

The concluding chapter considers some of the challenges facing the teaching of citizenship education and enterprise culture in schools. Deuchar comments on the threat posed by 'economic fundamentalism' and a neo-liberal, capitalist agenda. Also identified as a threat is teacher-led, risk-averse, target-driven learning. Many teachers, it is claimed, are still dismissive of citizenship education and pay lip-service to it, reinforcing its marginalisation within the curriculum. Notwithstanding this, the evidence presented from the case studies in Scotland suggests that there are some hopeful signs for a positive future for holistic citizenship education, and Deuchar's book seeks to play a catalysing role in the development of a more imaginative, bold and democratic approach to the teaching of citizenship and enterprise in schools.

Deuchar's book is a refreshingly easy read, leaning (it seems to me) more towards an audience of practitioners than one of academics. It is perhaps for this reason that the book avoids elaborating on certain theoretical issues that emerged from the text as I was reading it. For example, much of what Deuchar describes as good practice in the teaching of enterprise and citizenship – e.g., problematising the concept of 'enterprise', using self-interest as a generative theme, addressing contentious issues in a context of dialogue, and the necessity of risk in the teaching enterprise – reflects a perspective associated with critical pedagogy, and in particular the work of Paulo Freire. Some consideration of the research data in explicitly Freirean or neo-Freirean terms might have run the risk of turning the text into more of a polemic than a handbook. However, without it, some of the analysis seemed to me rather weak, particularly in respect of Freire's oft-repeated argument that democracy cannot be 'taught' but has to be learnt experientially. If a key aim of the book is to encourage professional development amongst teachers through a process of reflective learning, surely such a process is assisted, rather than hindered, by the development and application of appropriate theory. In spite of this, Deuchar's book does, overall, make a well-considered, well-argued and ultimately worthwhile contribution to the literature on citizenship education.

**John McCormack**

*Institute of Education, University of London, UK*

*jmcormack@ioe.ac.uk*

© 2008, John McCormack

**Diversity and citizenship education: global perspectives**, edited by James A. Banks, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2004, £15.99 (paperback), 485 pp., ISBN 978-0-78798-765-7

This volume explores the same ground as that covered by the (Ajegbo) Diversity and Citizenship curriculum review; this was the focus of the conference that is the origin of the papers presented in this special issue of the *London Review of Education*. The book has its origins in a conference in Bellagio, Italy, in June 2002 that aimed to explore ways in which 'citizenship education programs promote national unity as well as incorporate important cultural components of diverse groups into the national civic culture'.

James A. Banks, Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle, and past President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), has brought together this substantial collection. This most influential theoriser and practitioner of multicultural education now directs his attention to citizenship education.

Banks has a sense of organisation of an edited collection that is particularly helpful to readers. The underlying principles of the volume are explained in his preface. There are seven sections, each with a short overview introduction pulling out the main issues raised and providing some

relevant background information to the national case studies. This prepares the reader and provides signposting of a quality rarely found in edited collections.

A foreword by Will Kymlicka highlights key themes across the chapters: struggles against assimilationist models of citizenship education (Castles in chapter 1, Gonçalves e Silva in chapter 7, Froumin in chapter 10 and Wan in chapter 13) and the tensions between unity and diversity generated when multiculturalism is implemented within nation states (notably Ong in chapter 2 and Gutmann in chapter 3). Kymlicka characterised this struggle as ‘domestic multiculturalism’ as opposed to ‘cosmopolitan multiculturalism’.

The seven sections throw up some fascinating juxtapositions. Part 3 is South Africa and Brazil. In the former, the *apartheid* regime formalised racial segregation, whereas in Brazil the myth of ‘racial democracy’ obscured the almost total exclusion of those of African descent (half the population) from business and the media. In both cases the struggle is with the difficulty of implementing citizenship education when the government blatantly contradicts lessons taught in school. Part 4 brings together England, Germany and Russia. An issue that emerges is the separation of citizenship education and multicultural education because the latter was conceptualised essentially as the education of migrants. Figueroa in his chapter on England theorises the concepts of citizenship and identity within the context of citizenship education in a multicultural society as being based on feelings of belonging that are multiple, polymorphic, socially constructed, relational, open and dynamic. This provides a useful definition of Kymlicka’s cosmopolitan multiculturalism.

Part 5 of the collection consists of chapters covering citizenship education in Japan, India and China. Japan is, according to Stephen Murphy-Shigematsu in chapter 11, gradually coming to terms with diversity, though citizenship education has been based on understandings of concepts such as Japan, Japanese and Japanese culture, as defined by nationalist ideologies. India is a democratic and secular multicultural nation state, but T.K.Oommen, author of chapter 12, points out the tension between the two parts of the expression *multicultural nation state* and also between *multicultural citizenship*. This is because he associates citizenship with a system of governance of nation states and multiculturalism with universal human rights. In fact there has been a struggle to influence citizenship education textbooks in India between multicultural secularists and what Oommen refers to as cultural monists, namely Hindu nationalists who elide expressions such as ‘Indian tradition’ and ‘Indian ethos’ with interchangeable use of Hindu for Indian. There are no such ambiguities in the case of China. The constitution recognises national minorities, but all are united as Chinese citizens whose duty is to obey the authority of the state. As Wan Minggang explains in chapter 13, moral education, previously essentially promoting the ideology of the ruling party, is gradually becoming a space for something approaching citizenship education.

Part 6 juxtaposes Israel, a nation state, and Palestine, a not-yet nation state. Moshe Tatar provides an account of Israel as essentially controlled by monists. There is not a clear distinction, he notes, between the Jewish religion and the Jewish nation and therefore by extension the Israeli state. By definition, this label excludes those whose civic identity is Israeli, but whose national identification is with Palestine. There are consequently tensions between promoting national unity for the Israeli state and promoting democracy. Similarly, Fouad Moughrabi shows that in the occupied nation of Palestine that has yet to become a state, citizenship education as defined through *National Education* textbooks, whilst introducing concepts of civic and state institutions, allows little room for consideration of difference and diversity within the nation. These examples are essentially inward looking, failing to situate social and political issues within an engagement with what it means to promote universal human rights.

The first and last chapters of the volume are by colleagues from the Center for Multicultural Education, James Banks for chapter 1 and Walter Parker for chapter 16. Both provide the global perspective indicated in the title. Parker applies the Habermasian concept of deliberative

democracy to educational settings. In a key sentence, he notes that: ‘diversity figures as the most central deliberative asset’ (453). In other words, democracy is inconceivable without diversity and so diversity is an asset. National unity is a legitimate concern for governments and, in a democracy, may be an aim of the education system. However, the nation state is too narrow a focus to contain all the belongings and identities of those that live within its territory and those that attend its schools. Education for cosmopolitan citizenship, based on understandings of human rights, can help to reconcile the tension within multicultural nation states of issues of unity and diversity.

This volume is essential reading for all scholars and students of the academic field of citizenship education. There are further excellent chapters in parts 1 and 2. It is therefore particularly surprising that the Ajegbo report ignored this book. Perhaps the team was put off by the subtitle ‘global perspectives’. Unless citizenship education for a multicultural Britain is framed within a global perspective and universal principles, it is liable to recognise only the values of the dominant majority. In England we have lessons to learn from India and Israel.

Hugh Starkey

*Institute of Education, University of London, UK*

*h.starkey@ioe.ac.uk*

© 2008, Hugh Starkey

**Education for inclusive citizenship**, by Dina Kiwan, London and New York, Routledge, 2007, 147 pp. £24.99 (paperback), ISBN: 978-0-415-42368-7

Based on her doctoral research, and informed by her work on policy development, Dina Kiwan’s book explores the perceptions of citizenship of key players in the formulation of the policy and curriculum of citizenship education in England – including teachers, academics, NGO members, the former home secretary David Blunkett and Sir Bernard Crick. The book begins with an extensive historical account of the development of citizenship education in England from the nineteenth century Victorian context, up to the 1998 Crick report (QCA 1998) and the 2007 Ajegbo report (Ajegbo et al. 2007), which Kiwan co-authored. In her analysis, Kiwan explores the participants’ theoretical conceptions of citizenship and their relations to conceptions of diversity. From these she derives four models of citizenship underpinned by political philosophy – moral, legal, participatory and identity-based – and explicates their implications for ethnic and religious diversity. The theoretical implications may be transferable to other contexts, while the practical implications mainly refer to the education system in England.

Kiwan criticises the citizenship conception models based on moral, legal and participatory understandings. When it comes to the moral conceptions, Kiwan proposes that ‘the educational context must focus on the *process* of inclusive communication and collective problem-solving, rather than focus on trying to achieve the outcome of “shared values”’ (59). The author always places ‘shared values’ in inverted commas – perhaps to emphasise the danger of the quest for shared values becoming ‘a synonym for assimilation into a monoculturalism based on a numerical majority’ (ibid.). While the dialogue about values is not abandoned, it is not required that the participants reach an absolute agreement. Kiwan’s argument is in line with Appiah’s (2006, 78) proposal, in the context of cosmopolitanism, to learn about other people and civilisations:

... because it will help us get used to one another. If that is the aim, then the fact that we have all these opportunities for disagreement about values need not put us off. Understanding one another may be hard; it can certainly be interesting. But it doesn’t require that we come to agreement.