know that all teaching is contingent and ideological and encourage them to use their educational time to work things through like grown-ups? And why should we suppose that there is only one effective method of teaching, as Graff does when he insists that we must all "teach the conflicts"? We note also that few nonradical courses are explicit about their commitments. How often do teachers of business courses announce their commitment to the system of power relations in which their students seek advancement? And how many economics courses lead off with full disclosure about the historical contingency of the market they take as universal, or about the chief beneficiaries of economic process and their interesting relation to what gets taught in American colleges, including in economics departments? So, yes, let's do teach about "the failures of capitalism," when they are not off topic, and treat students as historical agents who are capable of making up their own minds. In this manner, as Gullette suggests, we can combat the isolation of the college classroom by breaking down the university walls that matter most—the ones between the campus and the world.

Jacqueline E. Brady
Kingsborough Community College
City University of New York

Richard M. Ohmann
Wesleyan University

Reply:

Margaret Morganroth Gullette's defense of "teaching for social justice" does more to discredit the practice than anything I can say against it. She apparently can't imagine how "teaching students to become radicals" could be an abuse of the teacher's power over students. Though Gullette aligns herself with Jacqueline E. Brady and Richard M. Ohmann in their critical response to my Presidential Address, her conception of radical teaching seems more dogmatic and unqualified than theirs. The phrase Gullette happily embraces—"teaching students to become radicals"—misquotes the phrase "helping students become radicals" that Brady and Ohmann renounced in their letter as admittedly "ill-chosen" (217) after I criticized in my address its implication that our students are "*yearning* to become radicals and lack only a little 'help' from a friendly radical teacher to show them the way" (124.3 [2009]: 727–43; 740).

Gullette's logic is a good example of the self-righteousness and insularity I attacked in my address: since history has now demonstrated the truth of "radical critique," we have the right or even the obligation to try to radicalize our students. As Gullette puts it, "[V]iews not informed by radical critique implicitly promote hegemonic values. Teachers who hold such views cannot lead useful debates." There's apparently no alternative—we either teach radical critique or we are complicit with hegemony.

In my address, I argued that "teaching politics as *debate*—teaching the conflicts about politics, if you will—is the surest way to protect students from being bullied by teachers" (737). Teaching politics as debate achieves the legitimate goal of "teaching for social justice" programs (738), making students more reflective about pressing social issues, without the coerciveness that's inevitably a danger if we say it's all right for teachers to push their own politics on their students.

Gullette objects, however, that some questions, like whether women have the intelligence to pursue careers in science, don't merit debating. In fact, I conceded this point myself in my address (737), as I often do elsewhere (e.g., *Beyond the Culture Wars* [14]). But it hardly follows, as Gullette seems to imply, that there are no serious debates to be had about current political issues. Indeed, even when it comes to matters supposedly beyond debate, like Gullette's example of the Bush administration's torture policies, the situation may not afford us the luxury of refusing to debate. Opponents may have felt the torture policies should be beyond debate, but they did debate them in the media, and it's a good thing they did since the policies might not have been discontinued by the Obama administration had nobody been willing to argue against them.

https://doi.org/10.1632/S003081290016924X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gullette clearly doesn't share my concern about the authoritarian potential of trends like "teaching for social justice." I wonder what she would make of the fact that some college-of-education faculties have now devised ways of measuring the ideological conformity of teacher-education candidates. A "'Learning to Teach for Social Justice-Beliefs' (LTSJ-B) scale" is elaborated in full psychometric detail in a 2008 article, "Learning to Teach for Social Justice: Measuring Change in the Beliefs of Teacher Candidates," by Sarah Enterline, Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Larry H. Ludlow, and Emile Mitescu of the Lynch School of Education at Boston College (*New Educator* 4 [2008]: 267–90).

An ingenious merger of politically correct ideology and outcomes-testing methodology, the LTSJ-B scale, according to Enterline and her coauthors, enables program authorities to calculate the degree to which teacher-education candidates "identify and challenge inequities" (270). To determine their score on the scale, teacher candidates are asked loaded questions, such as whether they agree with the statement "The most important goal in working with immigrant children and English language learners is that they assimilate into American society." Though a "strongly agree" response might seem one that a reasonable person could give, the article makes clear that it would get a low score on the scale. The clear implication is that, in order to qualify to teach, candidates must see themselves "as activists and advocates who can contribute to larger social movements that challenge . . . inequities" (279). Obviously, conservatives—or anyone deemed not radical enough—need not apply.

Leaving no doubt that this is indeed the message, Enterline and her colleagues stress that "teaching for social justice" is not simply one option among possible ways to teach but a baseline prerequisite. In their own words, "[L]earning to teach for social justice is integral to the very idea of learning to teach." It is one of the "inalienable purposes" of teaching, the equivalent for teaching candidates of "the Hippocratic Oath for prospective doctors" (288). The implication again is that dissenters must either change their minds or think about taking up some other line of work.

Though the exponents of the LTSJ-B scale acknowledge that their program is "widely criticized by those outside the teacher education community" (268), they dismiss such criticism as rooted in the fallacy "that teacher education ought to be neutral and apolitical" (288). But it's possible to grant that teaching is unavoidably political and still maintain that pressuring students to share our political beliefs—as the LTSJ-B scale and the entire teaching-for-social-justice movement aim to do—is unprofessional, if not immoral. Allowing students to form their own political positions through dialogue and debate is a more ethical and effective way to go.

Gerald Graff
University of Illinois, Chicago

https://doi.org/10.1632/S003081290016924X Published online by Cambridge University Press