REVISTA ELECTRÓNICA INTERUNIVERSITARIA DE FORMACIÓN DEL PROFESORADO
CONTINUACIÓN DE LA ANTIGUA REVISTA DE ESCUELAS NORMALES

http://revistas.um.es/reifop
http://www.aufop.com/aufop/revistas/lista/digital

Fecha de recepción: 4 de noviembre de 2013
Fecha de revisión: 12 de noviembre de 2013
Fecha de aceptación: 10 de enero de 2014

Banks, J.A. (2014). Emigración global, diversidad y educación para la ciudadanía. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado, 17* (2), 1-11.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/reifop.17.2.197571

Emigración global, diversidad y educación para la ciudadanía

James A. Banks

University of Washington

Resumen

La emigración dentro de un estado-nación y entre estados-nación es un fenómeno mundial. El movimiento de pueblos más allá de los límites nacionales es tan viejo como el concepto mismo de estado-nación. Sin embargo, nunca antes en la historia del mundo el movimiento de grupos tan diversos a nivel de raza, cultura, etnia, religión y lengua en y entre estados-nación ha sido tan numeroso y rápido, ni han surgido cuestiones tan complejas y difíciles sobre la ciudadanía, los derechos humanos, la democracia, y la educación. Muchas tendencias y desarrollos a nivel global plantean un reto a la idea de educar estudiantes para que se desenvuelvan en un estado-nación. Dichas tendencias incluyen la forma en la que los individuos se movilizan de un lado a otro de las fronteras nacionales, el derecho a trasladarse permitido por la Unión Europea, y los derechos contenidos en la Declaración Universal de Derechos Humanos.

Este artículo describe cómo la emigración global está planteando un reto para las nociones institucionalizadas de la educación para la ciudadanía, la manera en la que los estados-nación están gestionando dichos retos, y cómo se puede reformar la educación para la ciudadanía para tratar con eficacia la diversidad provocada por la emigración.

Palabras clave

Inmigración; educación; diversidad; ciudadanía.

Contacto

James A. Banks, jbanks@u.washington.edu, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA. 110 Miller Sala, Seattle, WA 98195-3600 (206) 543-3386.

Global migration, diversity, and citizenship education

Abstract

Migration within and across nation-states is a worldwide phenomenon. The movement of peoples across national boundaries is as old as the nation-state itself. However, never before in the history of world has the movement of diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, religious, and language groups within and across nation-states been as numerous and rapid or raised such complex and difficult questions about citizenship, human rights, democracy, and education. Many worldwide trends and developments are challenging the notion of educating students to function in one nation-state. These trends include the ways in which people are moving back and forth across national borders, the rights of movement permitted by the European Union, and the rights codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This article describes how global migration is challenging institutionalized notions of citizenship education, how nation-states are dealing with these challenges, and how citizenship education.

Key words

Immigration; education; diversity; citizenship.

Assimilation, diversity, and global migration

Prior to the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the aim of schools in most nation-states was to develop citizens who internalized national values, venerated national heroes, and accepted glorified versions of national histories. These goals of citizenship education are obsolete today because many people have multiple national commitments and live in more than one nation. However, the development of citizens who have global and cosmopolitan identities and commitments is contested in nation-states around the world because nationalism remains strong. Nationalism and globalization co-exist in tension worldwide. The number of recognized nation-states increased from 43 in 1900 to approximately 195 in 2012 (U. S. State Department, 2012). The number of people living outside their country of birth or citizenship grew from 120 million in 1990 to 214 million in 2010, which was three percent of the world's population of seven billion (Martin, 2010).

Democratic nations around the world are required to deal with complex educational issues when trying to respond to the problems that result from international migration in ways consistent with their ideologies and official policies. Researchers have amply documented the wide gap between democratic ideals and the school experiences of minority groups in nations around the world (Banks, 2009; Leibold & Yangbin, 2014; Luchtenberg, 2004). Researchers have described how students such as the Maori in New Zealand, Muslims in France, and Mexican Americans in the United States experience discrimination in school because of their cultural, ethnic, racial, religious, and linguistic differences (Banks, 2009). Democratic nation-states and their schools are grappling with a number of salient issues, paradigms, and ideologies as their populations become more culturally, racially, ethnically, linguistically, and religiously diverse. The extent to which nation-states make multicultural citizenship possible, the achievement gap between minority and majority groups, and the

language rights of immigrant and minority groups are among the unresolved and contentious issues with which diverse nations and schools are required to deal.

Nations throughout the world are trying to determine whether they will perceive themselves as multicultural and allow immigrants to experience what Will Kymlicka (1995)—the Canadian political philosopher—calls *multicultural citizenship* or continue to embrace an *assimilationist* ideology—described by the U. S. sociologist Milton M. Gordon (1964). In nation-states that embrace Kymlicka's idea of multicultural citizenship, immigrant and minority groups can—in theory if not in practice— retain important aspects of their languages and cultures as well as have full citizenship rights.

Nations in various parts of the world have responded to the citizenship and cultural rights of immigrant and minority groups in different ways. Since the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, many of the national leaders and citizens in the United States, Canada, and Australia have viewed their nations as multicultural democracies. An ideal exists within these nations that minority groups can retain important elements of their community cultures and participate fully in the national civic community. However, research has documented a wide gap between the ideals within these nations and the experiences of ethnic groups (Banks, 2009). Ethnic minority groups in the United States, Canada, and Australia experience discrimination in both the schools and the wider society.

Other nations, such as Japan (Hirasawa, 2009) and Germany (Luchtenberg, 2009), are reluctant to view themselves as multicultural. Historically, citizenship has been closely linked to biological heritage and characteristics in both nations. However, the biological conception of citizenship in Japan and Germany has eroded within the last decade. However, it left a tenacious legacy in both nations. Since the 1960s and 1970s, the French (Lemaire, 2009) have dealt with immigrant groups in ways distinct from the United States, Canada, and Australia. *La laïcité* is a very important concept in France, the aim of which is to keep church and state separate. *La laïcité* emerged in response to the hegemony the Catholic Church exercised in France over the schools and other institutions for several centuries. A major goal of state schools in France is to assure that students obtain a secular education and a commitment to the Republic of France. A law banning religious symbols in schools was enacted on March 15, 2004. Many observers interpreted the law as directly aimed at preventing Muslim female students from wearing the headscarf or *hijab* to school. The genesis of the rigid sanction against the headscarf or veil is *la laïcité* and the dominance of the Catholic Church in French history.

In France the explicit goal is assimilation (called *integration*) and inclusion. Immigrant groups can become full citizens in France but the price is cultural assimilation. Immigrants are required to surrender their languages and cultures in order to become full citizens. In 2010, the French Senate banned the wearing of the burqa or any veils that cover the face in public spaces, which was another significant victory for assimilationist forces in France.

Multicultural citizenship and cultural democracy

Multicultural societies are faced with the problem of constructing nation-states that reflect and incorporate the diversity of its citizens and yet have an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all of its citizens are committed. A nation-state that has an overarching set of democratic values such as justice and equality has the potential to protect the rights of cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups and enable them to experience cultural democracy and freedom. Kymlicka (1995) and the U. S. anthropologist Renato Rosaldo (1997) have constructed theories about diversity and citizenship. Both

Kymlicka and Rosaldo maintain that in a democratic society, ethnic and immigrant groups should have the right to maintain their ethnic cultures and languages as well as participate fully in the national civic culture. Kymlicka calls this concept "multicultural citizenship;" Rosaldo refers to it as "cultural citizenship."

In the United States during the 1920s Drachsler (1920) used *cultural democracy* to describe what theorists call multicultural citizenship today. Drachsler and Kallen (1924) —who were Jewish immigrants and advocates for the cultural freedom and rights of the Southern, Central, and East European immigrants— agued that cultural democracy is an important characteristic of a democratic society. They maintained that cultural democracy should co-exist with political and economic democracy, and that citizens from diverse groups in a democratic society should participate freely in the civic life of the nation-state and experience economic equality. They should also have the right to maintain important aspects of their community cultures and languages, as long as they do not conflict with the shared democratic ideals of the nation-state. Cultural democracy, argued Drachsler, is an essential component of a political democracy.

Cultural democracy and diversity have attained increased recognition and legitimacy in many nations since the civil rights and ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s. However, the assimilationist idea is still powerful in nations around the world, although it is being challenged by global migration and the quest by marginalized racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious groups for cultural recognition and rights within their societies and within schools, colleges, and universities.

Global migration and the assimilationist ideology

Global migration and the increasing diversity in nation-states around the world challenge liberal assimilationist conceptions of citizenship and raise complex and divisive questions about how nations can construct civic communities that reflect and incorporate the diversity of its citizens as well as develop a set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all of its citizens are committed (Banks, 2008). Before the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the liberal assimilationist ideology guided policy related to immigrants and diversity in most nations.

The liberal assimilationist conception regards the rights of the individual as paramount and group identities and rights as inconsistent with and detrimental to the freedom of the individual (Patterson, 1977). This conception maintains that identity groups promote group rights over individual rights and that the individual must be freed of ethnic and cultural attachments in order to have free choice and options within a modernized democratic society (Patterson, 1977; Schlesinger, 1991). Strong attachments to ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, and other identity groups promote divisions and lead to ethnic conflicts and harmful divisions within society. Assimilationist scholars such as Chavez (2010), Patterson, and Schlesinger also assume that group attachments will die of their own weight within a modernized, pluralistic democratic society if marginalized groups are given the opportunity to attain structural inclusion into the mainstream society. Assimilationist scholars argue that the survival of ethnic and community attachments in a modernized democratic society reflects a "pathological condition," i. e., marginalized groups have not been provided opportunities that enabled them to experience cultural assimilation and full structural inclusion into mainstream society and institutions (Apter, 1977). If Mexican Americans are structurally integrated into mainstream U. S. society—argues the liberal assimilationist—

they will have neither the desire nor the need to speak Spanish. Apter states that the assimilationist conception is not totally wrong but is oversimplified and misleading.

The assimilationist analysis is questioned

A number of factors have caused social scientists and political philosophers to raise serious questions about the liberal assimilationist analysis and expectation for cultural and identity groups within modernized democratic nations. These factors include (1) the rise of the ethnic revitalization movements during the 1960s and 1970s which demanded recognition of individual as well as group rights by nations and institutions such as schools, colleges, and universities (Banks, 2009); (2) the continuing structural exclusion of many racial, ethnic, linguistic, and religions groups in the United States and other Western nations; (3) the spiritual and community needs that identity groups satisfy for individual group members; and (4) the increasing global immigration throughout the world that has made most nations diverse and multicultural (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Kymlicka, 1995).

Identity groups in multicultural democratic societies

Assimilationist theorists such as Chavez (2010), Glazer (1997), and Schlesinger (1991) use the term "identity groups" to describe marginalized cultural, ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups. However, as Gutmann (2003) perceptively points out, mainstream groups such as mainstream Anglo Americans and the Boy Scouts of America—as well as minoritized groups such as American Muslims and Mexican Americans—are all identity groups.

Gutmann (2003) states that identity groups based on factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, language, and religion can both obstruct the realization of democratic values as well as facilitate their realization. Identity groups can try to make individuals ashamed for not having characteristics that the group considers essential for membership. A Mexican American who does not speak Spanish may experience ridicule from the group. However, identity groups can also enhance the individual freedom of individuals by helping them to attain goals that can only be attained with group action. Important examples are the political, cultural, and educational goals that African Americans gained from participating in the civil rights movement during the 1960s and 1970s. The civil rights movement also initiated changes within U.S. society that gave significant benefits to other racial, ethnic, and language groups, to women, to groups with disabilities, and to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) people.

During the course of U.S. history marginalized and structurally excluded identity groups have organized and worked for their group rights which resulted in greater equality and social justice for marginalized groups within the United States as well as in other nations. The Civil Rights Movement in the United States echoed throughout the world and empowered marginalized groups in other nations to organize and protest for full structural inclusion into their nation-states and societies. Catholics in Northern Ireland, Jamaicans in London, and the Aborigines in Australia adapted many of the goals and visions of the civil rights movements in the United States. Consequently, civil rights leaders in the United States, such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X, are internationally known civil rights heroes. In the United States as well in other Western nations, groups in the margins of society have been the conscience of their nations and the main sites for the struggles to close the gap between democratic ideals and institutionalized racism and discrimination. (Okihiro, 1994).

Universal and differentiated citizenship

A universal conception of citizenship, which is supported by assimilationist theorists, does not include or recognize group differences. Consequently, the differences of groups that have experienced structural exclusion and discrimination— such as women, people of color, people with disabilities, and LGBT people—are silenced in public discourse. A *differentiated* conception of citizenship, rather than a *universal one*, is needed to help marginalized groups attain civic equality and recognition in multicultural democratic nations (Young, 1989). Many problems result from a universal conception of citizenship which assumes that "citizenship status transcends particularity and difference" and which results in "laws and rules that are blind to individual and group differences" (Young, p. 250). A universal conception of citizenship within a stratified society results in some groups being treated as second-class citizens because group rights are not recognized and the principle of equal treatment is strictly applied. A significant problem with a universal conception of citizenship is the assumption that treating groups the same will result in equality, even through some groups have been victims of racism and discrimination throughout history. A differentiated conception of citizenship recognizes that some groups must be treated differently in order for them to attain equality and structural inclusion.

When universal citizenship is determined, defined, and implemented by groups with power and without the interest of marginalized groups being expressed or incorporated into civic discussions, the interests of groups with power and influence will become defined as universal and as the public interest. Groups with power and influence usually define their interests as the public interest and the interests and goals of marginalized groups as "special interests." This phenomenon occurs in the United States in the debates over multicultural education in schools, colleges, and universities. Critics of multicultural education such as D'Souza (1991) and Schlesinger (1991) define the interests of dominant groups as the "public" interest and the interests of people of color such as African Americans and Latinos as "special interests" which endanger the polity.

Cultural, national, Regional, and global identifications

The school should provide recognition and validation of the home and community cultures and languages of students. Although cultural identities are important, they are not sufficient because of worldwide migration and the effects of globalization on local, regional, and national communities. Students also need to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills required to function within their nation-states, their regions, as well in a global world society. Globalization affects every aspect of nations and societies, including business and trade, beliefs, norms, values, and behaviors. Worldwide migration is increasing diversity in most nations around the world and is forcing nations to rethink citizenship and citizenship education. National boundaries are being eroded because several million people live in different nations and have multiple citizenships (Castles & Davidson, 2000; 2012). Millions of other people have citizenship in one nation and live in another. Other people are stateless, such as millions of refugees around the world.

National boundaries are also becoming more porous because of international human rights that are codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the European Convention on Human Rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights codify rights for individuals regardless of the nation state in which they live and whether they are citizens of a nation or not. The rights explicated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights include the rights to freedom of expression, the

right to privacy and of religious beliefs, and the right to be presumed innocent if charged with a crime until proven guilty (Starkey, 2012). There are serious tensions between international human rights and national sovereignty. Despite the codification of international rights by bodies such as the United Nations and the Council of Europe, nationalism is as strong as ever (Benhabib, 2004).

The complex identities of immigrant youth

Historically, schools in Western democratic nations such as the United States, Canada, and Australia, have focused on helping students to develop national loyalty, commitments, and allegiance to the nation-state and have given little attention to their need to maintain commitments to their local communities and cultures or to their original homelands. School assumed that assimilation into the mainstream culture was required for citizenship and national belonging and that students could and should surrender commitments to other communities, cultures, and nations. Greenbaum (1974) states that schools taught White immigrant groups to the United States from Southern, Central, and Eastern Europe *hope* and *shame*. They were made to feel ashamed of their home and community cultures but were given hope that once they culturally assimilated they could join the U. S. mainstream culture. Cultural assimilation worked well for most White ethnic groups in the United States (Alba & Nee, 2003), but not for groups of color, which continue to experienced structural exclusion after they become culturally assimilated.

Ethnographic research indicates that the narrow and nationalistic conception of citizenship education that has been embraced historically by schools in the United States is inconsistent with the racial, ethnic, and cultural realities of U. S. society because of the complicated, contextual, and overlapping identities of immigrant students. Research by scholars studying immigrant high school students indicates that these youth have complex and contradictory *transnational* identifications (El-Haj, 2007; 2004; Nguyen, 2011). This research also indicates that the cultural and national identities of immigrant youth are contextual, evolving, and are continually reconstructed.

El-Haj (2007), Nguyen (2011), and Maira (2004) found that the immigrant youths in their studies did not define their national identity in terms of their place of residence, but felt that they belonged to national communities that transcended the boundaries of the United States. They defined their national identities as Palestinian, Vietnamese, Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi. They believed that an individual could be Palestinian or Vietnamese and live in many different nation states. The youth in these studies distinguished *national identity* and *citizenship*. They viewed themselves as Palestinian, Vietnamese, or Pakistani but recognized and acknowledged their U. S. citizenship, which they valued for the privileged legal status and other opportunities it gave them. Some of the Vietnamese youth in Nguyen's study said, "I am Vietnamese *and* a citizen of the United States."

Mainstream and transformative citizenship education

Citizenship education must be reimagined and transformed to effectively educate students to function in the 21st century (Banks, 2007). To reform citizenship education, the knowledge that underlies its construction needs to shift from *mainstream* to *transformative* academic knowledge (Banks, 2003). Mainstream knowledge reinforces traditional and established knowledge in the social and behavioral sciences as well as the knowledge that is institutionalized within the popular culture and within the schools, colleges, and

universities within a nation. Transformative academic knowledge consists of paradigms and explanations that challenge some of the key epistemological assumptions of mainstream knowledge (Harding, 1991). An important purpose of transformative knowledge is to challenge the social, political, and economic structures within society that perpetuate inequality and contribute to the marginalization of excluded groups. Feminist scholars and scholars of color have been among the leading constructors of transformative academic knowledge in the United States (Harding, 1991; Takaki, 1993).

Mainstream citizenship education is grounded in mainstream knowledge and assumptions and reinforces the status quo and the dominant power relationships in society. It is practiced in most social studies classrooms in schools around the world, and does not challenge or disrupt the class, racial, and gender discrimination within the schools and society. It does not help students to understand their multiple and complex identities nor the ways in which their lives are influenced by globalization, or what their role should be in a global world. The emphasis is on memorizing facts about constitutions and other legal documents, learning about various branches of government, and developing patriotism to the nation-state. Critical thinking skills, decision-making, and action are not important components of mainstream citizenship education.

Transformative citizenship education needs to be implemented within the schools in order for students to attain clarified and reflective cultural, national, regional, and global identifications, and to understand how these identities are interrelated and constructed (Banks, 2007). Transformative citizenship education also recognizes and validates the cultural identities of students and provides them civic equality in the classroom and school. It is rooted in transformative academic knowledge and enables students to acquire the information, skills, and values needed to challenge inequality within their communities, their nations, and the world, to develop cosmopolitan values and perspectives, and to take actions to create just and democratic multicultural communities and societies. Transformative citizenship education helps students to develop decision-making and social action skills that are needed to identify problems within society, acquire knowledge related to their home and community cultures and languages, identify and clarify their values, and to take thoughtful individual or collective civic action that will improve their local communities, nation-states, and the world.

Bibliografía

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Apter, D. (1977). Political life and cultural pluralism. In M. Tumin & W. Plotch (Eds.), Pluralism in a democratic society (pp .58-91). New York: Praeger.

Banks, J. A. (2003). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. Educational Researcher, 22 (5), 4-14.

Banks, J. A. (2007). Educating citizens in a multicultural society (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. Educational Researcher, 37 (3), 129-139.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2009). The Routledge international companion to multicultural

education. New York & London: Routledge.

Benhabib, S. (2004). The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging. New York & London: Routledge.

Chavez, L. (2010, May 24). Focus on U. S. history, not ethnic studies. Dallas Morning

News. Retrieved from http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/latest-columns/20100514-Linda-Chavez-Focus-on-U-6265.ece

Drachsler, J. (1920). Democracy and assimilation. New York: Macmillan.

D'Souza, D. (1991). Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus. New York: The Free Press.

El-Haj, T. R. A. (2007). "I was born here, but my home, it's not here:" Educating for democratic citizenship in an era of transnational migration and global conflict. Harvard Educational Review, 77(3), 285-316.

Glazer, N. (1997). We are all multiculturalists now. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenbaum, W. (1974). America in search of a new ideal: As essay on the rise of pluralism. Harvard Educational Review, 44(3), 411-440.

Gutmann, A. (2003). Identity in democracy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hirasawa, Y. (2009). Multicultural education in Japan. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), The Routledge international companion to multicultural education (pp. 159-169). New York & London: Routledge.

Kallen, H. M. (1924). Culture and democracy in the United States. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lemaire, E. (2009). Education, integration, and citizenship in France. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), The Routledge international companion to multicultural education (pp. 323-333). New York & London: Routledge.

Leibold, J. & Yangbin, C. (Eds.). (2014). Minority education in China: Balancing unity and diversity in an era of critical pluralism. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Luchtenberg, S. (2004). Migration, education, and change. London & New York: Routledge.

Luchtenberg, S. (2009). Migrant minority groups in Germany: Success and failure in education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), The Routledge international companion to multicultural education (pp. 463-473). New York & London: Routledge.

Maira, S. (2004). Imperial feelings: Youth culture, citizenship, and globalization. In M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), Globalization, culture, and education in the new millennium (pp. 203-234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Martin, P. (2010). Remittances and the recession's effects on international migration. Population Reference Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.prb.org/Publications/Articles/2011/international-migration-recession-remittances.aspx

Nguyen, D. T. (2011). Vietnamese immigrant youth and citizenship: How race, ethnicity, and culture shape sense of belonging. El Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

Okihiro, G. (1994). Margins and mainstreams: Asians in American history and culture. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Ong, A. (2012). Flexible citizenship. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), Encyclopedia of diversity in education (vol. 2, pp. 1115-1118). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Patterson, O. (1977). Ethnic chauvinism: The reactionary impulse. New York: Stein and Day.

Rosaldo, R. (1997). Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In W. V. Florres & R. Benmayor (Eds.), Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights (pp. 27-28). Boston, MA: Beacon.

Schlesinger, A. M. Jr. (1991). The disuniting of America. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.

Starkey, H. (2012). Human rights and education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), Encyclopedia of diversity in education (vol. 2, pp. 919-921). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, I. M. (1989). Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. Ethics, 99(2), 250-274.

Takaki, R. (1993). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Boston: Little Brown.

U. S. Department of State (2012). Independent states in the world. Retrieved

from http://www.state.gov/s/inr/rls/4250.htm

Autores

James A. Banks
Holds the Kerry and Linda Killinger Endowed Chair in Diversity Studies and is the founding director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. He was the Russell F. Stark University Professor at the University of Washington from 2001 to 2006. Professor Banks is a past president of the American Educational Research Association and of the National Council for the Social Studies. He is a specialist in social studies education and multicultural education and has written widely in these fields. His books include *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies; Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching; Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society;* and *Race, Culture, and Education: The Selected Works of James A. Banks.* Professor Banks is the editor of the *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education; The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education; Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*; and the *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*, a four-volume reference work published by Sage in both hard and electronic editions