forms of oppression in relation to people of color, women, gays and lesbians, and other social groups de-valued by capitalist society. Furthermore, Marxism expresses theoretic[ally], politically, and empirically the dynamics of social class as a form of oppression within capitalist society that is constituted by its own development. Marxist theory also allows me to perspectivize gender, 'race' and other forms of oppression through the lens of social class. Finally, it articulates the fragility of capitalist oppression. It expresses the scream of refusal, but also gives form to the shrieks of power of the oppressed as they resist and confront capital's insurgence into all spheres of social life. (*MAPET*, 16)

Rikowski argues that the contradictions capitalism forces us to endure are impossible to ignore in the long run, as the reaction to these impertinences and predations exist within our very bodies and psyches as well as in our social roles in union with other workers.

15. The neoliberal attack on working people since the Great Depression and World War II has been so severe as to make political liberalism—even in the New Deal and social democratic senses—largely irrelevant.⁹ In spite of real and important protections achieved against the predator, the fact remains that these efforts could not prevent capitalism from returning with a vengeance to its older and more obvious self. I use the word "irrelevant" to indicate that political liberalism and even social democracy were not successful in overcoming capitalism; more specifically, neither the New Dealers nor the current Democrats in the US are interested in achieving what Marxists have always insisted is necessary to achieve the goals that some of their allies claimed to espouse during times of popular front coalitions. Clintonism and Blairism have certainly not stayed the hand of the capitalist class war from above. This is not to say that even tepid actions by elected governments in support of some protections against free market predations are not necessary and welcome. The savagery of the Bush II administration makes clear that things can and do get even worse.

16. One of the greatest attractions of *MAPET* is the writers' courage to call spades spades—and even bloody shovels. As I have mentioned above, many of the contributors are not afraid to name names of those they oppose and why. I have long been convinced that the Left(s) need more really "tough" people in the various movements. When I grew up during the 1940s in a class-conscious working-class family, it seemed that the toughs had earned their bona fides by standing up to the worst kind of finks and hirelings of those who would be their masters and try to humiliate them. The pie hats, weathered leather jackets, and other accoutrements symbolized the almost militaristic attitudes and demeanors of classed men and women who knew they were at war. In the US today, the alleged toughs seem to be on the right. Tom Delay and Rush Limbaugh would not talk so tough were they opposed by the kinds of reds and allies of the type to which I just alluded. As a postscript, and an important one, picture La Pasionara (Dolores Ibarruri) with a real John Garfield—both wearing these hats and jackets!

17. Because of my interest in the meaning and history of "civil society," *MAPET* is of great interest to my own work. The term has been used to attack the lack of such a society in all the former Soviet Bloc countries. Those who were perhaps most responsible for this wedge issue during the Cold War implied or claimed loudly that the West was better and more democratic because it benefited from civil societies that were said to be independent spaces between market and government. Many postmodernists believe that civil society is substantially independent of political economy. Marx knew that the bourgeoisie constructed their versions of civil society in order to have spaces and places to conduct their business. Gramsci understood that the working classes had to conquer civil society so that an authentic, democratic revolution could occur and succeed. This has not happened—even in the West. Most postmodernists fail to see the intractable opposition between labor and capital. While they may not be obvious or conscious members of "rightist ensembles" that range from those who run the command heights of the economy to social conservatives seeking a return to a romantic notion of the past, postmodernists who fail to grasp that modernism is not complete until democratic forces battle and win against those who would force us into an even worse future may be inadvertent allies of these

ensembles. Such alliances can result in a return to the "good old days" when outspoken slaves, workers, women, and other "undeserving ingrates" could be sold, fired, or just made to shut-up. Some postmodernism!

18. Hill and Cole refuse to give up on production sites as central to generalized opposition to capitalism. They single-out the work of Patti Lather because she, as a "resistance postmodernist," does not recognize or acknowledge that mass groups are still structurally oppressed. Hill and Cole are adamant in their insistence that because capital will never enter a contract with labor unless it is to their advantage, and because capital has governments, schools, and other institutions basically on their side (in addition to a monopoly on the sanctioned use of violence), it is apparent that a generalized struggle based on our worker relations to the economy is the most effective way to overcome capitalism and its various allies. Hill and Cole argue that Marxism is the great deconstructive force that is capable of laying bare the whole system so that we can oppose it on many fronts but in solidarity and as comrades.

19. Hill and Cole draw on Alex Callinicos to locate postmodernists in time and space. They see them as part of a long line of those who claim that capital has transformed itself. Callinicos speaks of postmodernist thought as resulting from the dynamic capitalism that was introduced during the Reagan-Thatcher era—a phenomenon that continues presently. A socially mobile intelligentsia is reflective of this era—one marked by the systematic attack on organized labor and the welfare societies by capital's class warriors. The Marxist analysis offered in *MAPET* does not accept that capitalism has transformed itself in unprecedented ways, only through tactics and strategies that allow it to deal with the accumulation crisis that manifested itself in the 1970's. What some postmodernists believe is new would perhaps not seem so when situated within the historical realities of capitalism. One might say: Look out for the bosses' new clothes! What occurred during the last third of the twentieth century in educational policy, theory, philosophy, curriculum, and pedagogy is best understood holistically and of course historically. By definition, postmodernist forms of inquiry are unable to do this necessary job.

20. Postmodernists have criticized Marxists for insisting on solidarity in order to trump the importance of differences. Hill and Cole retort that at its best, socialism is about attempting to fashion solidarity from the realities of heterogeneity. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that many reds have understood subjective complexities. This quarrel about class and identity has great relevance for how those who oppose injustices on various fronts can construct movements that might address these conditions. I may be out on a dangerous limb when I present the following depiction of what critical, democratic Marxists would agree upon. Nevertheless, here goes: The need for broadly inclusive coalitions is made necessary by the totality of the system of oppression. I choose the pedestrian umbrella as a symbol. Redistribution and recognition politics can come together if the umbrella is constructed with the vertical "trunk," curved handle, and the longitudinal struts representing the primacy, generalness, and importance of class. The fabric that is supported by the structure stands for the very important complexity of identity and difference. Let us make this umbrella include multiple colors and images of unity out-of-the-many. Pushing my luck as I hear the chainsaws firing up, I contend that this umbrella can viewed in "correspondence" with capitalism as a system. As McLaren and Ramin Farahmandpur have written: "Conflicts among many logics find solutions...by subordinating some to others. The accumulation of capital is the dominant trait of the logic of capital and provides the channels through which economic logic is imposed onto political and cultural logics" (*MAPET*, 252).¹⁰

21. Hill and his comrades insist that so-called "vulgar" Marxism is still correct in asserting that schooling is mostly a mechanism of social control and reproduction of capitalist work relations. Our city newspaper informed us recently (January 2004) that the current occupant of the White House will propose a new initiative providing some funds to community colleges for "training" American workers. The Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel constantly stresses how the public schools in the city are failing their students. Not surprisingly, these schools serve mostly minority students. White flight and deindustrialization have already been the consequences of Schumpeterian gales that ripped through southeastern Wisconsin during

the last thirty years. It is widely known that Milwaukee and Wisconsin are considered among the leaders in the school choice movement. All the attempts have mostly failed with regard to closing the achievement gap on high stakes tests between whites and people of color. The city newspaper appears to be somewhat enlightened on race and gender issues; however, the fact that African Americans, Latina/os, indigenous people, and Hmong people are oppressed, classed people is never articulated forcefully or in-depth—actually never even suggested. The putative reforms that are often referred to as "innovations" do help some students; however, overall they result in the continuing trend toward a two or more school track system. The tracks exist in close correspondence with the kind of work the students are being prepared to do. Some of the most unfortunate are being prepared for underemployment, unemployment, and even significant time in the criminal "justice" system. The authors of chapter 8 tell us that, at the very least, we should insist that "all students have a right to know that market capitalism is only one way...of running economies" (*MAPET*, 185).

22. Jenny Bourne writes in chapter 9 that once postmodernists threw out economic determinism and class, the baby went also—namely a belief that political struggle against capitalism and the class state was necessary. She indicts certain postmodernists for substituting the brute fact of institutional racism with "racialized discourse." Many postmodernists claim that the Left(s) are so diverse now that we can no longer share common logic, values, and politics. How lapsed can lapsed Marxists be? If these post-somethings are correct, then the leaders and agents of capitalism can increase their predatory actions "totally." I have long been interested in the ubiquitous use of the terms "total and totally" in the society I live in; however, those who use it in my presence never connect it to the totalistic ambitions, logic, and realities indicative of the capitalist system. Bourne writes:

Postmodernism has come full circle. It had its roots in the genuine shortcomings of Marxism and Left politics, especially in relation to issues of race and gender. But, in the process of pulling the rug from beneath 'complacent certainties' and prying open some 'paranoid totalities' it has also surrendered to a politically paralyzing skepticism, flashy populism and...moral relativism. (*MAPET*, 207)

23. Jane Kelly writes that the "Marxist framework...at its non-Stalinist best is coherent, consistent and flexible, [it] has different levels of analysis, and was developed by many in the twentieth century to take account of changes that its originators could not have foreseen" (*MAPET*, 219). Kelly's chapter 10 is called "Women, Work and the Family: Or Why Postmodernism Cannot Explain the Links." She is aggressive in her criticism of those feminists who do not consider the worlds of work in which most women are being exploited. Barbara Ehrenreich's *Nickel And Dimed: On Not Getting By In America* (2001) provides a popular account of what Kelly sees as lacking in feminist writing that does not see society from below.

24. The last chapter encourages us to bid postmodernism adieu in favor of a politics of human resistance. Critical theory and pedagogy must embrace critical utopianism and political action that takes seriously the concepts of concrete realities and totalism. Dialectical inquiry is suggested as an important process to accomplish this. Leo Panitch reminds us of Marx's call for "ruthless criticism of all that exists," and his injunction that we must not shrink from the conclusions we arrive at, even if we're "just a little afraid of conflict with the powers that be." According to Panitch:

We live in an era when capitalism stands astride the whole globe, the power of its ruling classes and the waste and inegalitarianism of its markets unregulated and unchallenged. Yet we also live in an era when for the first time in well over a century, there are no significant political projects which articulate and campaign for a socialist alternative to capitalism. There is popular resistance, people continue to fight back, they hold on to values that assert our humanity in the face of global commodification. But one of the main contributions socialists can still make...is not to shrink from a ruthless criticism of the limits of this resistance in so far as it is not socialist, even not yet fundamentally anti-capitalist; nor should we desist

from criticizing those socialists who still blithely imagine that every popular resistance has it in its genes to become socialist. (Panitch 1997, 1)

In the "Notes from the Editors" section of the January 2004 *Monthly Review*, historical materialism is seen as not being magically predictive. Referring to Lenin, the editors write:

There was no absolute determinism in his thinking. Revolutionary situations, he contended, may be objectively determined, but revolution itself remained a contingent historical fact. Such recognition of historical contingency is not antithetical to Marxism, but is of its very essence. ("Notes from the Editors" 2004, 64)

25. Elizabeth Kolbert wrote in "Looking For Lorca" that during the Spanish Civil War Franco's forces murdered many civilians. Not surprisingly, others have reported that the forces of the Spanish Republic did the same. My reason for including this postscript is because of who the former's murder victims were:

Prominent among those shot and dumped in the roadside graves were union leaders, anarchists, and members of the Communist Party, but it could be just as dangerous to be a school teacher or a successful pharmacist. Many of the victims appear to have been chosen on the basis of what the novelist and philosopher Miguel de Unamuno, an acquaintance of Lorca's [who was among the murdered], called "the spiritual leprosy of Spain: resentment, envy, hatred for intelligence." (Kolbert 2002, 68)

Notes

1. For an informative contextualization of differences between those who take Marxist thought seriously in reference to educational theory and pedagogy and those who are skeptical, "lapsed Marxists," and/or against it, see *Educational Theory* 48 (Fall 1998): 431-554. The volume features a lead article by Peter McLaren followed by various responses.

2. I have written elsewhere about these crucially important issues for those interested in mass collective struggle against the capitalist system, class states, their allies, agents, and minions. See "Globalism, Postmodernism, The Politics Of Identity, And The Need For Broad Democratic Political/Educational Coalitions." *Philosophical Studies In Education*. Proceedings of the annual (1994) meeting of the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society. Terre Haute, IN: OVPE, 1994, 1-48. See also "The Complexly Constructed Citizen-Worker: Her/His Centrality To The Struggle For Radical Democratic Politics And Education," *Journal Of Thought* 32 (Fall 1997): 9-26. Finally, see "Issues And Arguments Concerning Class, Gender, Race, And Other 'Identities,'" *Educational Studies* 31 (Winter 2000): 393-406.

3. See my essay review of Paula Allman's *Revolutionary Social Transformation: Democratic Hopes, Political Possibilities And Critical Education* (1999) in *Educational Studies* 32 (Summer 2001): 187-198.

4. For an analysis of the enormous advantage capitalists have over workers, see my *A Radical Democratic Critique Of Capitalist Education*. New York: Peter Lang. 1994, chapter 4, "The Regime Of Capital: Myth And Reality," section II, pp.142-165. I want to clarify my use of citizen when there are so many workers who labor under harsh conditions without the protection afforded by citizenship. My point is that everyone who lives in a particular polity is forced to have relations with the governments included within it.

5. Marshall Berman provides a good description and analysis of Marx the modernist in his *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air*, New York: Penguin Books, 1982, and *Adventures In Marxism*, London: Verso, 1999.

6. I have written about the problem, or refusal, to see Marx's work holistically in "One Marx, And The Centrality Of The Historical Actor(s), *Educational Theory* 35 (Winter 1985): 73-83.
7. I have elaborated on "openness" in Brosio (2000), chapter 3,"Various Reds: Marx, Historical Materialism, And The Openness Of History."
8. For more on the teeter-totter model of explanation, see my "Capital's Domination of the Quotidian: The Unbalanced Teeter-Totter," *Discourse* 12 (October 1991): 85-91.
9. My use of the word "irrelevant" may be more easily understood after having read these two articles, both of which appear in the *Monthly Review* 55 (January 2004): 21-36 and 37-49. The first article is Minqi Li's "After Neoliberalism: Empire, Social Democracy, or Socialism?" The second is Asbjorn Wahl's "European Labor: The Ideological Legacy of the Social Pact."
10. Drawing from Rachel Sharp, I have presented the following in "Reconsiderations: Schooling In Capitalist America," *Educational Studies* 23 (Winter 1992): 423-438. Sharp is critical of Bowles and Gintis for their "lapses," specifically with regard to their claims that things are all so complex that one must abandon structural primacy. I argue that "[f]or Sharp, Bowles and Gintis's attempt to respect the irreducibility of phenomena and analyses—so as to avoid reductionism—has brought them to an ontology based upon only distinct structures, pluralistic games, and contingent relationships. It is mere description that emerges, and perhaps one that is no threat to those who exercise the monopoly of power in an increasingly savage global rearrangement" (434).

References

- Brosio, Richard A. *Philosophical Scaffolding For The Construction Of Critical Democratic Education*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Notes from the Editors. 2004. *Monthly Review* 55 (January) Inside front and back covers, and 64.
- Kolbert, Elizabeth. 2003. "Letter From Spain: Looking For Lorca." *The New Yorker* 79 (December): 64-75.
- Panitch, Leo. *Socialist Register*. London: Merlin Press, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997.