

The Dreamwork of Childhood Memory

The Futures Teachers Make from the Schooling Past

DEBBIE SONU

City University of New York

LISA FARLEY

York University

SANDRA CHANG-KREDL

Concordia University

JULIE C. GARLEN

Carleton University

CHILDHOOD MEMORIES BRING TO THE PEDAGOGICAL PRESENT traces of the past (Britzman, 2003) yet also telegraph dreams about how structures of schooling and society might be imagined otherwise. In teacher education, memories are often used in support of critical reflection. They provide the raw material for prospective teachers to contemplate both desirable and undesirable aspects of the teacher's role and to make observations about issues relating to classroom authority, values, and expectations (Chang-Kredl & Kingsley, 2014; Miller & Shifflet, 2016; Mitchell & Weber, 1998, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2011). As teachers stretch into their identities, traces of the past become "ghosts" that haunt conceptualizations about the work, intentions, and practices of teaching (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2003, p. 3). While linked to past events, memories, like dreams, are also linked to speculative imaginations about the future (Horton & Malinowski, 2015). Both memories and dreams hover in an elusive forcefield made from material reality and imagined immateriality (Derrida & Mehlman, 1972). Remembering may well be *dreamwork* when it tumbles the one-remembering into the intermingled space between lived social reality and future possibilities that are not-yet.

In this article, we offer *dreamwork* as a metaphor and method to shine light on the creative ways that prospective teachers utilize childhood memory to both affect the enduring, disquieting, and at times painful bedrock of the schooling past and imagine the pedagogical future. Our data is drawn from 116 childhood memories written by adults who were enrolled in teacher education programs and/or childhood studies courses in Canada and the United States. The memories we gathered are diverse, ranging from carefree scenes of summer picnics, first bike rides, and "innocent mischief" to frightening times when everyday mistakes, risks, and antics lead to harsh punishment and surveillance (Farley et al., 2020, p. 111). Of all the memories, we focus here on 40 memories set in the context of schools and classrooms to speculate about the lasting impact of

childhood past as teachers engage, navigate, and understand their adult return to the classroom (Britzman, 2003). By underscoring the transformative qualities of memory in relation to processes of empathy, repetition, and refusal, we theorize *dreamwork* as essential to orienting teachers toward different and possible pedagogical futures.

Dreams, Memories, Possibilities

At the turn of the 19th century, Sigmund Freud (1900) published *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in which he conceived dreaming as a nighttime avenue into a world of unconscious wishes and forgotten events. Dreams would continue to haunt the analyst's lifetime of work, particularly in relation to memory. If in Freud's later writings, he argues that "dreams produce memories that the dreamer has forgotten" (1940/2006, p. 21), in his earlier musings, he suggests that "memories" represent "the manifest content of dream-thoughts" (Freud, 1914/2006, p. 393). For Freud, dreams conjure memories as much as memories have dream-like qualities. It is not that memories and dreams are equivalent, but that both are "affecting narratives" that pass through layers of fantasy, wish, and anxiety that mediate, screen, shape, distort, and even conceal the meaning of the events to which they refer (Britzman, 2016, p. 140). Since both dreams and memories change the actual material of the events they represent, neither are exact chronicles. They reside in a collision of temporality: a time when the past and the anticipation of the future co-mingle, often without condition (Silin, 2018). In a related sense, dreams and memories break down the modern binary between child and adult because they invite a momentary leave of chronological time and draw together earlier and later moments of life.

Both dreams and memory dislodge time and space from the certitude and transparency often glorified in Western discourses. Memories, like dreams, are fragmented, disorienting, and affective. For surrealist poets and artists, dreams not only loosen the sense of a unified and individual self, but also serve as a revolutionary response to systems of domination that equate rationality with existence. Louis Aragon's (1924/2003) essay, "A Wave of Dreams," reminds us "that there are other experiences that the mind can embrace which are equally fundamental such as chance, illusion, the fantastic, dreams" (para. 4). Here, the dream is a process where representational forms become subordinate to "the textual weaving of differences" (Greenwalt, 2010), sitting within the inextricable and often unnoticed space between what is spoken and what lingers in silences. "The dreamer," write Jacques Derrida and Jeffrey Mehlman (1972), "invents his [sic] own grammar" (p. 89), actively contesting a fixed reality and unhinging ideological certitude to make room for more expansive interpretations than have hitherto been imagined.

In the essay "Real Dreams," Elissa Marder (2013) draws from a range of philosophical readings of Freud's work to argue that the radical singularity of dreams gives new meaning to older and extant forms of knowledge by producing insights that open us to a horizon of future possibilities. It is not just that we interpret dreams at a later time; they impact and therefore make the future itself. Whether intentional or not, dreams leave traces that are already "a principle of futurity" that change what might occur (Marder, 2013, p. 213). As Marder (2013) explains, "dreams are not merely interpreted *in* the future; they make something happen *to* the future" (p. 213, original emphasis). Édouard Glissant's (1985/2019) poem "Dream Country, Real Country" brings reality and dream into a similar transformative relation by carrying the traumatic history of colonialism into an original future, undetermined by the past and on the cusp of liberation. From

all that is lost of the original “dream country,” Glissant seeks repair not through the recovery of what was, but from a poetic synthesis of the new, what he refers to in his poem as the wounded real.

According to Robin D. G. Kelley (2002), the radical imagination created throughout the history of Black scholarship embraces the dream as a poetics of surrealism by crafting new forms and levels of consciousness from the plight of the formally colonized. Chronicling how “revolutionary dreams erupt out of political engagement” (Kelley, 2002, p. 8)—for instance, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s celebrated “I Have A Dream,” or in the context of education, Gloria Ladson-Billing’s (1994) *The Dreamkeepers*—Kelley (2002) argues that dreams must not be underestimated as individual desire, but as collective labour, one that, as we write this article, has spilled onto the streets as a global outcry against state-sanctioned police violence and systemic anti-Black racism.¹ Cast in this way, dreams symbolize a shared demand and desire for difference. They anticipate, without knowing for certain, a reckoning with legacies of social injustice that allows for a rising-up from subjugated life as an affirmative new future (Harney & Moten, 2013).²

Yet, dreams are also anchored in social and institutional discourses that are anything but liberating. Neoliberal school reforms condition a culture of consumerism and individualism that orients dreamers to notions of “success” and “happiness,” detracting from the critical work needed to challenge social inequities and disproportionate access to these very ideals. The idealization of “the Dream,” as described by Ta-Nehisi Coates (2015), is nestled in “cul-de-sacs” of race privilege that uphold the meritocratic language of “American ambition” and cover the tracks of socially-produced inequities (p. 116). Rooted in national fantasies of cohesion and efficiency, the dream of education is actually a “broken dream” that secures unequal power relations and, in this way, “glide[s] over the domain of ethics” (McLaren, 1988, pp. 61–62). In this construction, education’s dream serves its own wishes to maintain the dominant social order (Taubman, 2017). Deborah Britzman (1998), too, exposes the limits of “education’s dream of mastery” (p. 10) as a myth of meritocracy linked to a long history that defines, “competency as the absence of conflict” and the teacher as a monolith of knowledge (Britzman, 2003, p. 7).

While dreams imprint dominant ideals of education, a kernel of transformation remains. Dreams register an “underside,” harboring dynamics of resistance that interrupt the “heroic story of progress” on which schooling is based (Britzman, 1998, p. 50). As Britzman (1998) writes, dreams script an internal “otherness” of the self, of schooling, and of society that disrupts any sense of coherence or completeness in those domains (p. 50). Dreams telegraph the most unexpected and unwanted aspects of our wishes, including the wish to *not* know and so charge us to account for our implication in this cavern of refusal. In a related sense, dreams represent the deeply “emotional situation” of education that does not proceed by reason alone (Britzman, 2009, p. ix). Neither teachers nor students are in charge of knowledge per se, just as curriculum and pedagogy do not settle, but rather produce, conflict. Indeed, from the vantage of the dream, education sets into motion surprising entanglements that fundamentally alter and undo one’s sense of being in the world.

Brought to bear on the present study, *dreamwork* can show how teachers use memory to resignify what has already occurred when envisioning a pedagogical future. With Adam Phillips (1995), we consider what it means to “include dreaming in a context other than sleeping,” namely, as a frame to study the relationship between the schooling past and pedagogical future (p. 68). Britzman (2016), too, takes up precisely this idea when she proposes the value of reading a broad range of representations, including play and art, “just like dreams” (p. 45; see also Farley, 2011). Reading memories “like dreams” allows us to speculate about the “transformation of thinking”

that new teachers engage to reimagine the schooling past (Britzman, 2016, p. 45). Read as dreams, memories tell us something about how teachers symbolize the “otherness” of the profession they are about to enter and how, through this process, they may affect and interrupt its often constrictive legacies (Britzman, 1998, p. 50).

“Strange Methods”

At four university sites in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, and New York City, we asked undergraduate students enrolled in teacher education programs and/or childhood studies courses to conjure a childhood memory that was significant to their adult lives. Through a two-part free writing exercise, participants were asked to describe a childhood memory by giving representation to the sights, sounds, scents, and feelings associated with the memory recalled and then to reflect on the relationship between their memory and their current aspirations devoted to the education of young people. While we left the question open to a range of childhood events and experiences, a good number (42 of 116) nonetheless set their memories within schools and classrooms, in relationship with teachers, and with fellow classmates. Because in this paper we are interested in how new *teachers* engage memory to affect the past and future, we focus our analysis on the 40 memories penned by participants enrolled in teacher education programs.³

We look to dreams themselves to situate our method of reading memory. In Britzman’s (1998) framing, dreams operate by “*strange methods*” that work over material events through processes such as “condensation, substitution, distortion, displacement, [and] reversal into [the] opposite” (p. 50, emphasis added). In foregrounding *dreamwork*, we are interested in how teachers make sense of and describe the methods, meanings, dynamics, and operations of their school memories. Here, we are guided by Jonathan Lear (2005) who notes that Freud “is primarily concerned not with the interpretation of dreams, but with the self-interpretation of dreamers” (p. 93). For us, reading memories as dreams is not, therefore, a matter of applying a theory of universal symbolism, such that a playground represents *x* or a punishing teacher means *y*. Instead, we emphasize the highly contextual and personal uses of *dreamwork* (Derrida & Mehlman, 1972) by focusing on the interpretations made by participants themselves. Our discussion therefore considers how new teachers use memory to represent both salient and quotidian events of the schooling past and to make meaning from that which is often beyond their grasp or control.

Our method of reading attends to meanings within the liminal dreamscape between memory and the production of futurity that the memory enables. Within this temporal overlap of past and future, we propose three processes of *dreamwork*: In the first, teachers bend the emotional force of memory into empathy with the imagined feelings of students they have yet to teach. In the second, prospective teachers aim to replicate pedagogical practices of revered teachers that involve moments of happiness, recognition, and success. In the third, teachers identify, challenge, and refuse to repeat the oppressive force of the school as they contemplate the deeply relational and critical aspects of the work. While some of these findings mirror studies where anticipated relationships with students are imagined as replications or reversals of teachers’ childhood memories (Chang-Kredl & Kingsley, 2014; Mitchell & Weber, 1999), our use of *dreamwork* allows us to home in on the specific processes through which teachers resignify the meaning of the schooling past in the imagination of the future. Across all three processes, we note how, in the first two, participants take the side of the child (i.e., empathy) or the teacher (i.e., repetition) to establish a continuity of feelings and efforts between past and future. In the third process, we

suggest that teachers take the side of otherness to imagine a wider set of pedagogical conditions in a structural and relational sense. None of these processes exist in a pure way. We offer them as psychical positions on the understanding that two or more may be at work, to a greater or lesser extent, inside any one person or memory.

Empathy: Fantasizing the Side of the Child

Of the 40 school memories that concern our paper, 12 draw from empathy to bridge the divide between the schooling past and pedagogical future. These memories document how the oftentimes raw emotions felt as children can endure as conditions for relating to and identifying with the children teachers have yet to teach. This dream-like transformation occurs through both the crafting of the memory, by which new teachers return to themselves as children, and the way participants draw a portrait of other children through their dreams of being a teacher. With hopes to create a more caring pedagogical future, teachers in this subset transformed their schooling past into pedagogical visions that presumed sameness between self and other, invoking empathy as a means to rescue children from their own past struggles with anxiety and hurt. The *dreamwork* of empathy, then, bridges this shift in positionality from past-child to future-teacher to imagined-student, with structures and school systems left largely unmentioned.

For example, four of the participants who utilized empathy recalled the sheer anxiety of entering a new school for the first time, in one case articulated as a state of “being really confused and scared,” and in another, feeling “intimidated with all these eyes staring.” For these new teachers, going to school opened an abyss rife with “fears of entering an unknown,” invoking empathy for the vulnerabilities that all children may feel. When asked why their memories matter to their future work with children, participants used their own feelings as reference points. Sonia, for example, recalled the fear of going to school for the first time, and in particular, “not want[ing] to leave the comfort of my mom.” She used this memory as a guide to contemplate “the fears that individuals, like myself, may experience.” Insofar as Sonia’s memory “helps me think about the struggles of the children that I teach,” it stands as a reminder that others, too, bring emotional experiences that may not be immediately apparent. As she wrote, her memory “makes me realize that everybody has a story and experience that shapes who they are.” Manny also uses her “nervous” experience of going to the Principal’s office as a touchstone from which to articulate her desire to “build a learning environment that is a brave space for EVERYONE” (original emphasis). In these cases, teachers remember the nervous child they once were and anticipate the anxieties of the students they imagine in their future classrooms.

While the memories above were contoured by the everyday-ness of feeling “nervous, vulnerable, and scared” in relation to school transitions and routines, five memories described feelings of humiliation and betrayal linked to the harsh actions of teachers. Alice described a memory about a teacher leading a math game:

If you responded incorrectly, she would say something that would make you feel so embarrassed. She would also start counting “1, 2, 3, ...” if it took you long to respond. Sometimes even the other students would start counting with her which made you feel nervous in responding wrong or not be able to think [sic] because everyone is already counting how long you’re taking until they say times up.

Alice's memory guides her belief that "not all children are confident" and that teachers who are keen on "pointing out and expecting a right answer affects [children] in the long run just like it did to me." The pressurized clock in this experience made Alice "hot/embarrassed to the point of being scared" and informs her dual commitment to never make a child feel rushed to answer correctly and never to make a child feel ashamed by calling attention to mistakes.

Alongside this game-gone-wrong, participants recalled scenes involving impatient, accosting, and unempathetic teachers. Ashley remembered her teacher yelling at her for not being able to "sit up straight" because she felt "extremely sick, tired and hungry." Eventually, she was sent "into the hallway for failure to comply," but in actual fact she felt unwell and eventually threw up. Meanwhile, Melissa was met with a "cross" and "impatient" teacher because she was unable to "lace up shoes" quickly enough. Lou remembered "feeling like an outcast" when "forced to work" with a classmate who required extra help. In all three cases, participants contend that their memories help them empathize with the ways young children can become anxious about falling behind, being misunderstood, "picked on," or "targeted." Such lessons were concluded with not only the perceived ability to know how it "feels to be treated by an adult who I thought I trusted," but also a desire to become teachers who are "more empathetic and cautious of how my students will feel when I act/make certain decisions in my classroom."

Whether participants use empathy to imagine universal conditions for all children, or whether they frame empathy as a quality they intend to embody, they all held the common belief that the children of their future classrooms will eventually mirror the struggles felt in their own childhoods. In this way, prospective teachers anticipate the nightmarish traces of anxiety, fear, and loneliness in their imagined students. With less empathy given to the decisions made by their own teachers—although one did mention the possibility of "good intentions"—none of the participants in this subset considered the institutional structure of the school, nor did they contemplate how social identity may affect a teacher's capacity to "know" their students. In these memories, empathy bridges differences in social positionality and presumes an exchange of roles relatively uncomplicated by relations of power that, in actual fact, situate teachers and students in unequal relations with each other and the school (Boler, 1999; Todd, 2003).

Repetition: Taking the Side of the Teacher

Of the 40 school-based memories, 10 aimed to repeat the practices and/or attitudes of a supportive, empathetic, caring, or loving teacher. Participants here used memory to envision pedagogical approaches they wish to replicate in their own classrooms, citing signifiers such as "empowerment," "creativity," "freedom," and "potential." Nicole's memory, for one, recalled an English teacher who "took the time" to teach her how to make flower pens as part of a fundraiser. She focused both on the beauty of the activity itself and on her teacher's "warmth and kindness" that "will never be forgotten." Indeed, Nicole's teacher becomes the embodiment of "qualities I would want to have as a teacher" and orients her valuation of "attachment and relationship" in the classroom. Alexandra, too, recalled a class activity of creating a Mother's Day card. Emphasizing the importance of "values" and "love" in living a good life, Alexandra, like her teacher, hopes to one day "allow children to self-reflect about the role models in their lives and to show it through creativity."

This desire to repeat positive pedagogies also references the welcoming of parents and cultures into school. For instance, Kristy recalled the great pride she felt during her first grade year

upon seeing her dad introduce his recipe for Chinese fried rice at a multicultural food festival. The “sudden, bigger appreciation for [her] Chinese culture” leads to her conclusion that “it is important for children, even adults, to learn to embrace their cultural background; it is who they are and what defines them.” Bora’s “most significant memory from childhood” warmly recalled having a “birthday party in school,” underlining the excitement of having her father bring “goodies and a cake” for all her classmates to share. Struck by the “mood of the classroom,” she recalled this memory as one that she “held truly to [her] heart,” a time when she was “happy, elated, and excited.” As if no time had passed, Bora even recalled that distinctive smell of burnt wax as she blew out her five candles. In visualizing this dream-like scene, she speculated about its implication for practice: “The fact that a birthday party made me happy proves that when I teach, there will be birthday parties for my students too, so that they can experience one in their classroom.”

Other examples of repetition are tied to activities that support children’s independence and ambition. Kelsey, who was home-schooled, recalled a memory that underlines the importance of play when teaching. Pretending to be a mother penguin in the snow framed her desire to help students experience the same sense of “freedom” that she did. Other projects included Jane’s red paper maché model of the planet Mars and Robin’s construction of a tadpole-like structure as part of a unit on the life cycle of a frog. Such projects, Jane described, instill “a deeper yearn to learn more,” which “pushes students to be better prepared for life.” More than glimpses of the past, these memories are made certain as a useful guide for the planning of future school curriculum. On this point, Jane shared: “This memory is one of the reasons why I enjoy assigning group work in school and take-home projects. I learned a lot on my own and I was able to incorporate other subjects as well like art.”

In each of these cases, participants constructed teachers as heroic individuals who are largely responsible for positive learning experiences. While inspiring role models can and do make a difference in children’s lives, the proclivity to idealize teachers leaves unexamined the ways pedagogy is bracketed and limited by the structures, contexts, and relations in which teachers actually work. Not unlike the position of empathy, the *dreamwork* of repetition may overlook the institutional pressures that make the teacher’s work more than an individual effort. In dreaming of a pedagogical future that has already occurred, these new teachers may also downplay their own newness—their own otherness—needed to identify and productively reimagine the institutional discourses of the school.

Refusal: Awakening the Side of Otherness

While the *dreamwork* of empathy and repetition may variably lead prospective teachers to identify with their future students through their own childhood selves or offer the pragmatic hope of replicating positive experiences in their own classroom designs, in the third subset of memories, 18 of the 40 new teachers worked through difficult school experiences by refusing to repeat the oppressive terms that made them possible at all. The assumption here is that the future can be different but only if the structuring conditions giving rise to experiences of social isolation, racism, and exclusion are dismantled and dreamt otherwise. In refusing the painful bedrock of the schooling past, these participants transformed anxiety into dreams rooted in care, critique, and social change, including the complexities that accompany these ideas.

For instance, Ava described her childhood memory as the time she became critically aware of the privileges of her wealthy peers and how, from the margins, she “would just watch them and

feel a little out of place.” C.O. recalled the painful teasing she endured for being “poor” and “not white.” She described an incident that led her to run from this “racist school” altogether:

I was about 12 years old. I was in class and some of my classmates (boys) started giving names at me and laughing at me. They said, “you are my housekeeper,” “you are stupid, you are poor, you are my maid.” I started crying and left the class. I remember running and then sitting on a bench out of the classroom.

Steeped in racialized, classed, gendered, and ableist remarks, this memory contributed to C.O.’s observation that racism “leaves trauma” in its wake and that it must be addressed as a systemic problem rather than an individual experience of “bullying.” Ava, too, challenged the idea that being “left out” is something that individual children can or should resolve on their own by becoming more resilient. “Not everyone comes out with a positive attitude after facing alienation,” wrote Ava, “and I think it matters to build self-esteem.”

Such jarring memories of childhood injury abound in this collection of 18 refusers. From being told to speak English, to the regulation of behavior, to instances of racism, these childhood memories demonstrate a range of ways children are subject to social hatred, often at the hands of other children. Anjie described a formative kindergarten memory about a time when socializing across racial lines proved to be one she would endure throughout her life:

This day I went to sit down next to this white girl and [she] yelled “you can’t sit here!” and I asked, “why not?” Then she said “because you’re BLACK!” I froze and then got teary eyed. This was the first time anyone had ever mentioned my skin colour and told me something was wrong with it. (original emphasis)

While years later Anjie ended up befriending the very same girl from her kindergarten class, she was surprised that this girl had no recollection of the event at all. “It made me realize how racism affects the victim much more than the reprimanded perpetrator,” she pointed out. Instead of deriving an imagined sense of empathy with the students of her future classroom, Anjie explained how this memory compels her to “consider her positionality,” a perceptible obligation since she “must strive to be a positive aspect to [her students’] educational journey.” Her example helps us to acknowledge that adult authority is needed to address racism enacted among and by children and in this way to no longer guard the exclusive construct of innocence mobilized to protect white children (Garlen et al., 2020). At the same time, Anjie’s memory gives us pause to question how the heavy-lifting of meaningful anti-racist education is often relegated to racialized teachers.

Memories leading to refusal also include anxious classroom scenes in which teacher judgments are made public and in view of other classmates. Chand remembered getting “sick for a long time” in grade 2. Upon returning to school, he also recalled being made to “sit at the back,” a tearful experience that he transformed into a pedagogical meditation on the uncertainty of life. “In reality,” he wrote, “change is happening to us and somethings [sic] it’s unpredictable.” The anxiety recalled is existential. About a second grade homework assignment that asked children to decide “what do you want to be when you grow up,” Alison recalled a state of anxiety over this proposition that she considered “too inappropriate and uncomfortable” for some children. “This is a very important memory for me. It was the first time remembering the anxious feeling,” she explained. “I want children to know that whoever they are I will support them.” The reignition of these anxious experiences led teachers to consider what it can mean to support kids while not

presuming to rescue them. Alison made precisely this point in her resolve that she “wants children to know that they don’t need to choose right away.”

In addition to experiences of exclusion and anxiety, four memories of this third subset featured children’s bouts with illness or getting sick—palpably described by Emannuelle as a disorienting “blur/buzz.” Whether missing the first two weeks of kindergarten because of a diagnosis of *Kawasaki Disease* or being shuttled back and forth from school to hospital for two full months of second grade, these memories resurrect feelings of distress, helplessness, and confusion. Memories of illness become the raw material for aspiring teachers to critique the pathologizing force of labels and the ethical limits of empathy. Referencing hazy images of needles, tubes, and machines, Katarina remembered most how her “parents were frightened though, the risk that their baby girl might not make it” and the lasting feeling that “I wasn’t normal.” From this memory, Katarina committed to loosen the hold of labels: “The labels we get stick & often they are quite hurtful. I want to do my best to eliminate that.” N.C., too, challenged the limits of labels in recalling how their diagnosis of epilepsy led peers “to laugh at me.” From this memory, N.C. offered an important critique of ableist assumptions of who does and “does not belong” at school. Avery recalled the “social neglect” of both teachers and peers on a day when she felt “too sick to move,” an experience that she further linked to race: “No one wanted a brown girl as a friend.” Looking back, Avery offered a critical perspective of the “assumptions” teachers can make about children when they “automatically connect to their own personal experiences.” Not unlike our critique of empathy above, Avery warned that such assumptions can be projections of the teacher’s own experiences that “distract what the issue is for the child.” It is this self-referential stance that Avery refuses to repeat.

Memories leading to dreams of refusal give representation to the specific contexts and circumstances shaping educational relationships and the elusive qualities of emotional life. They symbolize the structural inequities that position children differently in relationship to each other, the teacher, and the school, as well as constructs of innocence, protection, and knowledge. Their visions of self-as-future-educator draw together childhood experience with social critique and do so in ways that express dreams for how to materialize more equitable and just forms of teaching. When teachers draw from their own marginalization, they use this knowledge to question the ways in which education privileges those who fit inside seemingly universal assumptions of both childhood and learning. In this subset of memories, participants take the stance of future teachers who refuse to repeat oppressive conditions of education that disavow the emotional, relational, and structural aspects of teaching and learning. Their memories dream of a different future when teachers and young people can reconfigure social inequities and engage relational complexities as part and parcel of education, and not the opposite.

Pedagogical Dreaming

The use of memory in teacher education and curriculum studies has a long history that has radically shifted both fields. Against technocratic constructions of the teacher’s work, studies that delve into the depths of teacher memory call our attention to the complexities and conflicts produced at the intersection between the teacher’s biography and the institution of school (Britzman, 2003; Britzman & Pitt, 1996; Greene, 1973; Grumet, 1988; Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2003; Michell & Weber, 1998, 1999). With scholars before us, we maintain that teaching is a deeply human profession that confronts us with existential dilemmas, fuzzy boundaries between self and

other, and the trouble of embodying a sense of self within existing structures. Our study affirms these claims insofar as the new teachers participating here recalled school scenes that are electrified by dynamics of love and loss, idealization and anxiety, social exclusion and critique as formative to their imagination of a pedagogical future. Memory reminds us that teaching is not a series of tasks to master in the management of children, but an entanglement with “the leftover terrors and pleasures of having to begin” *and* with the social legacies that unevenly affect how and for whom beginnings are supported and made livable (Britzman, 2013, p. 104).

Our own efforts in this article add an understudied relationship between memory and dreams. In particular, we utilize the notion of *dreamwork* to show how teachers employ “strange methods” that work over, and ultimately transform, the material events of the schooling past (Britzman, 1998). As much as dreams show us that we are susceptible to the haunting return of history, their “defamiliarizing sway” also shows us that teachers are open to possibilities that are not-yet and what might still be (McLaren, 1991, p. 28). Through processes of empathy, repetition, and refusal, teachers show us how linking *dreamwork* with memory work can make something new from what has already occurred. This action is rooted, by virtue of our birth, in what Hannah Arendt (1958) calls “natality” (p. 9), which refers to our capacity to invite and protect what is totally unexpected in the face of what already exists. *Dreamwork*, then, refers not to a literal undoing of the past, but the symbolic work of representing how and why history matters—and can be made anew—in the imagination of a pedagogical present and future.

If, at times, teachers use memory to secure wishes to repeat happy experiences and rescue children from perceived trouble, they also symbolize a future of teaching that, while it cannot be known, could be different. Particularly in the *dreamwork* of refusal, teachers use memory to make insights into the often constricting features and exclusive conditions of the schooling past. Ourselves wary of categorizations of knowledge, we do not wish to suggest that teachers can be squeezed into any one of the frames in our analysis, e.g., either empathizers or repeaters or refusers. Rather, we use the above terms to sketch a layered dreamscape of teaching that is touched by all three, and likely more. We suggest that the teachers of our study collectively shift the dream of education from one of mastery to one of natality that poses a tension at the heart of the teacher’s work. While teaching may be enjoyed as a promise of happy endings, teachers reside in the mismatch between the structures they inherit and formations that are still possible, and in this gap, dreams thrive.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank our research assistants for their contribution to this project: Johanna Barnhart, Emilie Hill-Smith, Lauren Jervis, Farah Virani-Murji, and Gala Wilkie.

Notes

1. As we were writing this paper, uprisings emerged around the globe in protest against centuries of anti-Black racism that have led to the murder of too many, including more recently, George Floyd. These uprisings also came in a context of the Coronavirus-19 pandemic that made social life all the more precarious, particularly for Black and poor peoples who have been disproportionately affected by COVID-19 because of systemic racism and enduring social inequities. While our paper is not about these events, both anti-Black racism and the COVID-19 pandemic infuse our words, reminding us that memories and dreams are thoroughly social and political. We do not know how excessive policing or the spread of COVID-19 would have changed the memories recalled by the prospective teachers of our study. But we do wish to note, in retrospect, that when participants recall memories of racism, they also call for the dismantling of the education system and for a radical reimagination of teaching committed to the creation of viable social conditions for marginalized children

and youth. In our current context of virus, violence, and social change, we hope our paper can help readers think about how racism affects childhood memories and future dreams, how memory may be put to use to expose social injustices, to dream of education otherwise, and to raise questions about who will be willing to undertake this critical labor.

2. Freud himself came to make a distinction between dreams as wish-fulfillment and as carriers of real-life concerns. Indeed, he changed his mind about the former in favour of the latter. As Jonathan Lear (2005) explains,

Freud eventually abandoned the idea that every dream was the gratification of a wish. In particular, he left open the possibility that a dream might be a manifestation—and representation—of anxiety. And anxiety can be a realistic response to the world. (p. 116)

The change Lear notes is important, for, in Freud’s new formulation, dreams are relational, situated forms of knowledge, rather than solipsistic, internally-driven pursuits.
3. The memories under examination in this article are drawn from narratives of those enrolled in teacher education programs (40/42). Only two participants enrolled in childhood studies placed their childhood memory inside the walls of the school.

References

- Aragon, L. (2003). *A wave of dreams* (S. de Muth, Trans.). Thin Man Press. (Original work published 1924)
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. Routledge.
- Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. (2009). *The very thought of education: Psychoanalysis and the impossible professions*. State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. (2013). Between psychoanalysis and pedagogy: Scenes of rapprochement and alienation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 95–117.
- Britzman, D. (2016). *Melanie Klein: Early analysis, play, and the question of freedom*. Springer.
- Britzman, D., & Pitt, A. (1996). Pedagogy and transference: Casting the past of learning into the presence of teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 35(2), 117–123.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849609543711>
- Chang-Kredl, S., & Kinglsey, S. (2014). Identity expectations in early childhood teacher education: Pre-service teachers’ memories of prior experiences and reasons for entry into the profession. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 43, 27–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.05.005>
- Coates, T. (2015). *Between the world and me*. Spiegel & Grau.
- Derrida, J., & Mehlman, J. (1972). Freud and the scene of writing. *Yale French Studies*, 48, 74–117. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2929625>
- Farley, L. (2011). Squiggle evidence: The child, the canvas, and the ‘negative labor’ of history. *History and Memory*, 23(2), 5–39. <https://doi.org/10.2979/histmemo.23.2.5>
- Farley, L., Sonu, D., Garlen, J. C., & Chang-Kredl, S. (2020). Childhood memories of playful antics and punishable acts: Risking an imperfect future of teaching and learning. *The New Educator*, 16(2), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2020.1731036>
- Freud, S. (1900). *The interpretation of dreams*.
<http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Freud/Dreams/dreams.pdf>

- Freud, S. (2006). Remembering, repeating and working-through. In A. Phillips (Ed.), *The Penguin Freud reader* (pp. 391–401). Penguin. (Original work published 1914)
- Freud, S. (2006). An outline of psychoanalysis. In A. Phillips (Ed.), *The Penguin Freud reader* (pp. 1–67). Penguin. (Original work published 1940)
- Garlen, J. C., Chang-Kredl, S., Farley, L., & Sonu, D. (2020). Childhood innocence and experience: Memory, discourse and practice. *Children & Society*. Wiley Online Library Early View. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12428>
- Glissant, É. (2019). *The collected poems of Édouard Glissant* (J. Humphries, Ed.; M. Manolas, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1985)
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger: Educational philosophy for the modern age*. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Greenwalt, K. (2010). The interpretation of dreams: Ladson-Billings, Freud, and Derrida. *Interchange*, 14(1), 81–80.
- Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Harney, S., & Moten, F. (2013). *The undercommons: Fugitive planning & Black study*. Minor Compositions.
- Horton, C. L., & Milinowski, J. E. (2015). Autobiographical memory and hyperassociativity in the dreaming brain: Implications for memory consolidation in sleep. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 874. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00874>
- Kelley, R. D. (2002). *Freedom dreams: The Black radical imagination*. Beacon Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (2003). *The essential conversation: What parents and teachers can learn from each other*. Ballantine Books.
- Lear, J. (2005). *Freud*. Routledge.
- Marder, E. (2013). Real dreams. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 51(Spindel Supplement), 196–213.
- McLaren, P. (1988). Broken dreams, false promises, and the decline of public schooling. *Journal of Education*, 170(1), 41–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748817000105>
- McLaren, P. (1991). Critical pedagogy: Constructing an arch of social dreaming and a doorway to hope. *Journal of Education*, 173(1), 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205749117300101>
- Miller, K., & Shifflet, R. (2016). How memories of school inform preservice teachers' feared and desired selves as teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 53, 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.10.002>
- Mitchell, C., Strong-Wilson, T., Pithouse, K., & Allnutt, S. (2011). *Memory and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (1998). The usable past: Teachers (re)playing school. *Changing English*, 5(1), 45–56.
- Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (1999). *Reinventing ourselves as teachers: Beyond nostalgia*. Falmer Press.
- Phillips, A. (1995). *Terrors and experts*. Harvard University Press.
- Silin, J. (2018). *Early childhood, aging, and the lifecycle: Mapping common ground*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Taubman, P. (2017). Death by numbers: A response to Backer, Sarigianides, and Stillwaggon. *Educational Theory*, 67(1), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12230>

Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. State University of New York Press.

