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ABSTRACT
The introduction to this article will seek to present a distillation of Sally Lubeck's achievements in order to provide a benchmark of existing knowledge in the field of early childhood care and education from her perspective and an indication of its likely future. Her work, it is suggested, provides an exemplification of the new sociology of childhood that is theoretically grounded as well as morally and ethically committed. The contributions and challenges she made that are offered in this article focus on childhood in different cultures, the impact of globalization and the role of cross-national perspectives in the critical examination of our own national contexts. Poverty levels and the choice made by the US and UK to avoid redistribution of wealth are identified as a major source of disadvantage. The tension between decentralization, choice and lack of co-ordination on the one hand, and uniformity, centralization and social control on the other, is emphasized. It is in this context that policy-making in early childhood education is subjected to critical analysis. The possible contribution that the theories of Habermas can make to our understanding of progress and change was raised by Sally (Lubeck, 2001b) and expanded in this article as a means of response.
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What thoughtful rich people call the problem of poverty, thoughtful poor people call with equal justice, a problem of riches. (R. H. Tawney, 1964 [1931])

introduction
I have found acknowledging Sally's contributions and challenges to the field of children's early care, development and education a daunting task that ideally
should represent a distillation of her achievements, a benchmark of existing knowledge in the field from her perspective and an indication of its likely future. It has been a task that has led me into curriculum theory, ethics, and organizational discourse and theory. In the process, I have sought to uncover underlying concerns, key themes and significant ideas, as well as trace their development over time. This has taken me across different disciplinary landscapes, between the public and private, all the while carrying on an implicit dialogue with the writer in an attempt to understand the tensions and contradictions that she presented and consider possible resolutions that she indicated.

The first thing that I noticed was that Sally's work exemplified for me the 'new paradigm in the sociology of childhood' with its central idea that childhood is a social construction, socially defined and varying enormously according to the social, cultural or historical context. Prout and James (1990) described this as an 'emergent' paradigm because it was not yet fully developed and, indeed, is still in the process of formation. More recently, Prout (2005: 62) has suggested that 'the two key elements in the sociology of childhood, the agency of children and the idea of childhood as a social structural form, were drawn from modernist sociology in a more or less unmodified form' and failed to seek ways 'to accommodate [the] mobility, fluidity and complexity' of the postmodern world. The emergent aspect of the new sociology of childhood, however, accorded well with my own sense of Sally's work as still in progress and with ideas that were still provisional. It has stimulated both theoretical and empirical work and influenced other disciplines, such as psychology where critical psychology is both a critique of mainstream psychology and an attempt to apply psychology in more progressive ways and contexts than had been the case hitherto. Thus, Kessen (1979) argued for a 'child as cultural invention' developing in context. Bronfenbrenner (1979) meanwhile, from a psychological perspective, presented an ecological model of child development which proceeded as a reciprocal process within inter-related micro-, meso- and macro-contexts. Much of the ensuing sociology of childhood focused on the agency of children and childhood as a social, structural form. Meanwhile, most of Sally's work has been conducted at the meso-level, concerned with children's lives in relation to institutions such as Head Start as an organization (for example, Lubeck and Kezar, 2002) and at the macro-level, concerned with children's lives on a larger scale in the national and cross-national policy arena, for instance, in the recent Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) studies of early childhood education and care (Lubeck, 2001a, 2001b). Suffice it to say at this point that until recently children's apparent lack of presence in society has been reflected in their corresponding lack of active presence in theory (Corsaro, 2005).

The second thing that I noticed was that throughout Sally's work, she was striving for new ways to construct or deconstruct the historical and social
context of early childhood education and care; and although she focused on the policy-to-practice context, theorizing featured very strongly. Whilst the reflective practitioner develops theories in practice by thinking about work in progress and by testing different approaches to examine how they work out in practical situations (Bowman, 1989; Schön, 1983), Sally as critical and reflexive academic was continually interrogating her own ideas with postmodern theories (for example, of Bredo and Feinberg, 1982; Giroux, 1991; Lather, 1991; Usher and Edwards, 1994) to expose the ‘totalizing discourse’ (Gergen, 1991) or ‘metanarratives’ (Lyotard, 1984) of dominant social groups with the power to define ‘how things are’. Her purpose was to identify a practice base that addressed issues of cultural difference (for example, Grant and Sleeter’s, 1985, 1988, typology of multicultural approaches). In order to understand better the inadequacy of developmentally appropriate practice (DAP) (Bredekamp, 1987; Bredekamp and Copple, 1997) for the culturally different child, for example, Sally sought not only for typologies of multicultural approaches but attempted to delineate the kinds of practices and experiences that would orient very young children themselves to work for a better society (Hatch et al., 2002). This enabled her to advocate an explicitly multicultural and social-reconstructionist education prepared for social action.

This leads to the third thing I noticed about Sally’s work. Not only was it challenging, critical and well theorized but it was also committed to individual and collective well-being and emancipation of young children, whether in the face of poverty, disability or discriminatory practices related to class, gender or ethnicity. In other words, there was a strong moral imperative and, hence, political dimension to her work.

She was thus a socially committed constructionist and reconstructionist. Her work was grounded in the sociology of childhood, specifically early childhood education, and positioned in the postmodern and post-structuralist tradition.

contributions and challenges

Sally helped to create new understandings of childhood and indicated that children can be both determined by their culture and at the same time active in creating new and transforming its existing meanings. As noted by Corsaro (2005: 4), until recently constructivist theories have focused primarily on developmental outcomes and children's collective activities. Now it is recognized that ‘children are active social agents who construct their own cultures and contribute to the production of the social world’. Indeed, the notion of ‘interpretive reproduction’ captures the innovative and creative aspects of children’s participation in society as they are contributing to as well as being shaped and affected by the existing social structure and societal reproduction.
Not only is there a multiplicity of childhoods but children themselves may be actively shaping and defining what those childhoods are or will be.

The new sociology of childhood has examined how recent economic, social and cultural changes have affected children and their families and one of Sally’s goals was to understand these changes from the perspective of childhood, children and families in both western and developing societies. Moreover, as Sally was well aware, values may be attached to different cultural practices so that western post-industrialized societies can be regarded as more ‘developed’ and powerful. Despite the fact that not all societies hold such values in high esteem, dominant groups have the power to define how things are or ought to be and globalization, with its collapse of time and space, is increasing cross-influence between cultures at the world level. With the rise of overseas trade by large multinational companies, it is difficult to see how the influence can be other than uni-directional, with developed and industrialized countries exerting their influence on non-westernized, non-developed and non-industrialized countries, rather than the other way around. Sally postulated the real dangers that rich countries with economic and entrepreneurial power could create a ‘cultural homogenization’ that threatens both local customs and local languages (New, 2005).

It also serves as a reminder that cross-national perspectives on early childhood practices and policies may ‘help us to see more clearly our own approach to parental leave, child care and early education’ (Lubeck, 2001a: 213). Analysis of the effects of recent socio-economic changes on childhood include the rapid decline of the two-parent and increase in mother-only families, the decline of family size and the rise of mothers’ participation in the labour force. Indeed, changes in child-rearing and labour market patterns of most OECD countries by the late 1980s served as a stimulus to investment in early childhood services that have facilitated the increased participation of women with young children. Research suggesting the value of positive early childhood experiences in promoting the cognitive, social and emotional well-being of children, as well as their long-term success in school and life was presented to ministries represented on the OECD Education Committee (Bennett, 2003) and, as a result, an initial 12 countries volunteered to launch a series of country reviews of early childhood education and care policy (OECD, 2001). As noted by Sally, all the participating nations were experiencing rapid social change and, with the exception of one, represented the nine per cent of the world’s children living in high-income countries. Since then a further eight OECD countries have been reviewed and with the aid of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reviews have been carried out in four developing countries, Indonesia, Kenya, Kazakhstan and Brazil, where early childhood care and education have generally not been part of public policy, and governments have a limited capacity for developing policies and systems for it.
Sally’s work in this field is represented by both the lead article of the special issue of *Phi Kappan Delta* that she guest-edited (Lubeck, 2001a, 2001b) and in her report on England. Her cross-national work provided a source of reflection on policies in the US as Sally explored what experience in England had to say to the US and in so doing identified challenges to the early childhood care and education field. Historically, she noted that at the time of writing, England was most like the US with ‘a highly de-centralized, fragmented collection of child care arrangements, most involving little co-ordination with other social services affecting children or families’. Of the US, she noted that the authors of the OECD’s ‘country note’ had recorded there was ‘no system’ of early education and care in the United States. She described how in England, as in the US, a ‘hodge-podge of services had evolved over time to meet the diverse needs of working and non-working parents and their children’. The English system, like the US system, had been characterized as ‘diverse and unequal’ (Lubeck, 2001b: 217). At the time of writing, she indicated that rates of female participation in the labour force between the ages of 25 and 34 years were high (71% in England, with 35% working part-time; and 73% in the US, with 19% working part-time). Existing education and care for the under-threes in England was provided largely by the private sector or by childminders. It was ‘uneven, of mixed quality and in short supply’, with the vast majority of parents incurring child care costs that were among the highest in Europe. The UK overall has lagged behind its European neighbours in provision of high-quality day care and early educational provision and has had one the lowest levels of parental leave entitlement and maternity benefits (Moss, 2001) whilst Neuman and Bennett (2001) drew attention to the need for the US to encourage the development of paid parent leave and an effective staff training and professional development system. As noted by Corsaro (2005), the US has lagged far behind almost all other industrialized countries regarding affordable day care, government policy regarding maternity and family leave, day care and early education.

On the positive side, Sally noticed that in England all children were entitled to monthly child allowances. Everyone, including children, was guaranteed health care under the National Health Service (Lubeck, 2001b). Paid parental leave was available to most working parents upon the birth of a child, and in 1999, paid job-protected maternity leave was increased, with paternity leave adopted for the first time. More than two-thirds of employed mothers return to work after maternity leave, with a 50 per cent increase since 1987. (Moreover, a new child tax credit and working tax credit, providing some relief to low-income working parents, was introduced in 2002.)

As a background to Sally’s observations, it is salutary to notice that the bottom four places in the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF, 2000) league tables of relative child poverty are occupied by the UK, the US, Mexico and Italy. Moreover, countries with the lowest child poverty rates, such as
Norway and Sweden, allocate the highest proportion of Gross National Product to social expenditure. In fact, one-fifth of Britain’s children lived in poverty in the 1990s, which is five times higher than in Norway or Sweden and represents a tripling of child poverty over a 20-year period. These contrasting rates do not happen by chance. They are the consequence of different tax and credit-transfer policies. The countries with low rates of child poverty redistribute funds with the intention of ensuring that families with children have adequate income. Income redistribution in the UK has worked in the reverse direction over the last 25 years; inequalities in income distribution have increased sharply and tax rates for the rich have greatly reduced. The UNICEF study identified two major factors in varying rates of poverty across rich nations: the proportion of households with children with no adult in work; and the proportion of full-time workers earning less than 66 per cent of the national median income. In this context, it should also be noted that England had the highest percentage of single-parent families in Europe, with the majority of single parents being unemployed and rates of teenage pregnancy again the highest in Western Europe. (UNICEF, 2001)

The current Labour Government set the target to cut relative child poverty (living below 50 or 60% of the average income) by a quarter by 2004–5, halve it by 2010–11 and ‘eradicate’ it within 20 years, together with a raft of policy initiatives to support this commitment (Sutherland and Piachaud, 2005). It has claimed that its policies have lifted 1.2 million children out of poverty. UNICEF (2000) confirms this figure, indicating that the child poverty rate will be cut by about a third, from 26.3 to 17 per cent. It is thus likely to have reached the first milestone but longer term targets will be difficult to reach unless poverty continues to be given priority. A dilemma for the Government is that, whilst state benefits may be the most cost-effective way to reduce poverty in the short term, they may also reduce the incentive for self-reliance.

Smeeding et al. (2001) examined overall child poverty rates in the US and 17 other industrialized nations and showed that the US had a much higher overall rate of child poverty (14.7%) than any other country except for Italy (at 14.1%), with the UK having the highest rate at 8.3 per cent in Western Europe after Italy and with least child poverty in Finland and Sweden. They noticed too that most of the countries involved provided paid maternal or family leave, government-supported child care and early education programmes, whilst the US provided few or limited programmes, such as Head Start.

A recurrent theme in Sally’s writing was child poverty and its impact on educational achievement. Neuman and Bennett (2001) drew attention to the need to face issues of child poverty and diversity. At a similar time, Sally was noting the lack of US discussion of context factors that deeply affect young children and their families, including the fact that one American child in five lives in poverty and an estimated 10.8 million children without health insurance.
By international standards, the USA is considered to be the richest country in the world and yet we have the largest number of children living in poverty of any industrialized nation. Too narrow a delineation of the field (that is, of early childhood education and care) can obscure factors (that keep children from participating or undermine their development outside the classroom) and arguably deserve more prominence. (Lubeck and Kezar, 2002: 452–3)

Change, she noted, whether economic, social or political, could be viewed in terms of its psychological effects on individuals. This, however, abrogated a conception of systems in which people's lives are embedded, an understanding of how change occurs, and a way to problematize systems of thought and organization and, indeed, the concept of system itself. Here she called for a shift of attention away from the psychological focus on individuals to broader transformations that are beginning to affect the early childhood field in profound ways. She too identified the dramatic changes in the global economy, the trend towards greater inequality, the need for a new ‘information society’ and market rationales or mechanisms increasingly being used to set educational priorities, citing:

... the neo-liberal version of globalization... is reflected in an educational agenda that privileges, if not directly imposes, particular policies for evaluation, financing, assessment, standards, teacher training, curriculum, instruction, and testing.
(Burbules and Torres, 2000: 15)

These influences, she noted, were now affecting early childhood education in the English-speaking world – with Head Start programmes, for instance, becoming increasingly accountable for children's learning. Similarly, in England, Ball (1999) was noting that the acquisition of skills and dispositions in current educational policy terms was stripped of social and psychological meaning. The pressures for performance, he argued, acted back on pedagogy and the curriculum, both narrowing the classroom experience and encouraging teachers to attend to those students likely to ‘make a difference’ to aggregate performance figures of the classroom and the school. Pedagogy and curriculum were shaped specifically to maximize test scores.

As noted by Sally, a key distinction between the UK and the US governments (at the time of writing the OECD report) was the increasing centralization of the UK educational system whilst the US remained decentralized. Neuman and Bennett (2001) emphasized that a major implication of the OECD early childhood education and care study for the US was the creation of a comprehensive, coordinated and stable system with a more universal approach through collaboration with public education.

Much of Sally's analysis of the UK was based on a previous landmark for England and Wales, the Education Reform Act (Department for Education and Science, 1988) that established a national curriculum and assessment for children of five to 16 years and the more recent introduction of an Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) system of school inspection through the Education Act.
(Department of Education and Employment, 1992). There is now a Foundation Stage curriculum (*The Curriculum Guidance for the Foundation Stage*, DfEE, 2000) for three- to five-year-olds with early learning goals assessed by a new Foundation Stage Profile at the end of children's reception class year at five years of age as well as *Birth to Three Matters* (DfES, 2002) guidance on early learning and development. The Early Years Foundation Stage (DfES, 2006), as a distinct key stage, is now being aligned with primary schooling, not only through Ofsted inspections but through a common curriculum and training initiatives. Compulsory state-funded schooling starts at age five with the majority of four-year-olds already in ‘reception classes’.

Meanwhile, subsequent to Sally's review, recent reforms have still further altered the landscape of schools with a national child care strategy already providing universal and free part-time preschool education for all three- and four-year-olds and a separate strategy for the expansion and improvement of child care for children from birth to 19 years (Children’s Act, DfES, 2005). Special help has been targeted on children from birth to three years in areas most at risk from poverty and social exclusion. Indeed, since the present Labour government came into power in 1997, a new public and broad-based social agenda has begun the process of integrating services through ‘joined up’ thinking, publicly funded through locally based Children's Centres planned to expand to 3500 in number often based in primary schools, that bring together multiple services of child care, health and family support needed by parents, carers and children, to encourage employment, improve health and combat social exclusion and poverty. As in the US, care arrangements for school-age children have been in short supply and often beyond the financial means of families who will still have the primary responsibility for funding child care for children from birth and through the school years. At the time of writing a report examining the contribution that child care might make to ending child poverty (Skinner, 2006) had concluded that provision was still patchy, with insufficient places for children from minority groups and some services terminated when pump-prime funding ran out.

In terms of professional development and qualifications, as Sally noted (Lubeck, 2000, 2001a) in both the US and England, current conditions of work within the child care profession have militated against plans to expand and improve services. Low salaries, long hours, poor working conditions, high rates of turn-over and few opportunities for advancement have led to chronic instability in the field. Whilst both England and the US had introduced a similar professional-development system, since the majority of child care is provided by private for-profit enterprise, wages have continued to be low and working conditions poor.

Whilst others have drawn attention to the fact that the young child has been constructed differently in different places and times, Sally noted:

> this is the child who must be ready to take her place as a future worker in a globalized economy. To make this a reality, early childhood educators are being repositioned to
teach basic skills, and as new methods of monitoring and control are set in motion, the dominant discourse within the field is giving way to an altered agenda. (Lubeck, 2000: 277)

Whilst there may be many possibilities and choices, she urged educators to make moral and ethical choices about what fits the situation, the community and the child, whilst at the same time assessing the impact of economic changes and responding to political realities.

One means of educational policy-making analysis that Sally derived from work by Jürgen Habermas (Bredo and Feinberg, 1982) distinguished between technical policy-making that is outcome-oriented; practical policy-making that interrogates goals and seeks to formulate both appropriate goals and means to achieve them; and critical policy-making that questions means and goals in the light of their capacity to create or sustain an equitable society.

In terms of technical policy-making, although different means had been used to effect change, she saw striking similarities between the English and US systems with their clear educational goals to improve attainment of all children but especially those traditionally disadvantaged and systems in place to track progress towards those goals and assess the presumed school/programme quality in terms of child outcomes.

With respect to practical policy-making, both the US and England provided targeted funds to low-income families, for example, in the form of US block grants to states and Head Start. Whilst the majority of children in western industrialized countries live in secure economic circumstances, there is still too high a proportion of children in the US and England living in poverty. Bradshaw (2006) has also emphasized that whilst child poverty data is out of date for most sources, OECD league tables of child poverty (D’Ercole and Förster, 2005) showed US with the highest child poverty rates and UK with the third highest child poverty rate.

Finally, in terms of critical policy-making, Sally noted that this requires an educated citizenry that questions the moral basis for policy-making, identifies unjust or unequal practices and searches for alternatives that create new possibilities for individual and social life. Whilst the UK has attempted to adopt European Union directives, the US has refused to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and failed to support international efforts to ban land mines or control global warming. Here, as elsewhere, she showed herself to be a fearless critic of US policy on matters she regarded of moral and ethical importance.

The UN Convention sets minimum standards against which the treatment of children in different countries can be judged and the UK overall is a long way from adequately addressing children’s right to express views on matters concerning these. Likewise, in terms of the European Convention of Human Rights (2000), there are significant differences within Europe in the extent to which
children are treated as citizens in their own right and in the extent to which the state is seen as having a role in the care of young children (Moss and Pence, 1994; Moss and Penn, 1996). In the cross-cultural context, as Sally noticed, there is no one right way to work towards a more just and equitable society, just as there is no one right way of child-rearing. Given the example set by rich countries such as the US and UK in terms of promoting a child’s right to an adequate standard of living, as more and more children have found themselves growing up in impoverished households, it is worrying to consider in the global context the potential for these rich and powerful countries to use power and influence on others to adopt their standards. Whether or not, as Sally concluded, the child care reform agenda of England is a positive force and integrated interagency approaches constitute a ‘living laboratory for early childhood education and care’ remains to be seen. Suffice it to say, that if childhood is to be regarded as a social construction generated by social processes of discourse, definition and interaction, then it will be essential for England and the US to recognize their children as being active in their own development and learning, and accept them fully as young citizens with rights to autonomy and participation in decision-making in the context of globalization.

**emerging issues in early childhood education and care**

Sally's work is set in a context of difference and change over time and across cultures. Difference and change in values and perceptions over time influence the early childhood curriculum and indicate the need to keep it under review.

Way back in 1989, Sally was contrasting the traditional, process-oriented preschool with the academic preschool, as well as the blend of the two in a hybrid form (Lubeck, 1989). By 1996, she was struggling with more radical ideas that challenged the traditional child-centred DAP and attempted to provide a set of developmental principles and guidelines, together with a number of different activities that might be used to respond to those principles, not only to take account of cultural plurality but to be both multicultural and reconstructionist. In other words, she saw teaching as having a role to prepare young children for social action (Lubeck, 1996). More recently, she contrasted Kliebard’s (1986) depiction of the American elementary school curriculum in terms of four interest groups that vied for control: three aimed to reform the disciplinary-based humanist curriculum – the developmentalists, the social-efficiency educators and the social meliorists (Lubeck, 2002). Kliebard explained that the developmentalists proceeded from the assumption that there is a natural order of development, without taking account of cultural context, whilst the social meliorists ‘focused on intelligent action to change things for the better’. In Sally’s view, this meant concern for the ‘whole child’, that is the child's education, health and welfare,
despite the fact that at the dawn of the 21st-century standards and measurement were prominent in reform of even early childhood education.

How might we best recognize the social meliorist approach that Sally described? It is a critical pedagogy and at its centre it is informed and committed to action. It entails an exploration of values and their practical implications. It also demands that actions reflect ideas about what makes for the good and what theories are involved. This nicely encapsulates what Sally engaged with and what she stood for.

It occurred to her, for instance, that research on Head Start had been driven by one over-riding practical and policy-relevant concern: to improve the program in order to improve the life-chances of the children it served. The need to demonstrate child outcomes had narrowed the field of enquiry to the extent that very little was actually known about the program, yet she set out to explore how it was constructed and understood through talk at the local level, through multiple perspectives representing multiple meanings (Lubeck, 2002). Learning about other ways of constructing social situations she felt, created new possibilities for both individual and organizational life. In terms of Head Start as an organization, this entailed uncovering the different ways the program was understood and enacted, in order to highlight the variety of strategies used in program-improvement efforts. When speaking of the English early childhood education and care project, Sally this described in her OECD report (Lubeck, 2001b: 224) as representing to her a ‘living laboratory for early childhood education and care’. In a very real sense, the whole field of early childhood education and care constituted for Sally a living laboratory in her scholarly quest for social change and justice.

**further challenges and possible responses?**

After less than 10 years of operation, Early Excellence Centres, including Pen Green that so impressed Sally (Lubeck, 2001a, 2001b) and the relatively more recent Sure Start programs, are being ‘rolled out’ into uniform Sure Start Children's Centres. These centres will integrate all the different forms of provision in a community into a single entity, in every one of the 20 per cent most deprived neighbourhoods, combining nursery education, family support, employment advice, child care and health promotion all on one site.

Despite the real progress made in development of early childhood services, however, it is likely that the overall pattern of distribution of services will continue to be fragmented and uneven in the context of continuing centralization, with the UK continuing to lag behind most other European countries. Moreover, whilst the original emphasis was on integrated services being defined and constructed according to local community needs, centralized control of unified services will soon be the order of the day, bringing the twin risks of greater inequality...
and/or increased standardization. Using Sally's policy-making analysis derived from Habermas, the test will be to question both the means and goals of this latest policy, in order to judge its capacity to create and sustain a more just and equitable system.

coda

As a means of rethinking the nature and purpose of a democratic society and the role of education in this, Sally noted the challenge of critical, feminist, postmodern and post-structural positions that shared a common scepticism with regard to the modernist project that had shaped western thought since the Enlightenment (Lubeck, 1996). In postmodernity, there was a rejection of universal and transcendental foundations of knowledge and thought and a heightened awareness of the significance of language, discourse and socio-cultural locatedness in the making of knowledge claims. Habermas, too, embraced critical theory but opposed Lyotard’s notion of the post-modern condition, contending that modernity posed for us a task that must be completed and, unlike Foucault (1980), posited in his later work communication free from domination as a regulative principle (Holub, 1991). He claimed there to be no escape from modernity or the problems raised by subjectivity and enlightenment and substituted the notion of inter-subjectivity to replace isolated subjects confronting the objective world. Habermas considered human beings in dialogue with each other to be the foundation for emancipatory social thought. He distinguished between instrumental reason that had achieved hegemony in the modern world and communicative reason that had the potential to transform societies into genuine democracies, thus retaining a critical stance towards modernity, whilst explicating a positive program for progress and change. Throughout his work he was critical of industrial democracies in the West for equating humanity with economic efficiency. For Habermas, the ability to use logic and analysis went beyond the strategic calculation of how to achieve a chosen goal. There existed a possibility for community, through communicative action that strives for agreement between others and he stressed the importance of having an ‘ideal speech situation’ in which citizens were able to raise moral and political concerns and defend them rationally. Just maybe, this is the legacy that Sally left us. She did not anticipate leading us to a new consensus but she did seek to construct a non-oppressive and inclusive framework for discourse, based on a desire for mutual understanding.
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