

Do We Want Something New or Just Repetition of 1492?

Engaging with the “Next” Moment in Curriculum Studies

CHANDNI DESAI

Ontario Institute of Studies in Education

Trekking Through Curriculum

*Bus thi-yu, mane bolvadee...Bus, amaro waq-at avigayo che...
Allow me speak my mother tongue before they take my language as well.....
I am your scorpion, your displaced non-human-other...You don't feel our writing...our thinking...and our
knowing. But let me break it to you...they exist....You long ago forgot.... but our breaths are our signs...
Our signs that we were here, we are here and we will remain here...*

A MMA WAS IN her luscious, green, serene home in Bangalore, India, when she was called upon by a group of women who were mud movers. In the process of moving mud, digging ditches, and creating mud buns, the mud movers had found black scorpions, little ones and big ones, and they called Amma and said, “look.” “They’re scorpions,” Amma said, we had European visitors that were present at that moment, and upon witnessing this they said/asked, “Now you’re going to kill them aren’t you? How are you going to get rid of them?” One of the mud movers, a woman, said, “No, it’s a family.” She scooped the scorpions up in a plastic bottle and took them carefully away to a farther place, where there was a bush, and let them be there, to live and exist, informed by the teachings of Vasudhiava Kutumbakam. The English language is inadequate to articulate the philosophy of Vasudhiava Kutumbakam but, simply put, it means ‘earth family’—where the human can never be separated from the non-human because as Indian cosmology understands this relationship, they exist in a continuum, a dialectic of existence.

As a doctoral student in Curriculum Studies, I struggle daily with feelings of belonging and non-belonging, placeness and placelessness. When I look to the academic stories that we are exposed to and expected to deconstruct as curriculum scholars, I have often felt and still continue to feel fragmentation in what I am reading as I relate them to the teachings of Vasudhiava Kutumbakam, taught to me by the elders in my family and community. These feelings first

emerged when we were given the curricular “list” of readings that discussed the historical and philosophical antecedents of curriculum studies in a course entitled “Foundations of Curriculum Studies.” As I read Ralph Tyler, Franklin Bobbit, John Dewey, Jerome Bruner, and others, I experienced an unenthusiastic physical reaction to their words and ideas on education, as they fundamentally contradicted the dialectic relationship between learners and the earth. Perhaps because their notions of teaching, learning and knowing were associated primarily with the reproduction of social hierarchies through models of efficiency and democratic nation-building in order to anchor capitalism—a logic of white supremacy—in place.

Throughout my journey of critique and resistance, my alienation grew further as my peers (primarily teachers) all seemed to relate their practice to these theories. To provide some ease to my alienation, one of my professors said “it would get better”; however, even after moving to the works of scholars that fall under the reconceptualization moment, I still continued to have a profound feeling of uneasiness, confusion, and non-belonging. Yet, I did not have the words to articulate and describe what this actually meant. I soon became anxious because while I was present I was simultaneously absent. As such, I wondered how long I would last. I wondered: will I be gotten rid of, like the European visitors proposed for the black scorpions, or will I find the mud movers, here in curriculum studies? I forged through the readings and the discussion, but continued to wonder about this fragmentation and what was missing. Was something actually missing? Was this something missing deliberately meant to be absent? A year after this moment, I encountered this type of “list” again, with those same readings and more; except, this time the “list” was entitled the Curriculum Canon Project.

The Canon project’s leadership was proposed at the Ohio Curriculum Summit in 2007. A formal leadership committee was formed following the 2009 Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS). The committee was assigned the task of creating a list of key texts in the intellectual history of curriculum studies. This was also related to the academic discussion formalized by Pinar. Pinar (2007) suggested that acquiring a historical understanding of curriculum studies (vertical disciplinarity) and understanding curriculum in the present moment (horizontal disciplinarity) are necessary because of the field’s inadequate disciplinary knowledge. As such, the canon project materialized and was proposed as a means of advancing the field of curriculum, particularly from a historical perspective, as curriculum studies does not have a disciplinary structure (Shubert, 2009a). The committee established evaluative and eligibility criteria (Appendix A), consulted William Schubert’s 2009 report and other sources dealing with the history of the field, and established a canonic “list” (Appendix B) of what was deemed to be key texts in understanding historicity and turning points in the evolution of the curriculum studies academic arena.

Of course, when shaping disciplinarity, the key curriculum question is: What is worthwhile knowing? What knowledge is of most worth? (Shubert, 2009). I would argue, however, that in curriculum studies, another foundational question ought to be: what is at stake in curriculum in asking what knowledge is of most worth? And what work does curriculum studies do in centering this question as the key curriculum question? This article, seeks to think through, within, and against these questions of what is worth knowing and what is at stake in asking this very question within curriculum at this particular moment, specifically in relation to the proposed canon project list and the move towards disciplinarity. The article draws from critical race studies, diaspora studies, Indigenous knowledge(s), and anti-colonial thought to theoretically frame this discussion. This article may be read as a provocation as well as an invitation to think about forging a new path towards the “next moment” where the focus is upon

creating and reinventing curriculum theories to allow for new perspectives by offering alternative languages and a multiplicity of readings.

What is worth knowing? Unfolding the project of coloniality...

Through your inner eyes you tell us what is good, true and real...Even if it opposes and juxtaposes what we know and feel, Through your inner eyes you tell us to understand...but thanks to learning-and-unlearning and learning-and-unlearning, what we have is....MisUnder-U-stood and...Under-WE- stood...

*Under-We-stood the dominations upon nations, the foundations of our relations.
Under-We-stood the descriptive statement with patience master, no master, are we supposed to feel sensation for your imposition master? Under-U-stood the sub-rational...irrational...
Wars... of the non-believ-ed idolator versus the rational-self-man*

Before navigating ourselves onto new paths, it is important to look back at history and the way it has shaped intellectual thought. Schurich and Young (1997) underscore that what is worth knowing takes place through the ontological, epistemological, and axiological positions that characterize different knowledge systems. When delving deeper into Amma's story, the epistemological, axiological and ontological differences between those that wanted to kill the black scorpions and those that wanted to let them live becomes apparent. For some of the western travellers, the scorpions were associated with danger and fear, while for the local people the scorpions were regarded as part of one another's co-existence and survival rooted in the cosmology of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam. In South Asia, scorpions are not only viewed as dangerous, evil, and vicious, but they are also "regarded as powerful guardians and protectors to counter other evil forces" (Frembgen, 2004, p. 4). Scorpions are considered important because they are used for making traditional remedies for healing from diseases, restoring energy, and increasing virility. Here, the differences in the ways in which the western travellers and the local people came to know, understand, and make sense of their encounters with, and in relationship to the scorpions was starkly distinct based upon their ontology and cosmologies.

In North America, within the field of education, the ontologies and epistemologies that shape education theories and practices are primarily influenced by European modern thought processes. Perhaps this is why my encounters with curriculum raised feelings of placelessness and fragmentation, because learning primarily takes place through Eurocentric paradigms, which often times raise contradictions, inconsistencies, and disconnection in how I have come to know and understand the social world. Anti-colonial thinkers Edward Said (1979), Frantz Fanon (1963; 1967) and Sylvia Wynter (2003) suggest that European epistemologies, ontologies and axiologies created universal values and defined what it meant to be human, and who constituted the human through what Wynter (2003) calls the descriptive statement. This descriptive statement of the human is based upon the biocentric model to which the name 'race' has been given. She asserts that this categorization of humans first took place in the 15th century through the Judeo-Christian religious creed, where the Christian self and its plan of salvation became the rational self of man as a definition of human-man, a construction of other-ness – the untrue other (non-Christians, Enemies of Christ) – was formed. Therefore, the untrue others were considered the irrational, sub-rational, and non human, and in the first instance these were the "negroes and the Indians" (Wynter, 2003, p. 14). This distinction of human and non-human brought about 1492: the violent encounters of conquest, genocide, transatlantic slavery, accumulation of lands, and power particularly in the Americas, and the expropriation of wealth from non-Europeans as

the basis of global expansion, imperialism, and capitalism. The large scale exploitation of the New World shifted the conceptualization of European Man from Christian to Western-Bourgeois-Man. This shift occurred in the 18th century when a bio-economic definition of the human was adopted whereby economic identities were instituted that required particular bodies to behave as producers, consumers, and traders. The demarcation of economic identities was based on racial (bio-centric) terms, which is eloquently articulated in Andrea Smith's (2006) "three pillars of white supremacy" - (1) colonialism/genocide, (2) capitalism/slavery and (3) orientalism/war.

Smith (2006) explains the way in which black bodies were viewed as irrational, therefore their bodies (not their mind) were used and became equated with slavability and commodity production. Indigenous people were also viewed as "irrational," their irrationality kept them from producing the land, therefore they had to be disappeared through genocide in order to develop and produce the land. Additionally, other people of colour were viewed as "barbaric and uncivilized" based on the logic of Orientalism, which deemed them as constant foreign threats. War was the only way to civilize them into productive people. These bio-economic demarcations premised upon a racial logic classified various people into groups and deemed them as non-human, while white European (Christians) came to understand their subjectivity as Human, and therefore Bourgeois-Man.

Racial hegemony was accomplished not only through relations of accumulation of property and capital, but also through knowledge/knowledge production. As Said (1993) highlights, colonialism was not simply about the removal of ivory and slaves, but also about the need to 'improve' populations, an explicit relationship between property and knowledge. Ngugi (1994) makes similar suggestions, that the improvement project took place through the "cultural bomb" that reshaped existing structures of human knowledge through a misrepresentation of reality and the erasure of memories of pre-colonial cultures and history, a way of installing the dominance of new, more insidious forms of colonialism.

Knowledge arrangement(s) and production have been shaped by the epistemic and discursive constitution of the descriptive statement, on the basis of phenotypical and religio-cultural differences between populations, particularly the ordering of disciplinary fields of knowledge. Our present epistemological order and its bio-centric disciplinary discourses were derived on this descriptive statement of the human. Since the descriptive statement first ordered humans and classified irrationality and otherness through theological terms and later bio-economic terms, the proposed canon project of curriculum studies—which is a move towards disciplinarity— does the same. Even the term "canon" itself connotes a certain theological foundation. As Shubert (2009) suggests, when one considers canonization relative to Christianity, particularly the Catholic Church, an indelible message resounds that to be canonized is to be exalted – as in the declaration of sainthood (Shubert, 2009). In the way that Church leaders exhaled what was worth knowing through the idea of the human, particular orderings of the world gained power and legitimacy. When one considers canonization within the field of curriculum studies, is there not a similar resemblance to the way the Catholic Church ordered and sanctioned what knowledges were worth knowing? More importantly, isn't canonization simply another means of delivering a 'cultural bomb', whereby the formulation of a curricular list and the formation of curriculum's origin story misrepresents and erases the memories of various groups and cultures?

What is at stake?

*Under-We-stood conquest, expansion and formation of human order.
With pleasure and love...our pains..in exchange for your gains. Under-We-stood.....
Bus thi-yu, mane bolvadee...Bus, amaro waq-at avigayo che...*

I began my discussion by linking race and the descriptive statement of the human because this centers and roots the project of establishing a curriculum studies canon and the move towards disciplinarity within colonialism. I understand race through an interlocking systems approach that suggests that all systems of oppression (e.g. race, class, gender, sexuality), are implicated in every experience and work together to mutually reinforce one another (Razack, 2002). I have anchored this discussion in Andrea Smith's (2006) framework "the three pillars of white supremacy" because its logics manifest and operate within the field of curriculum studies. That being said, I take a deeper look at the (lack of) presence of particular epistemologies, axiologies, ontologies and bodies in curriculum studies while examining the canonic list, specifically through the social category of race, to unravel the heteropatriarchal, white supremacist, and colonial work curriculum is implicated in and to underscore what is at stake. I hope that this discussion is not read as merely about inclusion and exclusion – that would be too simple and superficial of a discussion. I'm not asking only about why particular people do not have a seat at the table; rather, I am asking why is the table built this way?

This turns our gaze to the curriculum canon list (Appendix B). The list is made up of thirty-two "foundational" texts that were produced between the years of 1894 and 1970. All the authors, with the exception of Paulo Freire were based in the global North and most of their epistemologies and ontologies (with the partial exception of W.E.B. Dubois and Carter G. Woodson) are rooted *only* within Euro-American thought, while the knowledge's of/from different civilizations are not included on the list, nor are their perspectives of analysis and paradigms of reality. The issue is not simply regarding Euro-American thought, but rather with the privileging of this particular social history in the formation of education, as well as the formulation of a list that articulates which knowledge is most worthy of knowing. What is at stake in this privileging?

I briefly discuss John Dewey's (1916) seminal text *Democracy and Education*, which appears on the canon list. I focus on Dewey because he is considered the grandfather of progressive education and his work is most legitimated in education. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey emphasizes a relationship between schooling and democracy as central to nation-building. For Dewey, democracy meant the development and expansion of the nation, in which schooling (and its democratization) was a site that could further develop the nation. Within liberal democracies, capitalism is the way civilization aspires to organize itself economically, and democracy becomes the model of choice for political organization. Such aspirations need to be thought about carefully. This is because the promotion of democracy that Dewey advocated is premised on hierarchical and elective approaches to decision making and governance that are inherently linked to the capitalist order, in turn marginalizing other modes of governance and existence.

The nation-state form of governance is held up by heteropatriarchy and as Smith (2009) suggests it is one of its "building blocks" whereby gender differences and hierarchies, heterosexual marriage and private family are the technologies by which modern power is produced and exercised (Smith, 2006). As such, Dewey's theories on democracy and nation-

building covertly promote the institutionalization of patriarchy, which rests on a gender binary system whereby men dominate and rule women. Additionally, Dewey's theories of democracy and nation-building were "built upon the notion of ever-expanding possibility – the idea of the frontier as a free space awaiting settlement and inviting possession and use" (Grande, 2004, p. 33). Dewey's ideas serve to reproduce the pillars of white supremacy particularly colonialism/genocide as the nation-building project required the conquest of land for expansion of the nation and settlement, at the expense of the lives of Indigenous people. Dewey's vision "for the educational system presumed the colonization of Indigenous peoples" (Grande, 2004, p.33), and the assimilation of people of colour into citizens of the nation-state, in turn advocating multicultural nationalism. Transforming people into citizens via assimilation operated and still operates through the absorption of cultural difference and indoctrination through the educational system which covertly works to promote the colonizers values and ideology – something which is considered a form of genocide under the United Nations Genocide Convention.

Dewey's notions of democracy and education legitimated the "ambitions of the nation-state – that is, the naturalization of white superiority, the maintenance of class domination and propagation of Protestant morality" (Grande, 2004, p. 33), therefore legitimating the descriptive statement of the (non)human. This is concerning given that in my curriculum classes, I often hear teachers passionately idealize Dewey and his theories, in turn shaping their commitments to teach democratic citizenship in their multicultural classrooms to transform particular people into citizens. What do curriculum students/scholars become invested in when particular texts, such as *Democracy and Education* (1916) are exalted as foundational texts within education? What is at stake when these texts are normalized (as racial text)? In what ways does the normalization of particular knowledge's and social histories reproduce the notions of what it means to be human?

Moreover, the exaltation of Euro-American thought is evident in examining who is part of the intellectual genealogy of curriculum (outlined on the canon list). In "Regarding Race: The Necessary Browning of our Curriculum and Pedagogy Public Project," Gaztambide-Fernández (2006) says, "scholars of color are rarely mentioned as part of the intellectual genealogy that spurred our traditions of curriculum work" (p. 61). In curriculum studies "with a few exceptions, it seems that only curriculum workers of color are interested in integrating the work of scholars of color and others emerging from marginalized communities" (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2006, p. 61-62). In examining the canonic list, as well as other works cited on most published articles, it becomes apparent that the larger field pays little attention to the works of scholars from racialized communities, of course with the significant exception of Paulo Freire, Carter G. Woodson and W.E.B. Dubois

Dubois does appear on the canonic list. His piece "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools" broadly and simplistically discusses the issue of segregated schools in the USA. Dubois' seminal works such as the *Soul of Black Folks* (1903) and *The Study of the Negro Problem* (1898) which are heavily informed by an Africanist perspective (epistemology) are not included. These pieces provide important theoretical perspectives that seek to make connections between the larger social, political and economic contexts in relation to the conditions of African Americans in society, while countering notions of biological determinism (the descriptive statement). In doing so, aspects of African American life, particularly educational attainment, vocational level, wealth and oppression can/could be understood in relation to the historical trajectory of slavery and the color line (racism), while gaining insight on theoretical and practical approaches to struggle against racism and oppression. Dubois' notions of the "veil" and "double consciousness" -concepts that are informed by an Africanist perspective - are significant because

they offer literary devices to critique and unravel oppression, exploitation, inequality and white supremacy, while emphasizing the importance of educational attainment beyond vocational training for racialized people; however, these ideas do not seem relevant.

The exclusion of Dubois major work and the inclusion of a minor work raises the question of the politics associated with decision making, regarding criteria (Appendix A) and content of what should appear and not appear on the list (and what is relevant). What constituted as major contributions to curriculum? How were reasonable standards (of contribution) measured? What constituted the definition of generative of new lines of inquiry? Who was invited to sit at the table in constructing the list? The politics surrounding the criteria of what should be deemed as relevant and worthy of knowing risks the negotiation of important theoretical contributions made by scholars like Dubois, as well as other intellectuals whose works still remain on the margins.

Speaking of works that remain on the margins, when questions around considering the intellectual genealogies of women, particularly Indigenous women and women of colour in historicizing curriculum have been raised, many feminists jump at the opportunity to provide the explanation. The many “feminists” that I have encountered, especially at curriculum studies conferences have frequently responded saying that women’s perspectives, through the work of scholars like Hilda Taba and Maxine Greene, have been given consideration and do appear on the canonic list. Furthermore, they argue that since women of colour and Indigenous women only “appeared” during the third wave of feminism and have only recently emerged, it would be erroneous inaccurate to place them in the canonical history of curriculum. However, the very premise of this argument is problematic, because the periodization of the feminist movement into waves is centered on a White supremacist view of feminism. If one were to develop a feminist history, feminist history “would start in 1492 with the resistance to patriarchal colonization” (Smith, 2006, pp. 2). Through the narrative of the three waves, women of colour and Indigenous women are delegitimized, despite this constant historic presence.

Heather Sykes (2011) offers an example that demonstrates the way in which the intellectual genealogies of women of colour and Indigenous women are undermined. Sykes (2011) describes the “deracialization and whitening of queer theory and lesbian and gay studies,” and specifically talks about how Gloria Anzaldúa and Audre Lorde in the eighties “were theorizing about and as queers of colour well before Laurentis supposedly coined the term queer theory in 1992” (p. 2). Sykes’s example demonstrates the ways in which the works/voices of women of colour and Indigenous women are often appropriated but then denied legitimacy and existence.

While this particular discussion around gender speaks primarily to historicity of curriculum studies, notions around women’s progress in the field is often raised, as many women in the present moment are said to have opportunities to “lead” in the field. While in appearance this might be true, to unravel the essence of what actually is, the question becomes do all women have power and currency, or is it particular women? If hetropatriarchy is one of the building blocks that upholds the nation-state, and education is used as an apparatus of the state to uphold the nation, patriarchy is also insidiously infused within curriculum. By focusing upon a few individual women’s successes, the presumption becomes that curriculum studies might be in a post-patriarchal moment. This would be a foolish presumption as the logics of systemic power and domination are overlooked, specifically the interlocking ways in which gender is also made by race, class and other social categories that privilege certain individual women and their social histories *only*.

This leads me to the question(s) around origins that the canonic list implies, what is lost when a singular origins story is presumed? Are there alternative ways of historicizing curriculum studies? The curriculum studies canon list not only provides examples of Euro-centric, hetropatriachial dominance by what appears on the list, but the list also prescribes a particular “origin story” of curriculum. Though curriculum scholars would claim that the canonic list articulates an accurate timeline of the field’s history, I wonder how curriculum scholars reconciles with this history, as its timeline appears linear, and when the “origin story” is being told in relation to the erasure of other peoples histories? Shubert (2009) speaks to the issue of erasures when he asks, “why are so many of the colonized omitted – the often nameless faceless colonized? [...] Surely, they had curricula – ways of transmitting and transforming their cultures; where is knowledge of these?” (Shubert, 2009, p. 42). Shubert’s (2009) question is important to consider because by negating various histories, of course the taken for granted story of the “origins” of curriculum studies will point in the direction of Dewey, Bobbit, Tyler, Bruner and others.

Handel K. Wright (1999) speaks to the problematic of origins, specifically regarding the field of Cultural Studies, as the widely held assumption is that Cultural Studies originated in Britain. Wright problematizes the Cultural Studies origin story, by illustrating works from various locations and histories that propose multiple origins of cultural studies (from Denmark, Kenya and the United States). Wright suggests that it is important “to recognize a multiplicity of moments in a wide variety of locations as equally valid origins” (p. 45). Along the same lines as Wright, and his critique of Cultural Studies, the canon project proposes an origin story that implicitly makes claims to a universal civilization rooted in a universal history, with its particular subjects being the only ones with the capacity for worthy knowledge production.

Overall, this discussion of curriculum studies being complicit in the logics of white supremacy underscores that the curriculum studies canonic list essentially governs the assessment of another’s culture, a process which Edward Said calls (1979) “canonical wisdom.” Here the list becomes an institutional device whereby intellectuals shrink a culture to limit ways of knowing through only the dominant view. In doing so, the field will remain complicit in what Spivak (1988) calls epistemic violence – violence of knowledge and violence of discourse including the apparatus of knowledge production. By enlisting the canon it does not seem that curriculum studies would be reconceptualising something new and liberatory; rather, it would be repeating colonizing practices rooted in white supremacy, whereby lists were/are used to violently (epistemically and through force) impose domination and hegemony onto colonized peoples. So what exactly is being “advanced” here?

Multiple contestations and questions can be raised: who is left out of the intellectual genealogy of curriculum studies? who is constantly pushed to the margins of the field? why is the table built as it is? In response to a protest against this reality, intellectuals will often collapse the argument into “excess of identity politics” or “essentializing,” which has constantly been evoked at various curriculum studies conferences. I am cognizant that various racial groups are not monolithic, fixed or homogenous, and that there are differences constituted within and across groups. I recognize the fluidity, flux and heterogeneity of Indigenous peoples and people of colour due to gender, class, sexuality, ability, religion, ethnicity, language, phenotype etc. However there is no unified language to articulate a collective marginalization, only relations of relationality that exist between these groups due to the logics of supremacy. Along with hooks (1994), Razack (2000), Fanon (1967) and others, I am sceptical of those that complain of differences being essentialized, reductive or collapsed as excess of identity politics because such

claims de-contextualize and de-historicize specific relations of subjugation and domination, failing to distinguish acts of resistance (made by subordinate groups) from acts of domination. In doing so, supremacy is enacted once again as the experience; the continuing violent encounters and material consequences of white supremacy – real things, not to be denied - in the lives of people of colour and Indigenous peoples are reduced to critiques of identity politics.

In other words, the aforementioned scholars minimize the profound effects of the experiences of marginalization – something that one can never rationalize or idealize. Fanon (1967) reminds us that there is a difference between the objective knowledge of race and the experience of race and racism (subjective knowledge) in the body and flesh as a consequence of social experiences through lived and practiced experience. Similarly, for Audre Lorde (1984), the fact of difference is the reality of tremendous racial oppression. The need for engaging with difference is not simply about “inclusion” because this does not address the nuanced structure of white supremacy; rather, it is about anti-subordination, decolonization, and resistance in our work. An inattention to this leads to a denial of the violent ways in which knowledge and subjects have been produced and are being reproduced, as such naming issues through the power of language enables resistance to coloniality. David Goldberg (1990) asserts that “resistance must oppose the language of oppression, including the categories in terms of which the oppressor represents the forms in which resistance is expressed” (p. 314). Therefore, I am not suggesting that articulations of difference by subordinate groups remain beyond critique, but that those making this critique closely examine their own subject positions, *their own power, privilege and supremacy*. Who is describing and assessing the realities of whom, how do we hear these descriptions in relation to power, privilege and supremacy, and what relations do they secure? (Razack, 1998).

So what...

*These tongues' attempt to rupture....the coloniality of our being. While your 'lists' want to capture....the coloniality of our being. In them "lists"...where are them fists.....
oops, forgot the sub-altern, ain't supposed to speak*

Curriculum studies in its short history has evolved and undergone various theoretical shifts. If in the next moment the focus is upon creating more just equitable work by offering alternative languages, readings and diversity of knowledge, then the move towards towards disciplinarity –both vertical and horizontal – will have to be questioned and challenged. This is because the academic disciplines and their disciplinary discourses serve to maintain the present world order. Frantz Fanon challenged the basis of this ordering, which is important for those working for justice and equality. In *Black Skin White Masks*, Fanon (1967) says: “it will be seen that the black man’s alienation is not an individual question. Beside phylogeny and ontogeny stands sociogeny” (p. 11). The concept of sociogeny implies that humans and culture come into existence in and through one another, and that human and social-symbolic orders are made and can, therefore, be remade. Through this statement Fanon called into question the way in which disciplines order humans through a purely bio-centric definition of what it is to be (human) and ruptured our present knowledge system that our academic disciplines serve to maintain. Wynter (2001) argues that Fanon’s rupture (through this statement) was/is the move out of our present Western/European/Bio-centric understanding of the human, towards rupture of the present order of knowledge (p. 31).

Although Fanon’s intellectual revolution was seen briefly during the Black Power Movement (constituted of Black Arts, Black Aesthetics and Black Studies) and other anti-

colonial struggles, his work remained incomplete. Though these movements questioned the structure of the global system and ordering of knowledge systems, they failed because, as Wynter (2006) states, these movements got co-opted, as those that were struggling for human status, internalized their colonization to strive to become human-man. Still, Wynter encourages movement towards completion of Fanon's intellectual/conceptual transformation in order to move beyond the present Western mode of consciousness and way of being. This revolutionary space that Fanon created is an important entry point, in which scholars of education can partake to produce new socialities. By entering this space and pushing the boundaries of disciplinarity (both within curriculum and in other fields) intellectuals could move beyond the limits of the descriptive statement.

Forging new trails...

While you...go on...erase...mistrace...marginalize them 'othered' ways...Don't feel our writings...don't care about our social histories...and continue to forget..But we will resist...to remind you frequently, that we do exist...So these breaths and my tongue want to tell you, you are not reconceptualising anything new...when it's simply a reproduction of 1492...only in solidarity can we exchange...1492 for something new. Bus, thi-yu - It's enough.

Since intellectuals are some of the primary actors that have served to maintain the Western-bourgeois system of Human-Man (through lists, education systems and disciplines), they will have to play a key role in radical re-education and rupture. This requires moving beyond the idea of Human-Man. One way to do this is by engaging in a poetics of humanness, where a new inventory is created which considers cataloguing “flesh, blood, bones, and muscles, a poetics of toxic genealogies, bloody rags and soft travellers” (McKittrick, 2007, p. 22). This inventory must invest in various knowledge systems, traditions, cultures, social histories (painfully new, re-mixed, and mashed), aesthetics (e.g. poetry) and alterable discourses, rather than the reiterations of the categories of enlightenment.

Another way forward is the Fanonian rupture through decolonization, which calls into question the whole colonial order and its aftermath (Fanon, 1963), while keeping in mind that decolonization is an ongoing historical process that seeks to bring forth social change. The project of decolonization must be gained through a global commons – a practice – in fostering relationships of mutuality with other commoners and the earth through collective organizing independent of the state and law¹ (Sharma & Wright, 2008, p.131). One starting point of decolonization within the field is anti-colonial thought, as it takes into consideration various knowledges within particular social contexts and aims to draw upon diverse discursive traditions to explain the social and political phenomena as a vital force for multiple knowings. “Anti-colonial struggles see local subjects as makers of their own history. In other words, local subjects hold discursive power and their intellectual agency can be traced through history, not modernity” (Dei, 2006, p. 28). Most importantly it seeks to challenge dominant relations of knowledge production that sustain systems of power.

A possible methodology for participatory decolonization, via an anti-colonial curriculum, has been made by Eve Tuck; she calls this the “methodology of rematriation/repatriation”² (Tuck, 2011). She offers nine suggestions of the ways in which educators and scholars can engage through a participatory approach that are fundamentally anti-colonial. “Rematriation of curriculum studies [would be] concerned with the redistribution of power, knowledge, and place, and the dismantling of settler colonialism” (p. 4) while considering doing curriculum work in community not on communities. Most importantly, “reflecting the cosmologies of our [various]

communities, [...] this means that the chain of value of curriculum studies is shaped by a community's understanding of the relationships between human knowledge and/within the cosmos" (p. 3).

Tuck's ideas resonate and help me relate, to understand and make sense of Amma's story of the black scorpions through the teachings of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam. The relationship between human knowledge and the cosmos, particularly for those local mud movers, was a relationship of reciprocal survival inscribed in the cosmology of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam. Letting the scorpions live was of primary importance to the mud movers because their own existence and survival was connected to the existence and survival of the black scorpions, despite their poisonous venom. A methodology of rematriation offers displaced scorpions, such as myself, the ability to make sense of our own experiences, histories and cultures through the ontological, axiological and epistemological views that are rooted in our communities. This enables rupturing the imposed, internal colonization that many people of colour and Indigenous people adopt through schooling, in turn legitimating perspectives, ideas, and knowledge's that these scholars produce.—Rematriation serves as an important methodology to use if we are to embrace the idea of reimagining something new.

Last but not least, solidarity work (in the political sense) must be included in working towards something new - solidarity with all sorts of scorpions and species. At a young age, I was taught about political struggle and collective resistance as tactic for change. Why not use this in curriculum studies? Gaztambide-Fernández (2010) suggests 'browning' things up in curriculum studies for creating and reinventing curriculum theories to allow for new perspectives by offering alternative languages and a multiplicity of readings, and as a "tactic of solidarity" (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2010, p. 4). In his view:

a pedagogy of solidarity can trouble further the tension between rejecting cultural essentialism (particularly around questions of race/ethnicity) and confront the ways in which White supremacy continues to shape curriculum studies in fundamental ways. [...] Solidarity points to ways of imagining human relations that are premised on difference, not on commonality or shared interest, as any attempt to define the field, such as canonic tactics, implies. (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2010, p. 4)

Most importantly, this relationship of solidarity should be centered on the question of responsibility - responsibility as an ethic and responsibility as principle. It is important to consider responsibility as an important constituent, to the study of these relationships of solidarity. Also, to couple responsibility with principles of friendship, peace, trust, care and love, rooted outside ownership and property relations, which are fundamental principles of co-existence in many communities. Perhaps then the black scorpion(s) will appear less scary and dangerous and their sting can be used for decolonization and healing from white supremacy. As such, in wanting to envision something new beyond 1492, we have to collectively engage in a collective solidarity, rooted in an ethic of shared responsibility towards other people (locally and globally), the land, and our ancestors.

We have many questions to ask and have many conversations yet to come, many histories and knowledges to dig out and openness to build around these ideas. In doing this work, questions of complicity, epistemic violence, salience of marginalized voices/knowledges and willingness to work with and across difference is necessary. In forging trails ahead, towards "the next moment" in curriculum studies, I do not have the answers to how we will do this work.

However I will assert that it is our collective responsibility to figure this out together - to creatively think, work, talk, understand, exchange, read, care, listen (which involves remaining silent at times) and write across difference(s). While de-centering supremacy and the descriptive statement of the human, while at the same time addressing the marginalization of the ‘black scorpions’ in the struggle against the colonality of being. Yes, this work is going to be very complicated but in thinking about the challenges and the “next moment,” I leave readers with two questions in fulfilling my autonomous responsibility to Amma and many others that have come before me. Do you oppose or support the ridding and annihilation of the black scorpions? Or, do you oppose or support pathways of co-existence, solidarity, rematriation, decolonization, new modes of being human and emancipation? How one chooses to answer, act and take responsibility in response to these questions will shape the future of curriculum and humanity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández for his critical and invaluable feedback and support while I developed the ideas for this paper. I am also grateful to: the reviewers of the *Journal of Curriculum and Theorizing* for their input, and Rinaldo Walcott and Sarah Stefana-Smith for helping me think through the complexity of Wynter’s theories. A version of this paper was presented at the Bergamo conference in October 2011.

Notes

1. The notion of global commons relates to the organization of human activity that “vests all property in the community and organizes labour for the common benefit of all” (Sharma & Wright, 2008, pg 131). Agents of decolonization are known as commoners.
2. Tuck (2011) explains the meaning of repatriation in Indigenous context as “returning of the human remains of our relations and the reclaiming of sovereignty, land, subsistence rights, cultural knowledge and artifacts, theories, epistemologies and axiologies” (Tuck, 2011, p. 2). She uses the term rematriation as an alternative to repatriation in order to de-center heteropatriarchal dominance, which has been used by Indigenous activist from matrilineal societies. However, at times due to the limitations with the English language she uses repatriation.

References

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt. (1903/1990). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Vintage.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt. (1935). Does the negro need separate schools? *The Journal of Negro Education*, 4(3), 328-335.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt. (1898). The study of the negro problems. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 11, 1-23.
- Fanon, F. (1967) *Black skin, white mask*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Frembgen, J. (2004). The scorpion in Muslim folklore. *Asian Folklore Studies*, 63, 95-123.
- Gasztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2006). Regarding race: The necessary browning of our curriculum and pedagogy public project. *Journal of Curriculum & Pedagogy*, 3(1): 60-65.
- Gasztambide-Fernández, R. (2010) Solidarity and difference. In J. G. Maudlin, B. Stodghil, and M.F. He (Eds.), *Engaging the possibilities and complexities of hope: Utterances of*

- curriculum and pedagogy's past, present, and future* (pp. 90-94). New York: Educators International Press.
- Goldberg, D.T. (1990). The social formation of racist discourse. In D.T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Anatomy of Racism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider*. San Francisco: The Crossing Press.
- McKittrick, K. (2007). I entered the lists...Diaspora catalogues: The list, the unbearable territory, and tormented chronologies—Three narratives and a Weltanschauung. *Cross Cultural Poetics*, 17, 7-29.
- Ngugi, W. (1994). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Kenya: East African Publishers.
- Pinar, W. (2007). *Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity: Verticality and horizontality in curriculum studies*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
- Razack, S. (2002). When place becomes race. In S. Razack (ed.), *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 1-20). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Razack, S. (1999) *Looking white people in the eye*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sharma, N. & Wright, C. (2008). Decolonizing resistance: Challenging colonial states. *Social Justice*, 35(3), 120-138.
- Scheurich, P. and M. Young. (1997) Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- Shubert, W. (2009) The AAACS curriculum canon project: Divergent and convergent possibilities and evolutions report. Unpublished report.
- Shubert, W. (2009a) Currere and disciplinarity in curriculum studies: Possibilities for education research. *Educational Researcher*, 38(2), 136-140.
- Smith, A. (2006) Three pillars of white supremacy: Rethinking women of color organizing. In *Color of violence: The incite! Anthology* (pp. 66-73). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Smith, A. (2006) Indigenous feminism without apology – decentering white feminism. *New Socialist Magazine*, October.
- Sykes, H. (2011) Queering curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(1), 1-3.
- Tuck, E. (2011) Rematriating curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(1), 1-4.
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409-428.
- Wright, H. K. (1998). Dare we re-centre Birmingham? Troubling the origin and trajectories of cultural studies. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 33-56.
- Wynter, S. (1995). 1492: A new world view. In V. Hyatt and R. Nettleford (eds), *Race, discourse and the origins of the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wynter, S. (2001) Towards the sociogenic principal: Fanon, identity, the puzzle of conscious experience, and what it is like to be black. In M. DuranCogan & A Moriana (Eds.), *National Identities and Sociopolitical Changes in Latin America* (pp. 30-66). New York: Routledge.

Wynter, S. (2003) Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, it's overrepresentation – an argument. *The New Centennial Review*, 3(3), 257-337.

Wynter, S. (2006) On how we mistook the map for our territory and re-imprisoned ourselves in our unbearable wrongness of being, of Desetre. In G. Lewis & A. Gordon (Eds.), *Not only the master's tools: African-American Studies in theory and practice*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Appendix A – Canon List Eligibility And Evaluative Criteria

Retrieved from <http://www.aaacs.org/?p=93>

From September 2009 through January 2010, the committee communicated by email and met multiple times by phone. The committee first developed criteria for judging whether or not a particular text merited inclusion on the list:

I. Eligibility Criteria:

- a. Published prior to 1970
- b. Major contribution that by all reasonable standards falls within the scope of curriculum studies.

II. Evaluative Criteria:

- a. Key text that made “a distinctive and necessary contribution” to the field of curriculum studies;
- b. Key text that represented a “turning point” in the field of curriculum studies;
- c. Key text that “helped change the direction and scope of curriculum studies;”
- d. Key text that was generative of new lines of inquiry in the curriculum studies field.

Appendix B - AAACS Proposed Canon

1. Aikin, W. M. (1942). *The story of the eight year study, with conclusions and recommendations*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
2. Albery, H. B. & Albery, E. J. (1962). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
3. Beauchamp, G. A. (1961). *Curriculum theory*. Wilmette, IL: Kagg Press.
4. Berman, L. M. (1968). *New priorities in the curriculum*. Columbus, OH: C. E. Merrill.
5. Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
6. Bode, B. H. (1938). *Progressive education at the crossroads*. New York: Newson & Co.
7. Bond, H. M. (1934). *The education of the Negro in the American social order*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
8. Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* New York: John Day Company.
10. Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
11. Dubois, W. E. B. (1935). Does the Negro need separate schools? *The Journal of Negro Education*, 4: 3 (July), 328-335.
12. Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
13. Goodlad, J. (1964). *School curriculum reform in the United States*. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.
14. Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and the private vision: A search for America in education and literature*. New York: Random House, Inc.
15. Herrick, V. E., & Tyler, R. W. (Eds.). (1950). *Toward improved curriculum theory: Papers presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory, 1947, University of Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
16. Huebner, D. (1967). Curriculum as concern for man's temporality. *Theory into practice* 6 (4), 172-179.

17. Kilpatrick, W. (1918). *The project method: The use of the purposeful act in the educative process*. New York: Teachers College Press.
18. Macdonald, J. (1967). An example of disciplined curriculum thinking. *Theory Into Practice*, 6(4), 166-171.
19. Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the curriculum: A social process*. New York: Appleton-Century.
20. National Education Association (1894). *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies*. New York: The American Book Company.
21. National Education Association (1895). *Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education*. New York: The American Book Company.
22. National Education Association (1918). *Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
23. National Society for the Study of Education Committee on Curriculum-Making (1927). The foundations of curriculum-making. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: The foundations and technique of curriculum-construction* (pp. 11-28). Bloomington, IL, Public School Publishing Company.
24. Phenix, P. (1964). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
25. Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language for curriculum*. Washington D.C.: National Education Association.
26. Seguel, M. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years*. New York: Teachers College Press.
27. Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
28. Spencer, H. (1966). What knowledge is of most worth. In A. M. Kazamias, (Ed.), *Herbert Spencer on education* (pp. 121-159). New York: Teachers College Press. (Original work published in 1860)
29. Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.
30. Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
31. Washington, B. T. (1901/2010). The Atlanta Exposition Address [1895]. In *Up from Slavery: An Autobiography*. New York: Signet Classics.
32. Woodson, C. G. (1933/1990). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

