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**Abstract**

According to Boje, D. M., Svane, M., Henderson, T. L., & Strevel, H. B. (2015). Fractals are similar processes that repeat at each level of a system. While this concedes that there is a conception of small and big, even simple to complex, however this does not imply hierarchy. Hierarchy implies that one system is able to dictate the condition of a smaller or more simple system. It would be the argument of the fractal was created by the simple and it permeated the complex, or vice versa. But it might be possible to assume that the fractal that is seen at one level to the next is not simply two different fractals sharing similarities but it is in fact the same fractal. Schwartz, Stapp, & Beauregard’s, (2005), quantum theory argues for an inner world and outer world collapse into each other. Kuhnle (2002) posits a fractal company. In a fractal company the hierarchy of the company identity over worker identity is collapsed into one. Wirtsch, Sihn, & Klink, (2001) Posits that a fractal company and its Market is collapsed into one.

Boje and Henderson, (2015) Says that fractals are self-producing systems. What is interesting about self-producing systems is that it uses energy from the environment around it but produces itself from itself (Houston,1999). Yet Houston, (1999) also states that self-producing systems are both open and closed. Houston does limit its openness to the exchange of energy, but then it closes itself from being altered or changed from the external environment aside from the resources it obtains from the external sources. The external world is something to be used by the closed system. However if everything is collapsed and the inside and the outside are one and the same then it is possible to argue that inside and outside are created together and the fractals are the times and spaces in which in order for one thing that can not be another is then fractured so that the two creations may exist at the same time.

What are system agents? Well many system changers have many differing names, however their function remains the same. An agent is someone who is maintaining a system. Now there are two recognized agents, there are the objects, which are agents that are just resources for the system. Then there are subjects, agents who moves objects around in the service of the system (Freie 1970). Although one could argue that subjects take an invested interest in reorganizing the system in order for it to be sustained, the problem is that when a fractal is reorganized into something new, is it still the same fractal? And if it is the same fractal, if it is a different shape, would the objects protest that they no longer fit in this fractal, then become subjects that simply act to revert their fractal back into their own needs?

The following is a table inner and outer interacts of fractal reorganization. The division of object and subject, is that objects are closed systems acting to keep things the same while subjects are closed systems acting to reorganize the fractal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| my framework | truth storytelling 7 principles | fractal relationality |
| Self- reflection | truth | knowing ones authentic self |
| learning reflexive knowledge creation | make room | aware of place and situation |
| Community | plot | aware of relation to others |
| performance | time | awareness of possibilities |
| debrief | help the story along |  |
| update | stage |  |
| feed back | reflect |  |

In classism, there are social categories and ideology, it is about how social groups are arranged and how important it is for everyone to share the same ideology. In a high social structure and high ideology dissemination system, every category group has their place and purpose and this ideology should be shared by everyone. In a high social structure and low ideology dissemination, every social category, man, woman, child, has a place and purpose, and its not something for everyone and if one does not want to follow it then that one can leave. In a low social structure that is high in ideology, anybody can serve a purpose but there has to be an agreed upon purpose and it’s a good purpose, everyone should share the same purpose. In a low social structure and low ideology, it is fine that people are not being arranged by their social category, and its not a system for everyone but just as long as the status quo is not disturbed there would be no reason to make others follow this system.

Now there is nothing wrong with trying to decide how to organize society, its also not inherently wrong to feel that one’s social system is a good one. The issue of how far and widespread one’s system should be is also not the purview of this particular work. Its not about the changes in political boundaries. This work is more concerned when the social system is antidialogical. But America has to realize that their process to create their social structure and their ideology is utilizing an antidialogical process instead of a dialogical one. It is this antidialogical process that is causing suffering. What needs to be expressed here is that, each of these ways of organizing social categories and how disseminated one’s ideology should be, can be antidiologically created and sustained or it can be dialogically created.

This work is concerned with a system that is set up to cause suffering. Because the American social system has changed over time. It was founded on high social structure and high dissemination. The American social structure was so simple, as evident in the census, it was white and slave. It took a civil war to change the social structure of America. But America always believed that their ideology needed to be disseminated. Dissemination of ideology is very high, and this has not changed. Imagine the most Scio-politicalized American white adult male man-made human institution in existence, consider our public school system. Critical Pedagogy is the field concerned with the critique of the social situations of society and the role that pedagogues in the school can to take in order to create positive social change. This is a Freirean Dialogical Critique of the social situation of society vis a vi its antidialogical practices in its production of classism. The role that pedagogues could take is to recognize that the antidialogical structure of the school perpetuates the social situations of society and need to engage a Freirean dialogical reimagining of pedagogical practices.
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Who is suffering in America? There is much suffering by separatist traditionalists in the course of this story. The Supranational revolutionaries are violent. They behave antidiologically, they conquer the native inhabitants with bullets, pox, and death marches. They divide and rule, they give the privilege of owning land, the right to vote, and to act in commerce to those that will rule the land and enslave workers to run it well. They manipulate by acknowledging that some men that might be mistaken for slaves are the free ones, and yes women can be educated but not for politics and business. They culturally invade, a man and woman can have the American rights and privileges as long as they think, speak, and act like an landowner, who is going to vote and conduct business as it is prescribed. The story continues today, the violence is still enacted. But if we follow another’s past, Paulo Freire observed that in an antidiological system, everyone suffers, in this paper, all Americans suffer. These antidialogical practices will beget more and more violence, it does not matter if the face of the supranational revolutionaries have transformed from a white man’s face to a black man’s face, the antadialogical processes causes suffering in our social and ideological system, because it is a violent system. There is hope for America yet.

Our social situation begins with the census, which being with the first question, what are the privileges. Once privileges have been established it began to organize who has access and who does not have access to these privileges. Followed by having people identify themselves as those in need of government assistance. And if you can show you have earned your educational degree, and be a part of the system, then you will be considered for short term employment.

Critical pedagogy has undertaken a paradigmatic shift. According to Cho (2013), a critical look at pedagogy began with its economics then moved to a cultural political lens. I situate critical pedagogy in its historic context starting with the inception of American education after the American Revolution. Then I explore the tracking system as a cultural political situation. I conclude that critical pedagogy offers a rallying battle cry for positive social change against the disenfranchisement in existing antidailogical educational practices and how transforming the school from antidialogical to dialogical would lead to less suffering in the world.

**Conquest**

**Societal situation**

Conquest has a long and bloody history, and the entirety of such history is not the purview of this work, as this paper is only going to focus on the English conquest of America back in the 1600’s. There is one body of work that shows that just previous to American colonization and conquest, the English began to lay down the rhetoric that allowed the English to justify taking the land from the Native Americans. Namely, they argued it would be both strategically necessary and expedient (Canny,1973). First they argued it was strategically necessary to obtain the valuable resources, the location for trade, and to prevent others from having advantage in times of war. The second they argue it was expedient, the indigenous people were too savage and uncivilized, thus speed required genocide as it would take too long to ‘civilize’ them. Supranational revolutionaries, are bringing their good ways to the new world through conquest. The move of English settlers to the new world included the defeat and removal of the native inhabitants who are separate traditionalists.

**Educational institution that perpetuates the social situation**

Since its inception we have judged the function of a school to be teaching. False, since the inception of school it was never about teaching. Especially when funding the school became dependent on the student’s success. This was due to the legislation that established the school general fund, as proposed by Noah Webster, who believed very strongly that school was not meant for teachers to be teaching skills, it was meant for socialization. The history of American education is only 230 years old. It began after the American Revolution 1783. A philosophical society in the early 1800s had an essay contest regarding the conception of education and its purpose in America. Indoctrination of the American way was the most celebrated theme. A project to assure the perpetuation of an *American* ideology of freedom followed shortly after the American Revolution. At its core was the desire to instill an American sense of individualism in all people living in the United States. The assumption was that in order for America to prosper and thrive under its ideals, its visionary values must be embodied by the people who will serve this newly formed government (Spring, 1983).

Divide and Rule

**The Societal Situation**

The act of noticing gender, race, ethnicity, family, age and ability is socially and politically organized (Titchkosky, 2010). In the 1790’s the first census was taken in the US, and it was the census officials that determined the race of the person that was being counted. The person was either white or a slave. Which meant incorporated into the census was the division of those that are given legal privileges such as land ownership and the right to vote were separated by those that do not get those privileges. They had rules to limit who was white, one example where a person is not white if one close relative in the family is not white, example a parent, grandparent, or great grandparent; this was called the “one-drop rule” because if the person had ‘one drop’ of black blood, it made the person black (Brown, 2015; Parker, Horowitz, Morin, & Lopez, 2015). It was not till 1820 that free colored persons were added as a category. American Indians were not counted at all as US citizens until 1890, because they live in other nations. The first racial categories for Asians was “Chinese” in 1870, and it was used to categorize Korean, Filipino, and people from the Indian sub-continent. Then in 1920 till 1940 those from the Indian sub-continent were labeled “Hindus” regardless of personal religion (Brown 2015). In 1940’s the Mexican government lobbied that Mexicans be classified as white (Parker, Horowitz, Morin, & Lopez, 2015).

**Educational institution that perpetuates the social situation**

The Anglo-Saxon men were separated from the black, the disabled, women, the children, the American Indian, and the Orientals. Individuals of color, mostly of African descent, were living under black codes. According to the black codes, people of color were not considered human. The physical and mental ability to be a man as the public figure through business, politics and land ownership are all components that worked in tandem to rationalize why the disabled could be home bound. In 1826 Women finally began to attend higher education, but they were not being educated to participate in politics or business, they were being educated in the ways they were expected to educate children. The acts of child education and household duties are the duties of the woman. Immigration was limited, it was not till 1965 the immigration and nationality act opened up and gave out more visas to Latin America, Asia, and other non-European regions (Parker, Horowitz, Morin, & Lopez, 2015).

Manipulation

The Societal situation

It was not till 1960 that the census was filled out by the person themselves and they could select their own race (Brown, 2015). The 1970 Hispanic question on the census was added to count US residents who originated from Spanish-speaking countries, because Hispanic Advocacy groups wanted to be able to seek more data on the population they advocated for (Parker, Horowitz, Morin, & Lopez, 2015). 1980 when the Hispanic or Latino category is utilized for the first time it is an identity not a race (Parker, Horowitz, Morin, & Lopez, 2015). It was not till 2000 that six different categories of Asian origin were added, and Pacific Islander in order to reflect the Native Hawaiian, Samoan, and Guamanian or that a person could identify as more than one race. And just in time for the 2020 census, the word Negro will finally be dropped (Brown, 2015).

The way the types of work are given values, the white-collar Skilled work versus blue-collar non-skilled work distinction (Rosenbaum, 1975) is very political. In 1852, education became compulsory and the tracking system began to manifest at this time. Tracking was enacted to try to sort the skilled from the non-skilled, sort the white-collar from the blue-collar. This allowed the separation between the wealthy and the poor (Robinson, 2006). Only the wealthy could afford to pay for their admittance into the higher education institutes, so it was only the wealthy that were tracked towards preparation for their elevation into skilled work. When the tracking system was instituted, people of color were not going to school, as that was a privilege relegated to US citizens and immigrants. At this time Latin, Oriental, other non-European immigrants were denied immigration, so immigrants were Anglo Saxon. In 1863 came emancipation, the government's acknowledgement of individuals of color as persons. Government dictated right to be paid for labor, or have access to goods still did not easily reverse the non-person status of people of color.

**The educational system**

The tracking system began to manifest at this time. The tracking system has many levels, there is curriculum tracking, ability tracking, and mixed ability instructional method.  Curriculum is the division of subjects from other subjects and the subdivisions within those subjects. Subjects such as math, language, social studies, science, and vocational. The subdivisions of math, such as arithmetic, algebra, or geometry  or the subdivisions of language,  there is French or German, or Arabic, or Chinese. Curriculum tracking is when the classes are grouped to advance in a particular type of work, for example, the degree plans found in college, an engineer is going to take classes that are different from a thespian. Then there is ability tracking.

An example of ability tracking is used in language courses, where there is non-native speaker novice, non-native speaker intermediate, non-native speaker advanced. Then there is the mixed ability instructional method, this when the teacher groups students based on abilities. The rational was that the teacher was grouping the weaker students together to work with them more (Oakes, 1987). According to Cho (2013), the components of educational studies include, curriculum, classroom management, school culture, and evaluation. Curriculum is the content of the subject matter, the organization of the courses to transmit the subject matter, and the  instructional methods that the subject matter is to be transmitted (Au, 2007). Classroom management and school culture are extensions of instructional methods, an elaboration of how information should be transmitted between the teacher and the student, what behaviors are expected, and what values should govern the choices made in that environment. There is a different relationship with evaluation, because there is the way the evaluation is structured, and then there is the "who" that is under evaluation, be it the student, the curriculum or the school itself. Finally, the evaluation aspect of education is measuring the subject's conformity to an ideology.

**Cultural invasion**

**The antidialogical structure of society**

In the early 1900’s, around 1910 or so, the first MBA degree program began. Education became a criteria on which employment can be bestowed or denied. Due to the Jim Crow laws, 1876-1965, humanization of people of color took much longer, and the goods distributable among individuals of color were severely limited. But now these individuals had freedoms and rights, most importantly, the right to assemble for education.

The antidialogical structure of education

1800s was when it became mandatory that children were taught only in English (Prucha, 1973). The unexpected consequence of compulsion in 1852 was that every possible different person would be expected to attend school. Many Native American students were unable to derive any meaning from the English only lessons because the English language did not express the same relationships to the earth that they learned from their own people. 1954, people of color began to attend the same schools as everyone else, the American born, and the immigrants. In 1975, the education for all the handicapped Children act was enacted and the self-contained classrooms became an invisible real experience for children with disabilities.

It was in the 1970”s that the tracking system was perceived as a device to sustain racial inequality. While that is true in many respects that was not the only inequality the tracking system produces and sustains. The tracking system also produces and sustains gender, ability, ethnicity, and socioeconomic inequalities. The tracking system is not a within school mechanism, it is a between school mechanism. Tracking is about preparing students to either go to college, or go to vocational school. The tracking system functions utilizing these other elements, bias school officials, self selection, social and familial discouragement can all play a role. The tracking system has themes such as pipeline to prison for the poor and ethnic minority, and in the same vein it is an unrecognized pipeline into the home for the disabled and the female.

"Education takes place when there are two learners who occupy somewhat different spaces in an ongoing dialogue. But both participants bring knowledge to the relationship and one of the objects of the pedagogic process is to explore what each knows and what they can teach other.  A second is to foster reflection on the self as an actor in the world as a consequence of knowing” Macedo, (2013)

**The Languaging of Differences**

In Ellsworth’s attempt to create a public space for these critical issues, she created a class that was offered to students.  The class reflected on their past actions during the course of the class.  How some of the individuals in the class were not allowed to speak. How labor was divided. How they treated each other when they were from different identity categories. Resentment developed by the white students because they felt they had to keep defending themselves, keep trying to show that they were not the ones hurting others. Some would say that because you accept the privileges of the system, you were taking away the rights of another. It becomes this back and forth of attacking language. Because it could easily be shot back, “you are here, whose rights did you take?” In a classroom situation or even in a political movement, dialogue of difference was undesirable, a dialogue for what we here now are willing to struggle for together, was far more desirable. But written in legislation, for example the No Child Left Behind 2001, the languaging said it is established to help the poor minorities succeed. It named the most contending identifying isms such as racism, classism, and ablism. Ellsworth (1989), asks “What diversity do we silence in the name of "libertory" [Critical] pedagogy?” There fails to be a language of unity, because even in critical theory it's about the liberation of the “oppressed.”

The language of critical pedagogy is discrimination and oppression. When “system” comes up, there are the privileged individuals and they are the oppressors running the system.  If the critical pedagogue is someone who does come from the “oppressor” categories, they cannot relate to the oppressed. Right now there is no language for being in relation with others, there is only an us and them language, even in the critical stance. Even if two individuals had every category in common black, woman, working class, adolescent, lesbian, overweight, and disabled, there will still be alterity. The 'I' cannot relate to the 'you' just because those categories are in common. One might be more upset that they are judged by disability, the other might be upset that most judgements is because of being black. Even if these two individuals agree to be identified by the same category, one might support violence, while the other does not. One might say community projects is the way to go, the other may want to lobby and protest at Washington. These two with so much in “common” with the other are still truly different persons. Someone from the “oppressor” categories is just another truly different person who may also be another “oppressed” individual (Prilleltensky, 2008).

Categories are made because we want to enact projects from a distance (Latour, 1988). Divisive languaging creates smaller groups that larger groups can divert ownership to means of production from. ”Voice” is prevalent throughout the literature. Language and the use of language is something different from voice. The “voice” is a presence making process. Voice is not about content, such as language. Voice is a relationship process. Because we are all products of American education, we are all required to attend school and perpetuate the system, and as long as there is divisive languaging, which acts to mute 'voices', the antidialogical system wins.

**Freierain dialogical**

Freierian dialogical interpretation of the cycle of oppression is that the oppressed realize they are oppressed, they take on the identity of the oppressor, and then utilizing love, hope, and faith put down the oppressor identity and problematize the new identity of our being-in-the-world (Heidegger,) together. Because what Freire has discovered is that the oppressed must free the oppressor, first by being oppressed, then recognizing the oppressor in themselves, recognizing the oppressed in the oppressor, find love, hope to be new and faith that we can all love, forgive, and change. Because if the oppressed, everyone in this antidialogical system, are to free themselves and their oppressors, an oppressive antidialogical system, it is not about one person vs another person, but a people together with love in their hearts and faith in others who could cocreate a dialogical world together.

In a dialogical system there is cooperation. Whether we start with an us or them, it is time to put that aside and problematize. Is the social structure the problem? The social structure of America is low. One’s social category does not preclude one from becoming the president, there is no written law that says that the president must be white. Now is the problem the ideology, Even though our social structure is low, why was it still very difficult and took a long time for a person of color to become president? Could it because in an antidiological system American’s refused to cooperate? Well, we agreed with our social system, our president was a person of color. Some are even looking forward to a woman president. Perhaps what took so long is for American’s to unite. Now that we may be starting to cooperate, and we find some issue to unite for, are we able to organize? Is there space open to ‘voice’? are we listening? And most importantly, are we new together? Did we compromise, did we give and take? Are we moving forward with achieving our ends together?

**Discussion**

As the history of critical pedagogy and the school developed in these pages, the inequality appears to be the tracking system. This tracking system is heavily implicated in racial language. However, the tracking system's origin manifested when the only immigrants compelled to attend school were European. Native Americans were forced into boarding school, females were forced into primary education, African Americans were nonhuman and forbidden to be educated. Asian immigrants were not allowed into the nation let alone had any reason to be a concern for this tracking system. Its real purpose may actually be to perpetuate the classes, the need for blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, entrepreneurs, inventors and academicians. One study in 2006 by Lewis and Cheng found that schools that were vocational track dominant, their students would be encouraged to obtain vocational education, correlated heavily with how many free lunches the school had to provide. What really perpetuates poverty is poverty (Lewis, 2007).

We live at a time when we all live in the same space, we all want to live together. There are mixed marriages (Fortin, 2019) and adoptions and poverty effects everyone not just a particular identity group. There needs to be this shift away from critical pedagogy's political cultural paradigm. The  purpose of critical pedagogy is getting lost in identity wars, in which we all concede that we are all different with different needs. Critical pedagogy needs to try a political economic paradigm and reshape a language of inclusion, we can create a system of caring. We all should have a “voice” about what changes need to occur in the system. Even those that seem privileged by the current system might not be getting what they need.
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